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Executive Summary

Introduction
In 2004 Bridge House Trust commissioned Lemos and Crane to conduct research to support the Trust in identifying how it might best make a contribution to addressing the problem of knife crime and young people in London by determining

- what were the key factors involved in young people deciding to carry knives and weapons
- what was the scale of the problem, and
- what were the most effective types of intervention.

The primary recommendation of the resulting report ‘Fear and Fashion: The use of knives and other weapons by young people’ was the need for demonstration or pilot projects to combat the problem.

In response to this, five independent grant-making trusts developed and funded a collaborative programme named Fear and Fashion aimed at tackling the carrying and use of knives and weapons amongst young people. The overall aim of the Fear and Fashion programme is "To develop exemplar projects working with young people to tackle knife culture so as to reduce the use and carrying of knives and other weapons and to provide alternatives and long-term change."

In 2007 four exemplar projects were funded, one in Lambeth/Southwark and three in South Brent/North Westminster, to develop and test out different interventions to prevent young people from carrying and using weapons. The funded organisations were

- Kickstart/Crime Concern
- Rainer¹
- Paddington Development Trust (Uncut)²
- Leap Confronting Conflict

In January 2008 Clear Plan were commissioned to undertake an evaluation of the Fear and Fashion Programme. This is the interim report of that evaluation and follows on from a baseline report produced in Spring 2008.

The Changing Context for the Fear and Fashion Programme
Among the initial motivations for the funders interest in work on knife crime issues was the relative absence of any dedicated activity designed to address knife crime. As the Fear and Fashion Report noted in 2004

"Although the problem of young people carrying knives and other weapons appears, by common consent, to be growing, few dedicated public awareness or educational programmes have been developed or delivered. Similarly few dedicated programmes working with young people at risk of carrying and using knives have been developed."

¹ In 2008, Rainer and Crime Concern merged to form a single new organisation Catch 22.
² Activity delivered by Working with Men on behalf of Paddington Development Trust.
In June 2008, the government published the Tackling Knife Crime Action Programme. In addition, the Home Office action plan for reducing violence’s second key objective is ‘To crack down on knife crime, in particular involving young people.’ Among the actions in the plan is the provision of workshops for Schools, Youth Groups, young offenders via Youth Offending Teams and presentations for parents and teachers through the ‘Weapons Awareness Programme...Knife Talk’ delivered by the national voluntary organisation ‘Be Safe’.

A number of other major national, pan-London and local initiatives addressing knife crime among young people have also emerged in this period. The context for the Fear and Fashion programme has changed significantly since it was initially mooted, and has led to a situation where the overall impact of the Fear & Fashion projects is arguably lost within a much larger and more varied panoply of initiatives at national, regional and neighbourhood level to tackle knife crime.

In practice the actual activity undertaken by the evaluators to engage with the projects has varied according to the features of each of the individual projects. Activity has included

- Review of documentation, including funding applications, reports to funders, internal management documents, etc
- Meetings with project staff, manager, project steering groups, local partners etc
- Engaging directly with young people
- Observation of practice
- Support to development of monitoring tools

**Baseline Findings**

The evaluators carried out a survey of a sample of young people engaging with each of the projects in the first months of 2008. The survey found that;

- 66% of those responding to the survey have never carried a knife whilst a further 25% report that they have carried a knife once or twice. If those completing the survey are typical of project users, this suggests the projects are not engaging young people who habitually use or carry knives.
- 80% of respondents went to school which would be expected for the age-group responding to the survey, again suggesting that projects are not routinely engaging young people most at risk of carrying /using knives.
- Almost 90% agreed with the statement ‘Most young people I know are scared of being attacked by someone with a knife’.
- Over 50% of respondents reported that they had witnessed a knife crime at least once or twice, indicating that the fear of knife crime expressed by young people was grounded in some real experience.

Much of the work of the projects is preventative in nature and not targeted specifically at young people who are at any significantly greater risk of being involved in knife crime than the general population.

---

Seeking to establish if an intervention has been successful in preventing a young person from beginning to carry a knife (or any other behaviour that they have no history of) is more problematic - how can we know if they ever would have in the first place? Measuring the impact of the Fear and Fashion programme, and any of the individual funded projects, on levels of knife crime is challenging. This is due to a combination of the following factors:

- Absence of an agreed definition of knife crime: The knife crime review highlights that there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes knife crime or knife-enabled crime.
- Absence of baseline data on levels of knife crime: There is no universally accepted data on levels of knife crime at national or local levels.
- Limited evidence of what works in addressing knife crime for projects to use in design of interventions.
- Challenge of assigning cause and effect: The impact of the projects on general levels of knife crime in the areas where they work is not possible to assess, partly because of the absence of baseline data, but also because of the impossibility of separating the impact of the projects from the impact of other influencing factors.

### Project Summaries

**Kickstart**

Kickstart consists of 15 different projects targeted at young people aged 8 to 30 years located in the London Borough of Southwark. The Kickstart Fear or Fashion activity is flexible but is, in general based around three main areas

- Support to the young people’s Forum/Youth Action Group who help decide on and design the activities undertaken.
- The Circle Programme, a tailored educational programme, initially delivered as a 6 week intervention in schools but now also delivered in a one day ‘taster’ session in a number of other settings.
- Expressions Nights, where young people are supported to deliver various types of performing arts (rap, music, poetry, comedy, etc) with a message related to knife crime, to an audience of their peers.
- One-off, or smaller scale interventions which are delivered to hard to reach groups using youth work approaches to deliver anti-knife crime messages.

The Kickstart Fear and Fashion work is preventative in that the majority of the young people who participate are not known to have had any particular association with knife crime. They are considered more likely to be at risk of association with knife crime by virtue of their age and the geographic areas targeted. The move to working with young people in Pupil Referral Units has been proven, through the reported experiences of participants, to be more effective in engaging with young people with real experience of knife crime, either as victim, perpetrator or witness.

It is apparent from the work that the Kickstart project does today that there has been some drift from the originally planned outcomes, this may be to expected from a project that is responsive to young people’s expressed wishes seeks to ‘test things out to see if they work’.

---

4 Kickstart was part of the national charity Crime Concern when the project was initially funded. Crime Concern and Rainer have now merged to form a new national charity, Catch22.
It remains difficult to evaluate this, or indeed any project’s success in terms of prevention, given that it is not possible to say with any certainty whether the young people worked with would ever have engaged in the activity. The key lesson from the Kickstart project is that it is essential to appoint staff with the necessary skills to engage well with young people, and with partners and potential partners.

**Leap Confronting Conflict**

Leap Confronting Conflict is a national voluntary organisation that specialises in conflict resolution and mediation with young people. Their core work activity employs interactive group work, with young people who are experiencing disadvantage. Their organisational specialism is therefore closely aligned with the aims of the Fear and Fashion programme. The aim of the Leap Fear and Fashion project aims to reduce violence, weapon carrying and fear of violence for young people in schools.

A Leap local steering group meets regularly and attendance of officers at an appropriate level from each partner is consistent, indicating that the project is valued by the partners. The steering group is made up of Leap Confronting Conflict, the Youth Offending Team (YOT), Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP), the Metropolitan Police, the Youth Inclusion Support Panels (YISP) and Westminster Council’s Education Directorate.

Over the last year Leap have continued to deliver and develop the interventions which they piloted in the early stages of the Fear & Fashion funding, namely:

- **Intensive group work**, delivered to a small number of young people who are identified by the Fear and Fashion partnership steering group as being involved in, or particularly at risk of being involved in, knife crime.
- **Youth Work placements**: Following completion of the intensive group work course the young people are supported to move into youth work placements with local providers. By December 2008, 27 young people had completed a course, and there was significant pressure to identify suitable placements. There have been some difficulties in identifying sufficient suitable placements.
- **The Schools programme**: Leap have been working closely with three Westminster secondary schools
  - St Georges School
  - Paddington Academy
  - Westminster Academy

Leap’s work in schools is designed around a ‘conflict audit’ process and follow-up work designed to address the findings of the audit. Work in St Georges and Paddington academy has been disrupted. The work in St Georges has been renegotiated with schools management, however no follow up work has taken place in Paddington following the conflict audit. Work in Westminster Academy was just beginning at the end of the period covered by this report.

Leap place a high priority on impact evaluation and report that one of the very pleasing figures is that re-offending rates of young people involved in the Leap programme are currently nil.
The project’s success in engaging with young people who have an identified and explicit association with knife crime is a particularly strong feature. The local steering group presents a strong opportunity to embed the project in the local area although we are not clear of how this would be resourced following conclusion of the Fear and Fashion funding.

**Rainer**
The Rainer Brent Tackling Knife Crime Service provides young people in the Brent Youth Offending Team area who have been identified as being involved in or at risk of becoming involved in carrying and use of knives with access to specialist one to one support service to assist them to address their behaviour. The project is staff by a single worker, Angela Francis. The aims of the Rainer Brent Tackling Knife Crime Service are very simply to provide a casework service to support young people who have been involved in knife crime to more fully understand the potential consequences of using and carrying knives.

In the period since the baseline report the Rainer project has continued to provide one to one work with a further 25 young people, giving a total of 49 young people worked with over the course of the whole project.

Rainer intervention is largely made up of one to one casework, augmented by group-work where opportunities arise. This leaves limited scope for the development of new activities. In addition to the casework the Rainer worker worked with officers from the Metropolitan Police Youth Engagement Team to arrange a group-work session for young people working with the knife crime service.

Unlike the other Fear and Fashion projects, Rainer works exclusively with young people known to the criminal justice system. This means that their work differs from that of the other Fear and Fashion projects in that it is exclusively ameliorative, i.e. seeks to reduce or prevent young people who are known to carry (or have carried) knives from doing so.

An issue identified at the baseline report was that referrals to the knife Crime worker from Brent YOT were not systematically identified and passed on. Referrals relied on the individual YOT worker remembering to refer young people involved in knife crime. A new management information system was to be implemented in late 2008 which would allow young people involved in knife crime and known to the YOT to be systematically identified and prioritised. Reports from the outgoing worker are that the management information system is in place but that YOT staff had not yet used it to generate referrals.

One of the notable aspects of the Rainer project is that the worker has been very successful in establishing a profile as an expert on knife crime and a valuable resource in supporting partner organisations to understand how to work effectively with young people on knife crime issues. The status of the Rainer Knife Crime worker as a local resource to other organisations working on knife crime issues is identified as an attribute of the post-holder rather than of the post, or the employing organisation. Given that this member of staff has now moved on, the evaluators will need to assess what impact the change of staff has on this.
Uncut
The Uncut project is delivered by Working with Men on behalf of the grant holders, the Paddington Development Trust. Working With Men is a charity that has been developing work with boys and young men since 1985; in schools, youth services and probation settings. The work includes programmes on sex, violence, literacy and other gender related issues.

The Uncut project was set up with two main aims:
- To impact on young people’s attitudes and behaviour towards carrying and using knives and other weapons (the primary target group is young males aged from 10-17)
- To develop, deliver and evaluate a range of initiatives and integrate those that work within existing mainstream services.

The practical focus of Uncut has been delivering three key programmes:
- Conflict management Programme
- Mock trial programme
- Fatal Stabbing Assemblies

Delivery of these programmes is tailored to the particular needs of agencies / settings where the programme is being delivered. Since the baseline analysis, Uncut have delivered eight conflict management programmes (four of those in primary schools); two mock trial programmes (plus another two adapted one-day versions of the programme); and eight fatal stabbing assemblies. A key factor in the past year has been engaging local partners in the planning and delivery of these programmes with a definite focus on passing the responsibility for delivering them onto local agencies – reinforcing the Uncut role to develop ideas and trial them.

Peer education input has become a feature of the conflict management programmes which have been delivered in primary schools.

In addition to these key programmes the Uncut Project manager has been offering one-to-one support to nine individual young people referred by schools and the YOT. In all cases Uncut has offered at least five sessions with each individual and for some this has developed into intensive weekly support for at least eight months. This level of involvement has also led to Uncut programmes being embedded into formal court orders as part of the YOT’s menu of disposals.

Specific programmes target particular groups and the processes for selecting young people have become more sophisticated over the past year. School-based partners report that young people were selected on the basis of ‘behaviour’ that are felt to place them at greater risk of being involved in knife crime.

Fundamental to the delivery of Uncut activity is the support and contributions of partners. Processes for supporting partnership working require particular attention to support Uncut to make an impact and at the end of 2008 still represent a major challenge.
Like several other Fear and Fashion projects, the individual ability and approach of the staff member have been widely reported as the central factor in Uncut’s success. Equally there is widespread recognition that an over-reliance on a single individual is not the best way to ensure sustained delivery of this work.

Whilst one local stakeholder from the Metropolitan Police suggested that participating in Uncut programmes gives young people alternatives to carrying knives there is little in the way of definite evidence of an impact on knife use. Key stakeholders in the Fear and Fashion programme - Metropolitan Police and Lemos and Crane - agree that it is impossible to evidence the impact of an awareness raising initiative on young people’s use of knives.

The additional focus by Uncut on one-to-one work may be a welcome addition for the ability of Uncut to engage with young people at risk of being involved in knife crime and to make a difference to their attitudes, aspirations and behaviour. There is a need to clarify the role of Uncut in delivering one-to-one work which will require more clarity around referral procedures and in relation to understanding the purpose and desired outcomes.

**Overall analysis**

Overall, the evaluator’s interim analysis is that the Fear and Fashion programme has sponsored a good deal of strong youth work practice. But, with few exceptions, the evidence of impact on knife crime, or evidence that contributes to learning on what works in tackling knife crime is limited. There are however several key factors evident around what makes projects successful that provide pointers on how future work in this are may usefully be developed. These are:

- **Good quality staff are essential to establishing rapport with young people and credibility with partners.**

  A universal theme coming out of our discussions with project partners, funders, managers and young people is that the personality and skills of the staff deployed to deliver the initiatives is a key determinant of success.

- **Harnessing peer influence is important in establishing credibility in young people.**

  It is notable that all three of the projects applying Youth Work approaches are supporting young people to act as peer educators. Given that peer influence is an important factor in young people’s carrying and use of knives, it follows that peer influence may be an equally effective method of preventing it. The deployment of youth workers who are close in age and background/body identity to the young people they work with may also be a pragmatic response to this phenomenon.

- **The projects do not have the scope or capacity to develop or facilitate a ‘whole systems’ approach to tackling knife crime.**

  The range of influences on young people’s behaviour, including the family and the peer group are not wholly addressed by any of the projects. The Fear and Fashion projects in themselves are not able to deliver the range and extent of activities and interventions required to make a real difference to knife crime in communities.
• **Output focused monitoring processes encourages output focused planning.**
The evaluators have found working with projects to focus on outcomes rather than outputs has been a challenge – partly because an output focus is reinforced by the reporting mechanisms applied by the funders.

**Interim Conclusions and issues for Fear and Fashion funders**
These conclusions are the product of the evaluators own reflection on the evidence gathered through the evaluation and should be treated as for discussion only at this stage.

• Investment in small scale, localised projects may not produce the scale of impact, on knife crime or on the development of practice that the funders envisaged.
• Investment in creating and supporting good quality practitioners may be a more effective and cost-effective and may create more lasting legacy for the investment.
• The creation and support of peer educators may prove to be an effective, and cost-effective, method of investing in community capacity and sustaining the impact of an intervention over the longer term.
• The absence of effective coordination mechanisms at local level limited the impact of projects. Given that the early experience of the Fear and Fashion programme was that it is difficult to create partnerships by external intervention, other methods of supporting this should be explored.
1. Introduction

In 2004 Bridge House Trust commissioned Lemos and Crane to conduct research to support the Trust in identifying how it might best make a contribution to addressing the problem of knife crime and young people in London by determining:

- what were the key factors involved in young people deciding to carry knives and weapons?
- what was the scale of the problem? and
- what were the most effective types of intervention?

The resulting report ‘Fear and Fashion: The use of knives and other weapons by young people’, pulled together much of the available evidence and augmented this through primary research into the perceptions and experiences of practitioners working with young people. It concluded that there were two main reasons for young people carrying knives: fear of violence from other young people, and to obtain status amongst their peers for carrying and/or being willing to use a knife. The primary recommendation of the report was the need for demonstration or pilot projects to combat the problem.

In response to this, five independent grant-making trusts developed and funded a collaborative programme named Fear and Fashion aimed at tackling the carrying and use of knives and weapons amongst young people.

The five participating funders initially sought to pull together partners and interventions to deliver these holistic approaches within selected localities. A range of initiatives were used to support this process including a ‘speed dating’ type event and the provision of development grants of up to £5000. Following initial investigations it became apparent that the kind holistic partnerships envisaged were unlikely to be successfully developed and a more specific focus on youth work-related initiatives emerged.

In 2007 four exemplar projects were funded, one in Lambeth/Southwark and three in South Brent/North Westminster, to develop and test out different interventions to prevent young people from carrying and using weapons. The funded organisations were

- Kickstart/Crime Concern
- Rainer
- Paddington Development Trust (Uncut)
- Leap Confronting Conflict

A Fear and Fashion Advisory Group was set up and meets about once every six months.

5 In 2008, Rainer and Crime Concern merged to form a single new organisation Catch 22.
6 Activity delivered by Working with Men on behalf of Paddington Development Trust.
Membership of the advisory group includes:

- Roy Amlott, QC - Chair
- Mike Taylor, Metropolitan Police
- Tim Newborn, London School of Economics
- Rob Allan, Centre for Prison Studies, Kings College
- Paul Cavadino, NACRO
- Shami Chakrabarti, Liberty
- Diana Cox, Race on the Agenda
- Albert Tucker, Big Lottery
- Simon Strick, Metropolitan Police
- Gerard Lemos, Lemos & Crane

Representatives of all of the funded projects also attend the Advisory Group meetings.

The flow chart below shows the milestones in the process of developing Fear and Fashion, including the selection of the exemplar projects and the delivery of the baseline report for the evaluation.

In January 2008, Clear Plan were commissioned to undertake an evaluation of the projects over a two-year period. A baseline report was produced in Spring 2008.

**About this Report**
This is the interim report of that evaluation. A summary of the evidence gathered from the four projects during the period from the baseline analysis (April 2008) to the end of 2008 is presented. Analysis of this evidence along with interim analysis of the overall programme is offered.
The report raises questions about what aspects of the evaluation should be emphasised for the remainder of the evaluation activity during 2009.

The next chapter describes the overall rationale and purpose for Fear and Fashion projects. A brief description of the context for the Fear and Fashion projects is also offered.

Chapter 3 describes how the evaluation has been carried out and why it was designed the way it was. This section also describes the work undertaken to gather and analyse the evidence.

An evaluation to measure the impact of the Fear and Fashion projects requires some assessment of the projects’ starting points. An overall baseline for the evaluation is spelt out in Section 4. This includes relevant police statistics as well as the findings from a specific survey of young people carried out during April 2008.

Progress made during the first year of the evaluation is described project by project in Chapter 5.

An analysis of the overall progress and impact made along with key lessons which emerge is presented in Chapter 6. Chapter 7 suggests future action to complete the evaluation during 2009.
2. Fear and Fashion projects – rationale, purpose and context

The original brief for the evaluation describes the overall aim of the Fear and Fashion programme as follows:

- To develop exemplar projects working with young people to tackle knife culture so as to reduce the use and carrying of knives and other weapons and to provide alternatives and long-term change.

The objectives for the projects were described as:

- To bring together a package of interventions to raise awareness of the problem and of the consequences of carrying weapons
- To provide alternatives to carrying weapons
- To reduce the frequency of carrying weapons
- To create positive peer group influences
- To work in partnership with a variety of a key agencies, parents and community leaders working predominantly in a single secondary school
- To contribute to the development of a local strategy discouraging the carrying of weapons
- To contribute to and inform the wider policy debate on knife culture liaising with key Government departments, including the Home Office, DfES and the Association of Chief police Officers
- To provide a model of good practice and materials which could be replicated elsewhere.

These objectives have been further refined and evolved into the following desired outcomes for the projects’ work:

- Raised awareness amongst young people about the consequences of carrying and using weapons
- Reduction in the frequency and patterns of young people carrying knives / weapons
- Reduction in the number of incidents using knives / weapons involving the key target group for this work
- Young people adopting alternative solutions to conflict resolution
- Young people reporting a reduction in the fear of crime
- Strong partnership structures established between partner agencies to tackle the issue
- Local strategies developed and implemented by partner agencies to discourage the carrying of weapons
- Models of good practice developed and disseminated / replicated
- Lessons learnt from the work contributing to Government policies on this issue

The four demonstration projects and the evaluation work was commissioned by the Fear and Fashion Funders Group, comprising representatives from each of the five charitable foundations.
An additional piece of work was commissioned as part of the Fear and Fashion Programme. Lemos and Crane have been commissioned to:

- Develop a knowledge framework
- Describe the learning and practice of the exemplar projects
- Manage a website to host learning and knowledge
- Create a community of interest and influence
- Design and deliver Action Learning Sets

The Fear and Fashion website, managed by Lemos and Crane on behalf of the programme funders, classifies four approaches to work with young people on knife crime:

- Youth Work Approaches
- Approaches in Schools and Colleges
- Criminal Justice Approaches
- Working with Parents Approaches

The table below shows which of these approaches is applied by each of the funded projects and the London Boroughs in which the projects work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>London Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kickstart</td>
<td>Youth Work approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches in Schools and Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leap</td>
<td>Youth Work approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainer</td>
<td>Criminal Justice approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncut</td>
<td>Youth Work approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, the majority of the projects apply Youth Work and Work in Schools and Colleges Approaches. All of the projects have highlighted the potential importance of working with parents approaches, although activity which pursues this approach is only recently beginning to emerge.

**The Context for Fear and Fashion**

The context for the Fear and Fashion programme has changed significantly and has changed at a significant pace. Among the initial motivations for the finders interest in work on knife crime issues was the relative absence of any dedicated activity designed to address knife crime. As the Fear and Fashion Report noted in 2004

> "Although the problem of young people carrying knives and other weapons appears, by common consent, to be growing, few dedicated public awareness or educational programmes have been developed or delivered. Similarly few dedicated programmes working with young people at risk of carrying and using knives have been developed."

The Knife Crime review also noted that "A lack of a considered clear strategy based on high quality, specific research characterises the government and police approach to knife related offences." And that "Moves towards a more coordinated approach that recognises the importance of prevention are to be welcomed."

The government has responded to this by developing and publishing the Tackling Knife Crime Action Programme which was launched in June 2008. Targeted at 10 English Police Force areas, including London.

The plan aims to reduce teenage knife deaths and serious woundings and increase public confidence by focusing on three key areas;
- Enforcement: Offenders more likely to be caught, to be prosecuted and to get tough punishment
- Prevention: Prevent young people getting involved in knife crime in the first place
- Reassurance: Reassure the public

Activity in the selected areas includes
- stepping up enforcement operations
- targeting the most dangerous young people in each area
- carrying out home visits and sending letters to parents if their children are known to carry weapons
- working with A&E departments on information sharing
- setting up or expanding youth forums to enable young people to have a say in local issues
- clamping down on retailers who continue to sell knives to young people
One of the main resources developed under the Tackling Knife Crime Action Programme is the ‘It Doesn’t Have To Happen’ media based anti-knife crime campaign. This includes posters, a website and viral mobile telephone video messages. An update on the Tackling Knife Crime Action Programme published in December 2008 stated 73% of young people said the campaign made them less likely to carry a knife.

In addition, the Home Office action plan for reducing violence has as a second key objective: ‘To crack down on knife crime, in particular involving young people.’ Among the actions in the plan is the provision of workshops for Schools, Youth Groups, young offenders via Youth Offending Teams and presentations for parents and teachers through the ‘Weapons Awareness Programme...Knife Talk’ delivered by the national voluntary organisation ‘Be Safe’.

The Connected programme is part of the Home Office strategy to tackle gun crime and gun culture, aimed at working with community groups. As part of the Connected programme the Home Secretary outlined a new £4.5m fund in December 2008 for local community groups to run activities for young people in 13 priority areas. This will fund intensive work with young people through mentoring and outreach work to tackle guns, gangs and knives issues. The Home Office website KniveCrimes.Org provides what it describes as “The first and most complete resource on knife crime in the UK.”

The Street Weapons Commission chaired by Cherie Booth QC, toured the country in 2008 to find out why so many young people now carry guns and knives. Highlights of each hearing were shown on Channel 4, ending in a live studio debate hosted by the television journalist Jon Snow. The Commission concluded that tackling gun and knife crime should be an urgent national priority for everyone from the Government downwards. It further concluded that it needs coordinated and strategic leadership from the centre; effective enforcement to help reduce the attraction of knife and gang culture; and effective intervention and youth services on the ground to divert those young people most at risk.

In February 2008 the Association of Principal Youth and Community Officers, The National Youth Agency and the Speaking Out Project (NCVCCO/NCVYS) jointly organised a round table event to discuss how to combat knife, gun and gang crime and its effects on children and young people and how this should be taken forward with national policy makers. Among the many conclusions produced from this event were that there is a critical need to build the capacity of parents and communities to respond to issues that face them, and that services for families and young people need to be enhanced, with a focus of empowering local people and building social capital.

---

1. [http://www.bebo.com/itdoesn'thavetohappen](http://www.bebo.com/itdoesn'thavetohappen)
3. [http://www.knifecrimes.org](http://www.knifecrimes.org)
A number of other national funds have also contributed to the increase in activity to address knife crime. For example, the Children, Young People and Families Grant Programme has funded the Young Leaders for Safer Cities Project, run by the Metropolitan Black Police Association. This programme targets teenagers in Year 9 of secondary school who live in areas of high knife or gun crime, mirroring the work that several Fear and Fashion projects undertake.

The London Mayor’s Office has published a consultation document. The document ‘Time for Action’, sets out the Mayor’s vision for a programme of action for ‘Equipping Young People for the Future and Preventing Violence’. The consultation seeks feedback on the Mayor’s proposals to improve youth opportunities and prevent violence through a programme for action. In particular, views are sought on the action strands in the framework, and how these can be further developed and implemented. The proposals are intended to complement work being done by other agencies, in particular London boroughs that have lead responsibilities for children’s services, and to focus on the value the Mayor can add on these issues. The consultation period ended on 16 December 2008 and a report on the consultation responses is due to be published soon.

The Metropolitan Police have produced a website, It’s Not A Game\(^\text{10}\), with a number of resources, including an interactive video game to deter young people carrying knives in the first place.

More recently there has been a growing level of interest and activity in the role of parents in relation to knife crime. A Direct.gov website and media campaign, ‘Talk About Knives’ offering guidance and support to parents has been developed and promoted. The Fear and Fashion projects have reflected this development, a recent action learning set\(^\text{11}\) focused on effective approaches to work with parents.

All of the above has led to a situation where the overall impact of the Fear & Fashion projects is arguably lost within a much larger and more varied panoply of initiatives at national, regional and neighbourhood level to tackle knife crime. Given that the original intention was for the projects to act as demonstrations of potentially effective practice there is a risk that their ability to provide this is limited by their scale. Where they were once the sole dedicated project working with young people at risk of carrying and using knives, they are now but one part of a larger web of interventions. While this is to be welcomed on one hand, it does present challenges for the overall intention of the project to provide lessons for development of policy and practice.

\(^{10}\) [http://www.itsnotagame.org/](http://www.itsnotagame.org/)

\(^{11}\) [http://www.fearandfashion.org.uk](http://www.fearandfashion.org.uk)
Projects report that the "explosion of new initiatives and projects" can lead to a situation where it is difficult to stay aware of the direction of policy and the number of other initiatives operating in their areas with similar aims and objectives. Despite the investment in coordination of activity at national level, evidence from projects appears to suggest that, at local level, work on these themes is still relatively uncoordinated.
3. Evaluating Fear and Fashion

Clear Plan was appointed in January 2008 to carry out a two year evaluation of the programme. At an inception meeting it was agreed that the evaluation should:

- Help design consistent, useful, output and outcome indicators.
- Support projects to record and monitor practice.
- Record learning about effective interventions.
- Inform decisions on future funding
- Produce information that may be used to influence others to support effective interventions.
- Identify the features of effective practice.
- Identify the factors that influence the development of practice.
- Analyse the extent to which the projects are exemplar interventions.

An outline of the proposed evaluation work programme is shown here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>Baseline field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>Baseline report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-August 2008</td>
<td>2nd round of field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>Projects evaluation seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>3rd round of field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>First year review report and lessons learned seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-March 2008</td>
<td>4th round of field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June 2009</td>
<td>Follow-up surveys with young people and project partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August –Sept 2009</td>
<td>Produce case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>Young people’s conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work undertaken to complete the evaluation to date includes the following:

- Baseline field work with each of the projects
- A survey with young people engaged in the projects to examine experience of and attitudes towards knife crime. The survey was designed by Clear Plan in discussion with the Funders Group. The questionnaire was posted on a website and made available in hard copy and each of the projects were asked to get at least fifteen young people to complete it. Seventy-one completed survey questionnaires were analysed.
- A Baseline report produced in Spring 2008
- Follow-up field work with each project to clarify issues in the baseline report
- An evaluation seminar to identify progress and to consider key issues
- Further field work with each individual project, with a particular focus on engaging projects partners
- End of year 1 report produced
In practice the actual activity undertaken by the evaluators to engage with the projects has varied according to the features of each of the individual projects. Activity has included

- Review of documentation, including funding applications, reports to funders, internal management documents, etc
- Meetings with project staff, manager, project steering groups, local partners etc
- Engaging directly with young people who have participated in project activities
- Observation of practice
- Support to development of monitoring tools

The number and frequency of meetings has differed, but the approach to the evaluation has been characterised by an understanding of the complexity of the work. There has been a dual focus on the actual delivery of work with young people and the support structures, relationships and process which support that delivery.
4. Baseline

4.1 Police statistics
A significant challenge for evaluating the impact of the project interventions on knife crime is the lack of accurate, robust, useful data on the nature and prevalence of knife crime. As one report noted:

"estimates of the prevalence of knife-related offences are not exempt from ‘guesstimates’, incomplete recorded data and a reliance upon the extrapolation of survey findings. This, not surprisingly, results in unreliable and often contradictory data."\(^{12}\)

In June 2007, the Home Office and the Association of Chief Police Officers published the Knife Crime Best Practice Guidelines\(^ {13}\), which included a number of measures to improve the recording of knife-enabled crime. Debate on the government statistics on knife crime during 2008 have highlighted the challenges of producing reliable data on the prevalence of knife crime\(^ {14}\).

Obtaining data at a more local level is even more challenging and projects have found it difficult to obtain data to inform their work. Some statistics were passed to individual projects by the Metropolitan Police and then passed to the evaluators:

**Victims & Persons Accused (aged 13 to 19) of Knife Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victims aged 13-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for London</strong></td>
<td><strong>3803</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accused aged 13-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for London</strong></td>
<td><strong>2033</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{13}\) See [http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/violence/violence023.htm](http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/violence/violence023.htm) for the full text of the Knife Crime Best Practice Guidelines.

\(^{14}\) See [www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/thereporters/markeaston/2009/02/knife_stats_row_the_plot_thick.html](http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/thereporters/markeaston/2009/02/knife_stats_row_the_plot_thick.html) (accessed 17/03/09) for a review of the key events in this debate.
More up-to-date intelligence was passed directly to the evaluators by the Metropolitan Police

**Knife Crime Victims and Accused in Brent, Southwark and Westminster and MPS Total***
for periods 01/04/2007 to 31/03/2008 and 01/04/2008 to 28/02/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS Total</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>14941</td>
<td>12037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Young People’s survey
The findings from the survey at the April 2008 highlighted the following issues:

- 66% of those responding to the survey had never carried a knife whilst a further 25% reported that they have carried a knife once or twice. If those completing the survey are typical of project users, this suggests the projects are not engaging young people who habitually use or carry knives.
- 80% of respondents reported that they go to school which would be expected for the age-group responding to the survey. This also, however, again suggests that projects are not routinely engaging young people most at risk of carrying / using knives.
- Over 50% of respondents reported that they had witnessed a knife crime at least once or twice.
- Almost 90% agreed with the statement ‘Most young people I know are scared of being attacked by someone with a knife’
- The reported attitudes to knife crime are perhaps unsurprising. Detailed analysis of these responses was presented to projects and their partners with a view to them being used to inform their activities and programmes. Monitoring any shifts in reported attitudes when the survey is repeated towards the end of 2009 will contribute to the overall evaluation of the impact of projects.
- Similarly, changes in perceptions about levels of knife crime within their peer group and their community will be monitored to identify the potential impact of the projects.

The survey will be repeated later in 2009 to identify any difference in the experiences and attitudes reported.
5. Project by project progress

Introduction
This section describes the progress made by each of the projects up to December 2008 since the baseline report in April 2008. For each of the four projects the following is described:

- A brief description of the projects
- A summary of the project analysis presented in the baseline report
- The key activities delivered by the project during the subsequent period
- The profile of young people engaged in those activities
- The key tools and processes which have supported those activities
- The key roles played by project staff and staff in partner agencies
- Evidence of the impact of the projects’ activities
- Management issues for the projects
- Learning generated by the projects and how that learning has been used to influence others
- An overall assessment of the key issues and challenges

General Points
Earlier in this report and in previous management reports to funders we have alluded to the challenges of measuring the impact of the Fear and Fashion programme, and of the individual funded projects, on levels of knife crime. In summary, the challenges are based on the following factors:

- Absence of an agreed definition of knife crime: The knife crime review highlights that there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes knife crime or knife-enabled crime.
- Absence of baseline data on levels of knife crime: There is no universally accepted data on levels of knife crime at national or local levels.
- Limited evidence of what works in addressing knife crime for projects to use in the design of interventions.
- Challenge of assigning cause and effect: The impact of the projects on general levels of knife crime in the areas where they work is not possible to assess, partly because of the absence of baseline data, but also because of the impossibility of separating the impact of the projects from the impact of other influencing factors.

The Fear & Fashion report divides young people who carry knives into four categories:

- Group A: Young people who have offended and are in the criminal justice system.
- Group B: Associates of offenders who have not been identified by the criminal justice system (and are therefore not being worked with by youth offending teams or probation).
- Group C: Young people who carry weapons a lot of the time and are known to youth, education and criminal agencies.
• Group D: Young people who carry weapons on an ad hoc basis when they feel there are known risks, but without the knowledge of any agencies.

Note that all of the above groups with the exception of Group B are known to have carried knives at some point and even in the case of the Group B young people there is cause to believe that they may be carrying knives, simply that they are not actually known to do so. Therefore any intervention with these groups is designed to limit, reduce or completely end their carrying and use of knives.

Much of the work of the projects is preventative in nature and not targeted specifically at young people who are at any discernibly greater risk of being involved in knife crime than the general population. In assessing impact on knife crime there is a requirement to distinguish between two overall purposes, i.e. interventions that are either

• Ameliorative, i.e. seek to reduce or prevent young people who are known to carry (or have carried) knives from doing so.
• Preventative, i.e. seek to stop young people from being drawn into knife crime

In the case of preventative work, there are at least three further categories of young people who may be targeted by the Fear and Fashion interventions

• All young people in a specific location (e.g. through poster campaigns)
• Specific groups of young people who are not presently known to carry knives (e.g. through working with a particular youth group or school population)
• Young people who are not known to carry knives but are considered to be at greater risk of doing so (e.g. through working with young males who are excluded from school)

Although all of the projects can provide some evidence that some of the young people they work with have histories of knife carrying, only the Rainer project specifically targets young people who are known to presently carry knives, or have carried them in the past. Where projects work with young people who are known to carry knives, it may be possible to assess, albeit based on their young people’s own reporting, whether they had reduced the frequency of carrying knives or ceased to do so altogether.

Where projects work with young people who are not known to have carried knives then any evaluation of the impact of these projects cannot answer the question, ‘what evidence is there that the intervention made a positive impact on the frequency with which the young people they engaged with carry a knife?’ A more pertinent question is ‘what evidence is there to indicate that the intervention has made the young people the intervention engaged with less likely to carry a knife’.
Seeking to establish if an intervention has been successful in preventing a young person from beginning to carry a knife (or any other behaviour that they have no history of) is more problematic - how can we know if they ever would have in the first place?

Any evaluation of the impact is therefore based on the perceptions of the young people and of significant others in their lives. For this reason, this evaluation has also sought to investigate and analyse the processes applied by projects in designing and implementing their interventions. This includes seeking to gather evidence on the following:

- What is the problem an intervention is intended to address?
- What young people are targeted and what evidence was used to select this target group?
- What marketing material/processes are used?
  - What referrers-in are on board?
  - Are there any obvious potential referrers-in that are missing?
- What evidence was used to select the kind of intervention that is expected to be successful with this target group (i.e. if THAT is the problem, then THIS is the solution)?
- What changes (outcomes) do we want to see as a result of this response to an identified problem?
- What are the underlying assumptions of this intervention?
- How will we know if we have achieved what we wanted to?

This may be easily summarised using the following logic model.
EXAMPLE Logic Model:

**Situation**

Young People in XXXXX are at risk of involvement in knife crime.

The evidence for this is as follows...

1. Staff time
2. Questionnaire results from open day.
3. Partner inputs to referral and identification of young people.
4. Networking

**Inputs**

- Assumptions: Young people expressing themselves will allow them to better understand each other's experiences and exert positive peer influence on each other.
- External factors: Availability of resources and partner interest in follow-on action.

**Outputs**

**Activities**

- What we will do: Promote an event for young people to discuss their experiences of knife crime (how do we target it?)
- Support young people to think about their views and put them forward to their peers.

**Participants**

- Who we will reach: All young people
- Adults active in the local community.
- Staff of other professional agencies.

**Short term**

- Young people feel that they have had the opportunity to express their views on knife crime.

**Medium term**

- Professional agencies have a stronger and more nuanced understanding of young people's views on knife crime.

**Long term**

- Professional agencies take different action on knife crime.
- Young people and professional agencies take joint action to reduce knife crime.

**Evaluation:** How will we know our planned outcomes have been achieved?

Record of discussions. Evaluation forms. Staff reflection sessions.
In addition to the above process elements related to the actual delivery of activity we have sought to understand what systems are in place to ensure that young people move on into appropriately supported situations once their engagement with the Fear and Fashion project is over, i.e.

- Are they referred on to anything else?
  - If so, how are young people follow-up support needs assessed?
  - What communication tools/protocols are there between the Fear & Fashion project and the referring-out destination?
  - What do we know about where the young people who participated on previous Fear or Fashion work have gone?

- What processes are in place to track young people following the conclusion of their participation?
  - Is there an opportunity to follow-up and see if there has been a sustained change in behaviour/attitude? What, if anything does this tell us?

Finally we need to be able to describe what projects have done to ensure the sustainability of their overall approach or any aspects of good practice they have developed beyond the period of the Fear and Fashion funding.

**Evidence**
The evidence used to create this report was drawn from:

- Reports to funders – Our review of these concludes that the information recorded is fairly quantitave, i.e. they count the numbers of participants or hours of contact time. They are therefore of limited use in evidencing outcomes.
- Records of evaluation responses made by participants.
- Records of staff observation of attitude or behaviour change in young people.
- Records of staff reflection sessions, i.e. if staff have formally considered the strengths/weaknesses, successes/failures of an intervention.
- ‘Distance travelled’ measures, if projects record data on participant attitudes/behaviour at the commencement of their engagement with an interventions, do they re-apply these at later dates? What do these show?
- Interviews with staff in projects and partner agencies.
- Observation of practice.
- Case studies of young people’s ‘journeys’.
5.1 Kickstart

Introduction
On 23 April 2008 Crime Concern and Rainer (who also host a Fear and Fashion project) announced their intention to merge and create a new charity. The new Charity, known as Catch 22, now hosts both projects. For the purposes of this report, we still refer to the projects as the Kickstart/Crime Concern and the Rainer project.

The Kickstart project, branded Fear or Fashion, is based around a flexible programme of interventions designed to allow young people, Kickstart staff and other partners to identify opportunities to try out new ways of working with young people on knife crime issues in order to see ‘what works’. The nature of the activities delivered by the project has shifted regularly over the course of the funding period.

Kickstart consists of 15 different projects targeted at young people aged 8 to 30 years located in the London Borough of Southwark. One of the strengths of Kickstart is that there are a large number of services provided through the programme. This means that young people can be ‘internally referred’ with little or no difficulty. Many of the young people who participate in the Fear or Fashion services also participate in other Kickstart services.

Current Fear or Fashion staffing within Kickstart is

- Simon Grant is a full time project worker on Fear or Fashion?
- Yomi Sode is a project worker who works part time on Fear or Fashion?
- Abi Goodwin is the Communities Project Manager with responsibility for Fear or Fashion?

There is a ‘multiplier effect’ from the project being located within the Kickstart programme, as other Kickstart staff work with Fear or Fashion staff to deliver joint projects. Kickstart also enjoys an established position within the communities they work in - many of the young people engaging with Kickstart have older brothers and sisters who were Kickstart users when they were younger.

This and the fact that staff are often drawn from the communities Kickstart works with means that they are able to access young people from these communities as part of their day to day work. The work undertaken to produce the baseline report highlighted the following issues.

- There is no robust data available to the project about prevalence or patterns of use and carrying of knives and other weapons in the target areas. The absence of robust data on knife crime means that it is not possible to strategically target project interventions to ‘at risk’ young people. Kickstart staff are of the view that all of the young people they work with are ‘at risk’ of being involved in knife crime.
• Staff report that many of the young people using the service have been victims of knife crime, and are therefore more likely to carry a knife. 46% of young people from Kickstart who responded to the baseline questionnaire had carried a knife, albeit infrequently. There is a risk that the approach to working with young people fails to attract young people who are more ‘at risk’ than the majority of their peers.

• It may be difficult to distinguish the impact on young people of participation in the Fear or Fashion interventions from the impact of the range of other Kickstart services they participate in. Although there is a potential benefit in working with young people within their own chosen peer group, there is a risk that the project loses its specific focus on tackling knife crime and instead simply delivers good quality generic youth work.

• To date the project has developed a number of initiatives, largely based on a will to try out new initiatives on a ‘let’s see if it works’ basis. These appear to be selected on the basis of staff enthusiasm for the idea. This provides a strong opportunity for innovation. There is little evidence of any other criteria or planned outcomes being applied to select which potential initiatives are pursued and which are not. This has implications for measuring the overall impact of the project and for the project’s potential to address issues of strategic importance.

Activities undertaken by Kickstart this year
The Kickstart Fear or Fashion activity is flexible but is, in general based around three main areas with additional one-off, smaller scale interventions:
• Support to the Young People’s Forum/Youth Action Group
• Circle Programme
• Expressions Nights

• Support to the Young People’s Forum
A Young People’s forum is supported to identify, plan and deliver small scale projects to raise awareness of the consequences of using and carrying knives with other young people in school. The young people’s forum consists of 7 young people aged from 13 to 18 who meet weekly and discuss ideas as well as ways to bring the community together. Over the course of 2008 it became clear that the Young People’s Forum membership was beginning to dwindle and that effort would be required to attract new members and reinvigorate the forum.

Efforts have been ongoing since mid 2008 to attract new young people to the forum. This has led to Fear or Fashion staff working more closely with other statutory and community based partners to identify and take advantage of opportunities to deliver new areas of work and engage with ‘new’ young people who are not members of Kickstart or associated with the existing Fear or Fashion activities.
Example New Partnership Activity
Kickstart was contacted by the Rockingham Community Association from the Rockingham Estate in Southwark to discuss emerging issues around young people in the area. This led to Kickstart taking a lead role in planning and delivering the Rockingham Youth Festival on 28th August 2008. The Rockingham Youth Festival was attended by Fear or Fashion staff and volunteers, wearing Fear and Fashion T-shirts. A number of local young people performed poetry, rap and singing on the day and a minutes silence was observed for a local young person who had been killed as a result of knife crime. The event was very well attended and young people were encouraged to complete evaluation forms by automatically entering them into a raffle if they completed the forms. Review of the evaluation forms shows that the event was considered effective in raising awareness of knife crime, bringing together different communities and age groups and promoting the Expressions nights.

Expressions Nights
The Young People’s Forum, supported by the Fear or Fashion staff take the lead in planning the Expressions nights. This includes, identifying and recruiting artists to perform, hosting the show and also generating ideas for the discussion segment of the event. Staff report that the young people from the Forum experience increased confidence resulting from seeing a project they started planning on paper and watching it grow to real life as well as learning harder skills around event planning and management.

The Expressions nights are where young people are supported to perform in front of their peers. One of the notable learning points from the activity undertaken by Kickstart to date is the extent to which young people respond to the performing arts, including drama, dance, music and comedy. All performances have some link to knife crime, and are designed to raise awareness of the issue; create a culture where knives are regarded as unacceptable; and provide alternatives to carrying weapons by planning innovative ways to reach out to other young people and the wider community. The first Expressions night took place on Friday 19th September 2008 and was attended by 57 young people, mostly from the Rockingham Estate, but a few others attended from other neighbouring areas. The second evening saw this double to 115 young people indicating the strength of the word of mouth recommendations generated by the first group of young people.

The young people who perform experience the opportunity to practise their chosen art form, to express their views on knife crime, and to gain the confidence to perform in public. The audience benefit from listening to and discussing the messages delivered through the performances and a raised awareness of issues and consequences of knife crime. A final benefit is the Expressions night’s potential contribution to community cohesion.
The events are attended by young people and older people, contributing to an enhanced understanding of each other, and for older people a greater awareness of the real views and experience of young people in relation to knife crime, rather than the messages delivered by the media.

These opportunities for engaging local young people are being used to encourage new members onto the Young People’s Forum with a view to it taking on an increased role in identifying new work and reviewing existing work.

**Circle Programme**
The Circle programme is a major resource developed by Kickstart. It takes the form of a flexible toolkit containing a number of sessions on different aspects of knife crime. It was initially designed as a six week programme to be delivered to PSE classes in schools. Following its initial pilot in Lillian Bayliss School, an introductory one-day awareness raising Circle Programme was also developed.

Kickstart staff, despite dedicating significant time and effort to developing links with schools, reported that success in this area appeared to be dependent on the will of the school to deal with issues of knife crime. The number of settings in which the Circle Programme, both in its full version and the one-day taster version is applied, has increased in the last year.

As the profile of the Circle Programme has grown locally, Kickstart have begun to receive a number of unsolicited requests to deliver in community-based and more specialist settings. Recently the programme has been delivered to Pupil Referral Units, rather than the whole school approach which had initially been piloted. Staff report that, when working with young people in Pupil Referral Units, there are more young people that have actually carried a knife, have been held at knife point or have witnessed a knife attack than in a school of a class of 30 young people.

Young People’s Forum members are being trained in the Circle programme so that they can support lead workers in Schools and youth clubs. This provides a further opportunity for the project as a whole to leave a legacy of skills in the community that can last longer than the actual project.
Practice Example – Circle Programme
Kickstart’s work on the circle programme in schools had brought it to the attention of the youth service who requested that a 1 day Circle Programme workshop be delivered to the Youth Club for the Blue in Bermondsey. The aim of the Circle Programme is “To raise awareness of knife crime issues to young people in their community and to look at the consequences of carrying knives, peer pressure and alternatives.” Kickstart have an existing partnership with the Youth Service through the youth club sessions run at their venue in Brandon, which is also the base for a knife crime forum on Monday evenings. This opportunity was welcomed as a chance to work with young people that did not attend Kickstart sessions and mainly attended youth services provision. Fifteen young people aged 11 to 16 took part, some of whom were members of Kickstart. Young people were informed about stop and search, and how their perceptions of police and their attitudes in behaviour towards them can be misunderstood as aggressive and may also work against them by being perceived as being uncooperative. Participants were asked to suggest why young people carry knives. The role play scenarios allowed participants to consider situations that could occur in reality, such as a Young person being approached by another young person 3 years younger than them with a knife. This was an opportunity for young people to rehearse in a safe and supportive environment the kind of decisions they otherwise may have to deal with in a situation of high pressure and limited time. Discussion was facilitated on the impact of peer pressure on carrying and using knives. Finally the day allowed young people to consider and suggest ways to avoid knife crime; consider how to say no to knife crime; and identify how to find support including family, friend, police and other agencies including Kickstart.

Staff reflection following delivery and review of evaluation forms concluded that the key element was the role play, because young people were able to relate directly to the different situations and had a lot to say about what they would do in that situation. Many young people initially looked at retaliation in conflict situations. After thinking things through in the Circle Programme environment, it was apparent that they changed their view. Key to this was the discussion that highlighted that “they only have one life which can’t be replaced while materialistic things are replaceable.” Feedback from the youth service was that the young people were really engaged and would like further workshops to be delivered. This is a valuable outcome for the Fear or Fashion project, increasing their ability to engage more young people, and to attract new members to the Young People’s Forum.

Other Activity
The nature of the Kickstart programme is that a number of smaller scale initiatives may be undertaken in any particular period. We describe the following example to indicate the general nature of these smaller scale initiatives.
The Waterloo men’s 5-a-side football is funded through Fear or Fashion. Sessions take place every Wednesday evening from 7.30 to 9.30pm for young people aged 16+. On average every week between 12 -15 young people attend. Young people from Southwark and Lambeth attend the session but the majority of attendees are from Southwark. The sessions are not simply about football, but are seen as an opportunity to build relationships with the young people and to meet a range of needs relating to personal, educational, finding a job, housing, volunteering or being involved in anti social behaviour or crime issues.

Some young people that attend are considered to be hard to reach in terms of getting them involved in other activities and workshops. The Waterloo session provides an opportunity to ‘hook them in’ and engage them in other activities.

As part of the Waterloo men’s 5-a-side 10 young people attended a Crime Stoppers workshop on knife crime delivered by an ex-offender who currently works with them. He has spoken to them about his experience inside prison; friends and bad influences; police and why they are needed; being able to think for yourself; peer pressure; consequences; stop & search; law and the use of crime stoppers and what its for.

Who are the young people Kickstart engages with?
The Kickstart Fear or Fashion work is preventative in that the majority of the Young People who participate are not known to have had any particular association with knife crime. They are considered more likely to be at risk of association with knife crime by virtue of their age and the geographic areas targeted. The Knife Crime review\textsuperscript{15} carried out by the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies identified that “The evidence clearly suggests that children and young people suffer much higher rates of victimisation” and “People living in poor neighbourhoods also stand a far greater chance of finding themselves at the wrong end of a knife.”

The Kickstart ‘whole community’ approach does include an element of working with victims of knife crime, both in a general sense (providing anti-knife crime messages across a whole community) and in a more specific sense (provision of one-to-one support to a small number of young people who have been victims, or to friends/relations of victims of knife crime). This is both a strength and a potential problem in relation to evidencing the impact of the project on levels of knife crime. The strength is that no young people are singled out as criminals, and no young person can ‘slip through the net’ as activities are available to all. On the other hand it is difficult, if not impossible, to evidence that any of the Kickstart interventions prevented anyone from taking up carrying a knife or assisted them to stop, if they already were doing so.

\textsuperscript{15} Knife Crime: A Review of Evidence and Policy, Eades et al, Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, December 2007
Processes, tools, and materials
A key tool developed by Kickstart for Fear or Fashion work is the Circle Programme described above. Other tools and processes developed and applied during this period are more specifically oriented towards supporting an evidence based selection and review of potential activity and are discussed in the section on overall assessment of the value of the project and lessons learned below.

Kickstart’s wider influence
Kickstart have produced a communications strategy to support and guide how the Fear or Fashion project, in the context of the range of anti-violence and general youth work programmes provided by Kickstart, may be effectively promoted to others. Key audiences identified in the strategy include policy makers at London and nationwide levels; policy influencers, particularly the media- including young people’s media and community safety trade publications; and other stakeholders including partner organisations, parents and families, schools and young people.

The project has been quite successful in establishing a media presence, no doubt aided by the generally high profile afforded to knife crime in recent years. Fear or Fashion staff are frequently contacted by print, radio and visual media for comment on knife crime issues. A planned development is to provide media training to a group of young people, parents and project workers to allow other voices, particularly those of young people to be heard in the media.

The work on the Expressions nights has also been successful in raising the profile of the Fear or Fashion work among partners. The head of Community Safety in Southwark has been in touch to request an input from Kickstart in planning and delivering a ‘mini-Expressions night’. This does create some additional work for Kickstart staff but the potential benefits available from working closely with statutory organisations to deliver this are considered to outweigh the additional work.

Overall assessment
It is apparent from the work that the Kickstart project does today that there has been some drift from the originally planned outcomes, this may be to expected from a project that is responsive to young people’s expressed wishes seeks to ‘test things out to see if they work’. Since the publication of the baseline report the evaluators have had access to further detail on how the Fear or Fashion project interventions are planned and reviewed. While there are still clearly challenges in identifying ‘effective’ practice in a project that is inherently designed to allow staff and young people to try out new approaches to working with young people on knife crime, the application of planning and review sheets by the Fear or Fashion staff team and recording of post-delivery staff reflection sessions provides a greater clarity on why particular forms of intervention are selected and how decisions are made on whether to continue, change or discard these interventions.
Planning and review sheets are completed by the Fear or Fashion delivery staff, often with the input of Young People’s Forum members. The planning sheets cover the overall aim of the planned intervention clearly expressed as an education activity, including learning outcomes and links to the national curriculum.

Specific objectives for the planned intervention are articulated, the target group is defined and milestones in the project and the resources required (including staff time) to deliver it are specified. The review element records evidence of how each of the planned objectives have been addressed, and scores on a scale of 1 to 5 of how well the learning outcomes have been achieved. They also provide a number of prompts to reflect on the overall success of the activity; how it may be improved; and what, if any, further action should be taken.

Complementing this formal process of planning and review, staff have informal, open, discussions in which they consider how well each intervention went and what evidence there is that it was effective as a means of preventing young people from getting involved in knife crime or supporting them to reject it if they are already involved. These sessions help the staff deal with the more intangible aspects of the Fear or Fashion work which is accepted as innovative and difficult to measure.

"After completing the 6 week circle programme at the Peckham PRU we have discovered that measuring the level of impact would prove to be difficult in terms of attitudes and behaviour. Although the young people we delivered the programme to were very respondent to us and actually got involved and gave feedback, whether their mindset in general has changed is difficult to assess. One thing we do know is that the young people are more aware and vigilant to what could happen if the choices they make are negative or wrong doing which could result in them facing the consequences or becoming a victim."

Staff have begun to see case studies as one of the most effective and potentially powerful ways of showing the impact of the Fear or Fashion work. An outline profile for developing case studies has been developed which covers the young person’s own description of their lifestyle prior to engaging with the project; the activities they have participated in; how beneficial they thought the activities were, including what stood out and why; what they feel they have learnt through their engagement with the project; and the changes they feel have resulted from this.

A key lesson, identified by Kickstart staff and the range of partner organisations who they work with is that it is essential to appoint staff with the necessary skills to engage well with young people, as well as with partners and potential partners. Without the ability of these staff to develop a rapport with young people and engender respect and credibility with partner organisations it is unlikely that any useful work would be achieved.
The historic place of Kickstart in the communities of Southwark and its policy of supporting service users to move on to work as volunteers and eventually progress into paid positions may make it appear relatively easy to attract such staff. It should not be taken for granted by funders that attracting such staff is replicable in other circumstances.

While there is still no robust data available to the Kickstart project on prevalence or patterns of use of or carrying knives in the target areas, anecdotal information, including staff knowledge and recommendations from partners, is used to target particular interventions in locations or with particular groups where there is considered to be existing or emerging issues around knife crime.

In addition the move to working with young people in Pupil Referral Units has been proven, through the reported experiences of participants, to be more effective in engaging with young people with real experience of knife crime, either as victims, perpetrators or witnesses.

The evaluators are still not wholly clear about how young people are recruited into the Kickstart Fear or Fashion programme. It is not clear the extent to which partner organisations or available sources of data on young people at risk of being involved in knife crime are systematically used to target activities. It is noted that the Kickstart approach is more consistent with preventative work, i.e. work which seeks to offer young people activities which will prevent them from becoming involved in knife crime, rather than targeted work with young people who are known to be involved in or associated with knife crime. It is therefore accepted that in Kickstart’s case the extent to which activity is targeted at particularly at risk young people may be tempered by the overall approach of working with ‘whole communities’ of young people. It remains difficult to evaluate this in terms of prevention, given that it is not possible to say with any certainty whether the young people worked with would ever have engaged in knife-related activity.

The example of Waterloo Football described earlier highlights the potential of youth work approaches to engage with hard to reach young people and to offer educational interventions on knife crime. It is not clear how much staff time and other resources are required to create the circumstances to ‘hook them in’ to this form of intervention or if this investment is commensurate with the outcomes it delivers.

A question remains for the evaluation to determine whether investment in interventions of this style delivers adequate evidence of impact on knife crime to warrant further funder investment.
5.2 Leap

Introduction
Leap Confronting Conflict is a national voluntary organisation that specialises in conflict resolution and mediation with young people. Their core work activity employs interactive group-work, with young people who are experiencing disadvantage. The organisation’s specialism is closely aligned with the aims of the Fear and Fashion programme. The aim of the Leap Fear and Fashion project is to reduce violence, weapon carrying and fear of violence for young people in schools. The objectives for the project articulated when the project began are

- To gather baseline data in each of the two schools on levels of conflict and violence within the school, including the carrying of weapons and levels of safety / fear of violence
- To work with local partner agencies to identify young people at risk
- To carry out targeted intensive group work with 80 - 100 young people over three years who are at risk of carrying weapons, or currently carrying weapons, or involved in gang activity in the target school
- To train up to 20 young people over three years from this target group as young leaders
- To carry out a programme of preventative work of one-day workshops across the Year 9 year group in both schools
- To train up to 50 young people over the three years in the target schools as peer mediators / peer trainers
- To train selected staff in both schools in skills for working with conflict and challenging behaviour constructively
- To provide ongoing opportunities for young people involved in the programme to increase their skills and resources

Leap staff stress that the Fear and Fashion project is very highly regarded within Leap at a strategic level as well as at an operational level. This is evidenced by its inclusion as one of three action research projects operating under the 'Crossing Frontiers' title. In November 2008, Jesse Feinstein took over day to day management of the Fear and Fashion project and the coordination of the action research elements from Amanda Nelmes.

Activities undertaken by Leap this year
Over the last year Leap have continued to deliver and develop the interventions which they piloted in the early stages of the Fear and Fashion funding, namely;

- The intensive group work course
- The Schools programme
- Youth Work placements

Intensive Groupwork
There have been three cohorts recruited to the intensive groupwork course since the beginning of the project. The first cohort ‘graduated’ at a certificate ceremony held on the 30th June 2008. The second cohort of the intensive group work programme undertook training over 5 sessions in August at the Four Feathers Youth Club.
Nine young people were recruited to the third cohort following interviews undertaken by Fear and Fashion staff and partners.

This number was drawn from a total of 15 young people put forward for selection. There were issues around the acceptance of young people from outwith Westminster on the course given the terms of the original funding agreement to focus on Westminster.

The Leap intensive group work course is set up both to address young people’s attitudes and behaviour in relation to knives, and to train them to become peer trainers who will help to cascade their learning to other young people in subsequent intensive group work courses. The third intensive group-work course was run in two main parts. The first part took place over three days - Thursday to Saturday during half-term break. Two weeks later the young people returned for a further weekend on a school facilitators course. In addition to this, they participated in two sessions designed to prepare them to take responsibility for running most of the Fear and Fashion certificate presentation ceremony to celebrate the achievements of the second and third cohort of Fear and Fashion peer trainers on the 3rd December 2008 at the Abbey Centre, Westminster.

The certificate presentation is given a high level of importance by the Leap staff and their partners in the City of Westminster Youth Service and other members of the steering group as it provides an opportunity to recognise the achievements of the young people and provide them with a certificate as a physical symbol of what they have learnt.

Following completion of the intensive group-work course the young people are supported to move into youth work placements with local providers. This ensures that the young people remain in touch with services; have the opportunity to put what they have learnt into practice; and have access to alternative lifestyle and career options in comparison to what may have otherwise been apparent or available to them.

**Youth Work Placements**

By December 2008, 27 young people had completed a course, and there was significant pressure to identify suitable placements within which they can practice their newly acquired skills and operate as role models for their peers. Staff from Positive Activities for Young People and the Youth Offending team have visited 18 local youth work settings to identify possible placements for intensive group work ‘graduates’.

So far, Westminster Youth Service has identified relatively few potential placements within youth clubs and other informal youth provision within their portfolio. Discussions with Leap staff and the local steering group for the Fear and Fashion project suggests that senior staff and managers in the Youth Service are supportive, but that delivery level staff are less enthusiastic and may regard the peer trainers as a potential burden rather than a resource. This lack of ‘moving out’ opportunities does have implications for maintaining the motivation of young people completing the intensive group-work and the overall sustainability of the programme.
There is a risk that the peer trainers will 'drop away' and fail to maximise the potential benefit from engaging with the intensive group work if placements are not identified within a reasonable period of time after they complete the course. Leap is exploring the potential to seek placements outside of Westminster but this will have to be clarified and approved by the steering group. It is not clear why, if delivery staff in Westminster are resistant, delivery staff in other areas should be more receptive.

In the consultants view, this may be a result of lack of clarity in the local partnership around who has lead responsibility for identifying placements, and, importantly, the provision of support to the face-to-face staff who could work directly with the peer trainer graduates. The actions taken by the partnership to address this may provide a good indication of the strength of the partnership and the commitment of individual members to making it work.

The Schools Programme
Leap have been working closely with three Westminster secondary schools
- St Georges School
- Paddington Academy
- Westminster Academy

St Georges School
Despite a significant volume of work undertaken by Leap Confronting Conflict in St Georges Catholic School and the production of a Service Level Agreement between Leap Confronting Conflict and St Georges Catholic School, the work programme as planned did not go ahead. Only six pupils were identified for a residential event in May 2008 which had been planned for 20 pupils. Due to the low level of recruitment, the residential was cancelled.

A number of meetings took place between St Georges School staff and Leap staff to review the programme. The Headteacher was considered to have been positive about the potential of the programme and recognised the 'disappointments'. A contributory factor to the disappointments had been that the school had not identified a lead contact within the teaching staff to liaise with Leap and to promote the programme within the school. This has now been addressed and a new programme is being put in place.

This differs from the original planned programme in that it will consist of more targeted work focusing on ten to twelve young people within the Learning Support Unit in Year 9. The work will be built around a three-day course on issues around the carrying and use of knives. In addition to this group the school will identify a group of fifteen young people considered to be 'at risk' who would fall into the 'Group B: Associates of offenders who have not been identified by the criminal justice system' from the typology of young people who carry knives and other weapons detailed in the Fear and Fashion report. These young people are anticipated to be drawn from the Year 7 age group who are seen to be at a particularly vulnerable transition stage.
The intervention will target approximately fifteen Year 7 students and will be delivered by a partnership of the Learning Support Unit with Leap staff and freelance trainers.

- **Paddington Academy.**
  Leap’s work in Paddington Academy has been affected by sensitivities associated with the potential for duplication of effort between Leap and the work of another Fear and Fashion project, Uncut, in the same school. Meetings between Leap and the funders concluded that there may be more benefits to both organisations working in the same school than there were disadvantages particularly in relation to the original spirit of the Fear and Fashion mission which was entirely about partnership approaches.

  Despite this Leap’s work in the school has been limited to conducting a conflict audit. The conflict audit is a research tool aimed at identifying the levels and nature of conflict experienced within the school community, the effects of conflict and how it is managed. The Leap conflict audit is generally regarded as a starting point for the Leap ‘whole school philosophy’ which strives to support the school community from senior team and teachers, support staff, lunchtime and cleaning staff and local neighbours, along with students in embedding a new culture of managing conflict. Following completion of a conflict audit it is commonly Leap practice to them work with the school community to design and implement interventions to address the key issues identified through the conflict audit. Hence this may not be a wholly satisfactory outcome of Leap’s work with Paddington Academy.

- **Westminster Academy**
  This is a new relationship for Leap. The Leap ‘whole schools philosophy’ is being implemented. A conflict audit was undertaken by two Leap trainers who interviewed staff and pupils over December 2008 and January 2009.

**Who are the young people Leap engages with**
The Leap project is consciously targeted at young people on Groups B, C and D from the Fear and Fashion typology, i.e.

- Associates of offenders who have not been identified by the criminal justice system (and are therefore not being worked with by youth offending teams or probation).
- Young people who carry weapons a lot of the time and are known to youth, education and criminal agencies.
- Young people who carry weapons on an ad hoc basis when they feel there are known risks, but without the knowledge of any agencies.

As the programme has developed, a clearer focus on delivering targeted work has emerged as a key element of the Leap Fear and Fashion project.

\[16\] Note that this programme was due to start in February 09, hence these comments are not up-to-date.
Processes, tools, and materials
A strong process has been put in place through the Local Steering Group to identify and refer in suitable young people to the intensive group work. This includes a combination of the following:

- The Positive Activities for Young People and Youth Offending team staff identify young people who are known to them, who may have been involved in offending behaviour, but who have expressed an interest in changing their behaviour.
- Some participants are referred in through word of mouth by previous participants.
- The Youth Offending Team has identified some young people who have recently been released from Young Offenders institutions.

The data held by partners on each potential participant in the intensive group work is supplemented by a detailed 'Targeted Group Interview Form' with each individual, aimed at assessing the young person’s involvement in, and understanding of, the issues around carrying and using knives and other weapons.

Roles and responsibilities of project and partner staff
The Leap local steering group meets regularly and attendance of officers at an appropriate level from each partner is consistent, indicating that the project is valued by the partners. The steering group is made up of Leap Confronting Conflict, the Youth Offending Team (YOT), Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP), the Metropolitan Police, the Youth Inclusion Support Panels (YISP) and Westminster Council’s Education Directorate.

It is part of Leap's normal procedure to put in place a formal written Partnership Agreement signed by all parties, but this was not done in the early stages of setting up this partnership – an omission partly attributed to the confusion arising from moving the project from Brent to Westminster and the consequent pressure on getting things set up quickly. Leap staff are exploring the potential to produce a formal partnership agreement although, given that the partnership is working well, there is some doubt over whether this will make a great deal of difference at operational level.

Evidence of impact
Leap place a high priority on impact evaluation and report that one of the very pleasing figures is that re-offending rates of young people involved in the Leap programme are currently nil. This is tempered by a recognition that this is based on a fairly short period of time and that “with this client group, often it is a case of one step forward and one step back.”

Post-participation evaluation with young people asks them to score their views on a five-point scale and provide comment where appropriate.
Scores and comments were sought in relation to the following six key questions:

1. Did you enjoy the training?
2. What skills/qualities did you learn/develop?
   - Communication
   - Understanding conflict
   - Preventing conflict from escalating
   - Confidence
   - Self leadership
   - Team work
3. Do you think the training has helped you to be more confident to stop small conflicts from escalating?
4. Do you think that weapon carrying is a problem in your school?
5. How do you think this training could make your school a safer place?
6. What would you change about the training to make it better?

Our review of the responses made by the participants indicates that the training is regarded very positively. For example, 100% of participants felt that the training had helped them to be more confident in stopping small conflicts from escalating. Comments on what would improve the training were limited but the most frequent themes were more games, and more role play/drama, indicating an unsurprising preference for participative method of working with young people.

Leap staff are working with partners in the Metropolitan Police to explore the potential of using data on knife crime to measure the impact of the project, although there are a number of problems with the availability of data and creating a link between any changes in knife crime and the activities of the project.

Leap staff had worked with several young people to develop case studies of the impact of their participation on their attitudes, behaviour and aspirations however these were lost when a member of staff moved on. A recent development has been the use of video recording technology, starting at interview stage, to capture the journey and development of participants. Presently seven out of nine participants on the intensive group work programme are participating in this.

Leap staff report that, although their technical competence with the equipment is limited, the impact of seeing and hearing participants speaking direct to camera is very powerful.

Leap staff are exploring the potential to work with audiovisual professionals to produce footage which is more technically competent and possibly suitable for recruitment/promotion purposes.

**Overall assessment**
The project is well managed, possibly as a result of Leap’s eminent place in conflict resolution activity with young people and their experience of delivering similar work in other settings.
The project’s success in engaging with young people who have an identified and explicit association with knife crime is a particularly strong feature. Leap staff are keen to maintain the targeted approach and to resist the opportunity to work with larger numbers, e.g. a whole year group, in a less intensive way.

The local steering group presents a strong opportunity to embed the project in the local area although we are not clear of how this would be resourced following conclusion of the Fear and Fashion funding.

The limited availability of progression routes, i.e. youth placements, for graduates of the intensive programme is of some concern. A number of places have been found in Leap itself, however this does present some potential for simply creating a dependency on Leap which is concerning for two reasons. Firstly the ‘graduates’ may be more effectively challenged and supported if they have the opportunity to work outside of the Leap context. Secondly there is a risk that if Leap becomes the primary source for placements that other partners will not prioritise this and the potential sustainability and ‘ripple effect’ impact of the intervention will be limited.
5.3 Rainer

Introduction
The Rainer Brent Tackling Knife Crime Service provides specialist one to one support services to young people in the Brent Youth Offending Team area who have been identified as being involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in, carrying or using knives with access, to assist them to address their behaviour. The project is staffed by a single worker, Angela Francis.

The aim of the Rainer Brent Tackling Knife Crime Service is very simply to provide a casework service to support young people who have been involved in knife crime to more fully understand the potential consequences of using and carrying knives. Young people who wish to stop carrying knives and other weapons are supported to establish and implement effective strategies to stop. Young people are referred to the project through the Brent Youth Offending Team. The service is provided through a single member of staff, employed by Rainer, but based within the Youth Offending Team.

The service is tailored to each young person. There is not a set programme that all young people undertake. There is however a five-stage process that broadly describes the key elements of young people’s engagement with the service:

- Stage 1 – Initial Referral
- Stage 2 – Initial Assessment Plan
- Stage 3 – Programme of one to one meetings
- Stage 4 – Group Work
- Stage 5 – Exit meetings

Exit points are decided by the term of the young person’s attendance order.

In 2008, Rainer and Crime Concern merged to form a new organisation, Catch22. The original post-holder, Angela Francis, moved on to a new post in Catch 22 following the merger. A recruitment exercise has been undertaken and a new member of staff selected. A Criminal Records Bureau check is presently being carried out on the new appointee. They will not begin work until this is completed.

Activities undertaken by Rainer this year
The fact that the Rainer intervention is largely made up of one to one casework, augmented by group-work where opportunities arise, leaves limited scope for the development of new activities. In the period since the baseline report the Rainer project has continued to provide one to one work with a further 25 young people, giving a total of 49 young people worked with over the course of the whole project.

“There was the work we did with the YES project, apart from that there wasn’t really any other group-work that I did.”

17 Facts checked on 24th March 2009
In addition to the casework, the Rainer worker worked with officers from the Metropolitan Police Youth Engagement Team to arrange a group-work session for young people working with the Knife Crime Service. The Youth Engagement Team deliver a range of activity intended to break down negative barriers between police and local youths by giving them more insight into how the Police work.

This session was delivered by the Metropolitan Police CO19 Specialist Firearms Team. It was intended to give young people an insight into the consequences of carrying and using weapons; help them understand the role of the CO19 command, how they operate and why their procedures are the way they are; and how the officers who work with CO19 team view their work. The session took place on 28th August 2008 at Copland High School in Wembley, and was attended by twenty-eight young people, drawn from a range of sources. The evaluators attended this session, as did a representative of the Fear and Fashion Advisory Group and other officers from the Metropolitan Police and Rainer. The CO19 team brought a number of resources with them, including an Armed Response Vehicle and a number of firearms and fake firearms. They challenged the young people to identify the fake firearms, which proved impossible. This was used to highlight the reason why officers from the CO19 team have to treat every visible firearm as potentially real, because they cannot tell. This was also related to experiences they had had where young people had been caught with fake firearms and professed to be unable to understand why they had been treated as if they had a real firearm.

The session was mostly direct ‘chalk’n’talk’ style presentation by three officers from the CO19 team. The officers did seek to generate discussion by asking the whole group questions about their experiences or views. It was apparent that most of the young people were not wholly confident about speaking out in this full group situation and discussion was limited. Post event discussion between the evaluators, Rainer staff and others identified that in this case it would have been difficult to encourage group discussion as few of the young people knew each other well and were therefore unlikely to be prepared to speak out in front of each other.

Discussion between the evaluators and with the officers after the session revealed that the officers had drawn the session together at the request of the Youth Engagement Team. They admitted that that they had no training in delivering educational sessions and were not themselves wholly confident about how to plan and deliver a session in an appropriate style. They were keen to receive feedback from the evaluators and the other professionals present on how they had performed and how they could improve. This highlights the value of the Rainer worker’s position as an acknowledged expert resource in supporting staff from other agencies to plan how to effectively engage with young people.
Despite the limited opportunities to develop the group-work aspect of the project, the worker has begun to include additional elements in the range of topics and issues covered in the one-to-one sessions. The fact that the young people she sees are referred to her for a period corresponding to an attendance order means that, in some cases, they are present for a sufficiently long period to exhaust the discussion on knife crime and to cover other issues that may be underlying causes of the young person’s offending behaviour.

"With some of the Young People who had been with me for quite a while, I had started doing some work on self-esteem, power, masculinity. Talking to the boys, we found that at the root of conflict there was usually a female – you know the sort of thing. We may have to find ways to support young people to understand where conflicts arise and avoid them or defuse them”

The worker had undertaken training in working with parents but had not had the opportunity to explore ways of applying this training before she left her post.

Who are the young people Rainer engages with?
Unlike the other Fear and Fashion projects, Rainer works exclusively with young people known to the criminal-justice system, who have been convicted of a crime in which a knife was a factor, in other words Fear and Fashion Group A: Young people who have offended and are in the criminal justice system. This means that their work differs from that of the other Fear and Fashion projects in that it is exclusively ameliorative, i.e. seeks to reduce or prevent young people who are known to carry (or have carried) knives from doing so.

The worker is of the view that

"Working with young people after they have been caught with knives is useful, but by then it’s already too late for that young person. We need to be doing more preventative work with young people who are at risk of carrying or using weapons but I never had the chance to do that at Brent. I had the impression that the Preventions worker – they only have one in Brent – didn’t want his young people referred to me in case they learnt bad habits."

The majority of the young people referred to the Rainer project are male, although the worker notes that

"I am getting more females in. I’m not sure why that is... it could be a result of increased use of female officers on stop and searches but most of the young people we get in have been picked up not for carrying but for using a knife in the commission of some other crime, so that’s not really likely.”
Of sixty-nine referrals received through Brent YOT over the period the project had been running, only two young people had been rejected as inappropriate referrals, in both cases because they were considered too young to fully understand the kind of intervention provided.

Eighteen young people failed to attend after referral, sometimes simply because they did not attend, sometimes because they received a custodial sentence for another offence in the period between referral and commencement of work with the Rainer project.

Roles and responsibilities of project and partner staff
It was also identified at the baseline report that the existing worker was very much a ‘one person service’. Line management support is provided through Rainer and referrals are provided through the Brent YOT.

It was also noted that and that the Rainer worker had been very successful in establishing a profile as an expert on knife crime and a valuable resource in supporting partner organisations to understand how to work effectively with young people on knife crime issues.

Evidence of impact
The knife crime intervention provided by the Rainer worker focuses on the young person’s knowledge and understanding of knife-crime law and the consequences of being involved in knife-crime for the young person. This is measured through the application of a questionnaire on knowledge levels when the young person commences work with the knife crime project, which is repeated, along with a more informal exit interview, at the end of their work with the project.

With the exception of the increase in knowledge, which is objectively measurable, the worker is clear that the impact of their work is difficult to measure

"It’s very subjective, the work I did. It’s difficult to say for sure what impact it has. I can say that none of the young people I worked with subsequently reoffended but obviously I can’t claim that was definitely because of me, or that they won’t reoffend in the future, it’s not been that long for many of them."

One of the identified flaws in the programme was the young people moved on when the term of their order concluded, rather than because of any clear decision that the young person was ready to move on. This was compounded by the lack of referral-out systems, or any way of knowing what sort of links to services young people had after concluding their work with the knife crime project.

"When the YOT finishes with a young person they don’t follow or establish what else they may need so we never know what happens to them – until they return to the system. The prevention worker in Brent was resistant to working with me. This may be different in different YOTs. I’ve come to Haringey and their preventions systems are different, so I don’t know.”
The Rainer project’s wider influence
The Rainer project is not linked in at operational level to any local forums or partnerships, although Rainer itself as an organisation working across London is. The primary opportunities for the Rainer project to influence others comes through the worker’s status as an expert resource available to partners. The worker questions the potential long-term effectiveness of project based intervention on knife crime, viewing this as an effort to address the symptom of a wider set of social problems.

“There are so many societal things wrapped up in this, poverty, gangs, race, class. Unless we are dealing with all of these I can’t imagine we will do more than fight fire.”

Overall assessment
An issue identified at the baseline report was that referrals to the knife Crime worker from Brent YOT were not systematically identified and passed on. Referrals relied on the individual YOT worker remembering to refer young people involved in knife-crime. A new management information system was to be implemented in late 2008 which would allow young people involved in knife-crime and known to the YOT to be systematically identified and prioritised. Reports from the outgoing worker are that the management-information system is in place but that YOT staff had not used it to generate referrals during her tenure there. The status of the Rainer Knife-Crime worker as a local resource to other organisations working on knife-crime issues was identified as an attribute of the post-holder rather than of the post, or the employing organisation. Given that this member of staff has now moved on, the evaluators will need to assess what impact the change of staff has on this and whether the new member of staff.

It is apparent that the project has been successful in attracting sufficient young people to form a full caseload for the worker. Comments from partner organisations confirm the high regard for the worker. Given that the success of the project has been established through the worker’s capacity to establish a rapport with young people and a credibility with professional partners, there is a question over the extent to which the incoming worker will be able to equal this. The outgoing worker says

“Exciting time for the new worker, I had quite a good relationship with others, especially the Youth Engagement Team from the police. They will be able to pick up on that. There should have been something on paper about who I’m working with, what to look out for, who I’d made connections with locally, but most of it is in my head... I did the interviews for the new worker and I’m confident that the new worker has the personality to work with young people and to do what she can to work innovatively...I don’t expect her to do the same job I did, my advice to her was that she needed to make the job her own, I mean I did it the way that suited my skills and personality, she needs to find the way that plays to her strengths too. She will have the benefit of using some of the materials I developed, but then again she might decide that these aren’t for her.”
5.4 Uncut

Description of the project
Paddington Development Trust successfully applied for Fear and Fashion funding to establish an initiative to tackle knife culture amongst young people in North Westminster and South Brent. Working with Men (WWM) were contracted to deliver the work and established the Uncut Project. WWM is a charity that has been developing work with boys and young men since 1985, in schools, youth services and probation settings. The work includes programmes on sex, violence, literacy and other gender related issues.

The Uncut project was set up with two main aims:
- To impact on young people’s attitudes and behaviour towards carrying and using knives and other weapons (the primary target group is young males aged from 10-17)
- To develop, deliver and evaluate a range of initiatives and integrate those that work within existing mainstream services.

The project stated that a number of different activities were to be trialled and evaluated with partner agencies. This is in order to identify what works within the local context. The project states that "part of the aim is to mainstream those initiatives that are both effective and able to be delivered within mainstream agencies."

For this reason a strong emphasis is placed on a local Partners Advisory Group. The original plan envisaged the Partners Advisory Group meeting four times per year. The Paddington Development Trust is identified as the lead agency for the Partners Advisory Group. The project design states that "partners will feed into the development of new initiatives and projects and also support the mainstreaming of projects and initiatives that work."

Original partners identified were:
- Pupil Referral Unit
- Youth Offending Team
- Civic Watch
- Youth Inclusion and Support Panel (13-19 year-olds)
- PAYP
- Westminster Youth and Connexions Services
- Victim Support Westminster

A full-time dedicated Project Manager was recruited in March 2007 (on JNC point 32-36). The Project Manager is based in office space at the Amberley Youth Project (another WWM project in the area). The Project Manager is line-managed by a WWM Manager.
Key issues identified at the baseline analysis:

- The Uncut Project Manager is very busy. He had established good working relationships with local schools and some other youth-related services. He is highly committed and has delivered a lot! The real danger lies in being spread too thinly. The amount of time and effort to establish working relationships with four schools and a pupil referral unit should not be under-estimated. The workload involved in maintaining these relationships, as well as devising programmes and materials then delivering and evaluating them could become unsustainable.

- In the last week of March 2008, two young pupils from Paddington Academy were involved in an incident that resulted in one of them dying from a knife wound. The victim previously participated in Uncut programmes. The incident had a marked impact on Uncut and its local partners and forced a reconsideration of priorities and a determination for Uncut to become less thinly spread.

- A key part of the success of the project to date has been the success of the individual Project Manager to create relationships and to deliver programmes which young people reportedly value.

- The Project Manager needs to be supported to prioritise the overall work programme to avoid burn-out and to ensure that time is available to reflect and learn about what works which is the second of the two key aims for the work.

- Despite the high level of activity there was little systematic evidence of what impact it has had and less evidence of how the activity developed is being used to influence local decisions. Because the Project Manager is extremely busy there is little management information available to be analysed for the evaluation. As part of the evaluation the Project Manager is being supported to establish some quick and efficient tools for capturing the impact on young people.

- How the project work is informed by, and contributes to, achieving local priorities has been given little attention to date.

- WWM state that they are happy for the Project Manager to be very busy now in the early stages of the Project. The initial priority for WWM has been to get things moving, then to take stock to identify what works and how it can be replicated / sustained. Arguably there is a need to engage more effectively with local partners now to engage them in understanding what works as early as possible.

- There is a need to benchmark what partners think and want relating to the work of Uncut so that the impact can be measured against those aspirations over the next two years. This evidence will help partners consider how to sustain work that makes a difference in their locality.

- Working with local partners is a prerequisite to the project being successful in mainstreaming the activities and initiatives which are judged to have worked. The Project Manager has established and developed effective operational relationships with schools and other key local partners. Connecting to partners to influence local decisions is nominally the role of the WWM Manager. Because he is based in the Working With Men’s main office he is inevitably less connected to very local issues, agendas and networks which may be necessary to fully exploit possibilities for mainstreaming work in future.
• There is a need for local partners to support WWM to manage and prioritise Uncut work to ensure its contribution to local agendas is fully understood.

Uncut activities since the Baseline
The practical focus of Uncut has been on delivering three key programmes:
• Conflict management Programme
• Mock trial programme
• Fatal Stabbing Assemblies

Delivery of these programmes is tailored to the particular needs of agencies / settings where the programme is being delivered and varies to some extent each time it is delivered. Below is an illustration of the basic framework for delivering the programmes:

**Conflict management programmes** are typically four X 1.5 hours sessions for around twelve participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Defining conflict – and examine participants’ experience of conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open up discussions related to weapons and violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Focus on communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine communication in conflict-type scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Understand the dangers of carrying a weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spotting and avoiding danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Examine why young people carry knives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore aspirations and motivations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mock Trial Programmes** are typically 5 X 1.5 hour sessions for around twelve participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Support young people to develop insight into what can happen in a knife situation – what are the processes through to an outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Lawyer – insight into the law: joint enterprise; conspiracy; re-occurring factors that are familiar in these cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Police perspective: stop and search policy and practice; Possession; Hotspots; Community safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Experiences of incarceration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>Review and learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fatal stabbing assemblies** are one-off sessions to explore the medical and criminal justice issues in knife crime situations.

Since the baseline analysis, Uncut have delivered eight conflict management programmes (four of those in primary schools); two mock trial programmes (plus another two adapted one-day versions of the programme); and eight fatal stabbing assemblies. A key priority in the past year has been engaging local partners in the planning and delivery of these programmes with a definite focus on passing the responsibility for delivering them onto local agencies – reinforcing the Uncut role to develop ideas and trial them.

Peer education input has become a feature of the conflict management programmes which have been delivered in primary schools.

In addition to these key programmes the Uncut Project manager has been offering one-to-one support to nine individual young people referred by schools and the YOT. In all cases Uncut has offered at least five sessions with each individual and for some this has developed into intensive weekly support for at least eight months.

The Project Manager has also played a prominent role in local responses to the killing last year – including helping to organise public meetings for parents; designing and publishing posters and publicity leaflets; commissioning dedicated artwork.

A second Uncut worker was appointed in November 2008 following a successful funding bid to Westminster Council by Paddington Development Trust.

**Who are the young people Uncut has engaged with?**
Uncut has engaged over 1500 young people aged 11-17 over the past year. This includes whole school years participating in a school assembly as well as participants selected to take part in intensive 4-6 week programmes, and in a small number of cases to engage in one-to-one work with Uncut staff.

Specific programmes target particular groups and the processes for selecting young people have become more sophisticated over the past year. School-based partners report that young people were selected on the basis of ‘behaviour’

> "Some were known to the school for bullying – others who demonstrated lack of confidence, or were insecure."

The YOT have worked with Uncut on preparing Mock Trial programmes. Towards the end of 2008 they reported:

> "We have been fairly formal in agreeing which young people"
This level of involvement has also led to Uncut programmes becoming embedded into formal court orders as part of the YOT’s menu of disposals.

Schools-based work is complex and can involve school safety support officers, learning support unit staff, as well as heads of year. Sean has worked over the past year to formalise the process for engaging with schools:

- Working with the school to identify young people for programmes
- Identify young people through the programme who could benefit from further individual programme
- Carry out a shared assessment
- Measure the progress with young people

Local stakeholders are confident that Uncut programmes reach the right young people. Some stakeholders indicated that one of the real strengths of Uncut work has been reaching beyond the usual suspects:

"Even at the original consultation stage Uncut reached some young people who are not normally reached – Eastern European kids and Kurdish kids – who often don’t use services but get picked up for problems."

Another local stakeholder who manages a youth project offers a different view about the young people Uncut engages:

"It’s very difficult to reach the young people that need to be reached with this kind of work"

Reaching younger age groups has been suggested as a priority for preventive work by a number of local partners. The YOT is one agency that sees the need to work with Uncut to push preventive work down the age range:

"We need to focus on Y6 before children go into secondary school."

This thinking has contributed to Uncut developing peer education initiatives where ‘older’ young people are trained and supported to work with younger young people in the conflict management programmes delivered in two primary schools.

"Peer influence is real – and frightening – the pull of their peers is huge – the terminology they attach to some of these things is to desensitise it e.g. they call a robbery / mugging "eats” to make it more palatable. We need to take notice of the influence of the older (18-19) on the younger (13-14)"

The young people engaged in one-to-one support with Uncut first came into contact with Sean in group activities in schools and through the YOT. In most cases, the referral was informal at the outset. Sean has worked with YOT and schools to formalize this. He reports that

"It has transpired only once we got into the one to one work that some of these young people have extremely complex issues"
INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDY – Part 1 – Aaron

Aaron is a student at Paddington Academy. He turned 15 in summer 2008. Aaron participated in an Uncut conflict management programme which is where he first came into contact with Sean. ‘Aaron’s whole attitude to school was no good – but you can see he is a definite leader, very articulate, can take care of himself.’

Aaron agrees with Sean’s observations: “Yeah I recognise that – I like to control things – a lot of young people look up to me.”

Following intensive review work involving the school and City of Westminster Education services which considered medical, family and learning issues, an agreement was reached to allow Aaron to continue to be registered at school and to spend time doing school work with a dedicated tutor at the Uncut project office 3-4 times per week. He goes to school part-time on Mondays and Wednesdays and comes to the Uncut office on other days. “I didn’t like school – because I had to wake up early – went into school in a bad mood and would end up beating people up. School just wanted me out.”

Weapon-related incidents have been a significant feature of Aaron’s story: “I know that lots of young guys play about with knives round here. They just do it to get props. My friend was playing with a knife and he stabbed me – I couldn’t breathe properly but it didn’t hurt me. Then he stabbed another friend and I began to think no! stop the knife games. Then my friend got killed – people need to stop messing about with knives. My friend Amro’s brother – he’s in Jail and he sent me a letter. That’s when I got serious about it.

Earlier this year I was arrested for having a gun. Someone bought it and everyone was looking at it. When the police came into that alley way, I was holding that gun. When I was sitting in the cell I was thinking about a whole lot of stuff. I could be somewhere a whole lot better”

Processes, tools, and materials to support these interventions

Tools and resources for supporting knife-crime related work with young people will be a key output from the work of Uncut. Partners have clearly engaged in delivering the interventions with a view to designing tools which will support them to deliver this work themselves in future. A series of detailed learning plans have been developed for Uncut’s key programmes with explicit instructions for designing and delivering sessions. Additional materials to support the programmes include a sophisticated interactive DVD which YOT have been closely involved in helping to develop.
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A key concern has been ensuring the relevance of materials to the young people YOT engage with:

“the fact that it has been filmed in this area is particularly attractive to our young people”

Local partners point to the materials being produced as key to sustaining the work that has been developed but caution that

“the materials are only any good if they go hand in hand with training and support for people to use them”

Fundamental to the delivery of Uncut activity is the support and contributions of partners. Partnership working processes require particular attention to support Uncut to make an impact and, at the end of 2008, still represent a major challenge for Sean:

“Getting local partners to buy into our planning has been a challenge:
Current issue for me is to try to pin key people [in schools / YOT] down to meet to timetable and plan.”

Despite this both Sean and local partners report that partnership working over the past year has become increasingly sophisticated:

- Uncut becoming involved in school reviews for individual students
- YOT staff shadowing Sean in delivering courses and formally reviewing the delivery
- Uncut has become an ingredient in the YOT’s menu of disposal’s available within court orders
- Schools will be delivering Uncut programmes by themselves – still to iron out how Sean will quality assure this work. “Schools pass the feedback to me – I analyse it and send them a report.” Sean uses this to have a conversation with the school.
- Westminster Council’s Young People and Weapons Sub-group – a very strategic, though very enforcement-led forum – recently featured Uncut on its agenda
- The positive reputation of Uncut has enabled Paddington Development Trust to attract an additional £50k for further preventive work which has been used to employ an additional worker within the Uncut project.

Uncut is still not exploiting as many partnership opportunities as it could be:

“Uncut is not always plugged into local forums and processes”

“Our local Strategy Panel meeting is an opportunity to develop the best local responses to issues for young people. Uncut haven’t been part of that meeting as yet. Partly that’s because we haven’t got around to inviting Sean as yet but I’ll be putting that up for the next meeting.”

“It’s a struggle to interest Sean in some of the strategic agendas in the area.”
Engaging local schools:

The snapshots outlined below illustrate how Uncut partnership working has evolved to engage schools in the Uncut programmes and to embed the programmes within their curriculum activity.

Paddington Academy
• Sean initially put the ideas to the school
• Vice principal and Head of Learning Support Unit (LSU) discussed this with Sean.
• Previously had a stakeholder group (Y11s) – set up by Sean with head of Y10 - they were consulted on who should be participating in the Uncut programmes – they came up with the idea that it should be Y7s. Sean fed that back to the school
• This term they will have another yp stakeholder group – School will now take responsibility for setting this up and coordinating it.
• Discussions with the school – Head of LSU and Sean have had regular meetings – Sean now saying that he needs to timetable in a meeting with key services and key individuals within school (e.g. Heads of Year)
• LSU staff will be shadowing Sean to pick up on the work and look at how she can play a role in delivering – Head of LSU and Sean jointly came up with this idea

Quinton Kynaston
• More up in the air – less ongoing contact than with Paddington Academy
• They contacted Sean saying they wanted to do more work. Sean’s response was that yes – but it needs to be more coordinated. Previous experience for Sean has been lots of chasing individual Heads of Year.
• LSU have come back saying that they would like to focus on integrating Sean’s work into an overall PSHE peer education programme.
• Head of LSU will take responsibility for disseminating information to relevant staff in the school and for coordinating the work with the school.
• Now Sean wants to programme in the work – for Sean to be supporting the school to take the work forward.
• It has been agreed that responsibility clearly lies with the Head of LSU.

Roles and responsibilities of Uncut staff and partner agency staff

Sean’s individual ability and approach have been widely reported as the central factor in Uncut’s success:

“Sean is creative with coming up with how to make it useful and valuable.”

“We need another 1000 Seans but if we can’t get that the next best thing would be to find ways to develop the skills and capacity to take on this kind of work in the area.”
“When I have young people on their own I can create a rapport with them but it then becomes difficult in the group. That appears to come naturally for Sean.”

Equally there is widespread recognition that an over-reliance on Sean is not the best way to ensure sustained delivery of this work:

“Comforting to know we have someone who has this specialist but we need to make it less about Sean and where he has come from and more usable for all of us”

“Sean has such a rapport with young people we just need more of him. – but we need to recognise the limits on curriculum and how we can integrate this into our work”

Partners agree that more focused action is required to support local agencies to embed Uncut approaches and tools devised into their day-to-day work.

“We would like to have Uncut around forever – great to have someone with that kind of energy – have someone on my case saying what are we doing about this.”

“YOT workers in the Uncut programmes? – measure of success will be – that they are able to go and run an Uncut group – that we can get them to have enough confidence in it”

“Team (case workers) are very keen on it – because of Sean’s reputation. This is fed by young people almost asking for Uncut groups.”

“You can’t always teach others what Sean does – he has a particular type of relationship with young people – I couldn’t have because I’m a police officer. He is a young black man”

Local partners report that the overall context for partnership working is improving which may help support more effective partnership working between Uncut and local partners:

“On the ground we are good at sharing information between YOT and police – we have had a good act together and managing community perceptions.”

When it comes to identifying individuals who would benefit from one to one work there are particular issues for partnership working and additional action is required. Sean has worked closely with the school counselor to establish ground rules e.g. nobody can come straight to Sean for this kind of support without coming through the school Counselors

An additional member of staff was appointed by Uncut in November 2008. The intention is to pass responsibility for delivering programmes to the new post-holder to free Sean up to design the materials which are emerging from the programmes delivered during 2008. Work with parents will also become a focus for the new post.
Decisions about Sean’s work load are discussed with Trefor Lloyd, his line manager in Working With Men. Sean also speaks with Jackie Rosenberg, of Paddington Development Trust, although this contact is viewed by Sean as more a support than a management role. The ultimate decision on the scale and focus of the work programme is taken by Sean.

**INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDY - Part 2 – Sean’s work with Aaron**

Sean was pulled in by the school to contribute to Aaron’s annual review. The school was ready to exclude Aaron and send him to the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU). Sean stood up for him “knowing the way he is and the way the PRU works, I know that he wouldn’t benefit.” As a result of Sean’s intervention Aaron was allowed to remain in school as long as there was support in place for Aaron through Sean. Aaron meets with Sean 3-4 times per week: “some of it is informal; better when the discussion just happens; he’s now doing better in school. I’m able to work with him to explore what’s going on for him. Helping him to identify the difference between thinking situations through and acting on impulse. We’ve talked a lot about how he could respond differently to the way he has done in the past.”

Sean also meets with Aaron’s mum here in the centre and speaks to her regularly on the phone about Aaron’s progress and issues as they arise. This is in addition to Sean working carefully with Aaron to help him understand the need for him to keep his own mother informed about situations at school etc.

What is the difference between school and this arrangement for Aaron? “In school don’t get the one to one talks. Don’t listen when I’m in school – prefer to go on the computer instead of doing my work. When I met Sean I thought here’s a guy knows about the street – asking us about when we last had a fight.”

As well as direct support to Aaron, Sean has worked carefully to support Aaron to engage in informal peer support / education with other young people who drop into the Amberley Youth Centre which houses Uncut.

**Evidence of impact**

Whilst one local stakeholder from the Metropolitan Police suggested that participating in Uncut programmes “gives young people alternatives to carrying knives” there is little in the way of definite evidence of an impact on knife use. Key stakeholders in the Fear and Fashion programme - Metropolitan Police and Lemos and Crane - agree that it is impossible to evidence the impact of an awareness raising initiative on young people’s use of knives.

There is, however, widespread support for the view that Uncut activities do have a positive impact on young people: “When I observed the sessions they were talking about things that they hadn’t thought about.”
“The physical side of it – he was showing them physical moves about how to defend yourself so that injuries are minimised – using some particular manoeuvres / dance moves”

Uncut staff themselves are realistic in their assessment of what the work can impact on:
- Awareness? – definitely
- Skills development? - some
- Change in attitudes?– less noticeable
- Change in Behavior? – less noticeable
- Increased confidence? – less noticeable

Monitoring and evaluation of individual programmes has been used to indicate the impact of the programmes on young people who participate. These potentially present useful data for Sean, managers and local partners to consider what does / doesn’t work. There is little evidence of them being used for that purpose. Two examples of monitoring responses are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avenues Youth Club (Edutain) – August 2008 Conflict Management Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you that you can resolve a conflict without resorting to violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= not confident at all / 5= very confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do you know about methods of avoiding conflict or potentially dangerous situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= none / 5= loads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What percentage of communication is done by speaking?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number getting the correct answer (&lt;15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you able to spot a potential attack by looking into someone’s eyes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= never / 5= always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any non-verbal techniques to diffuse potential conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= not a lot / 5= loads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paddington Academy–August 08 -Conflict Management Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you that you can resolve a conflict without resorting to violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= not confident at all / 5= very confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you know about methods of avoiding conflict or potentially dangerous situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do you know about techniques to prevent yourself from losing your temper</th>
<th>1= not a lot / 5= loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When you’re upset do you..?</th>
<th>1= always shout / 5= never shout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What percentage of communication is done by speaking?</th>
<th>Number getting the correct answer (&lt;15%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do you know about the potential lines of a knife attack?</th>
<th>1= not a lot / 5= loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any personal safety strategies to deal with a potential attack</th>
<th>1= not a lot / 5= loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any non-verbal techniques to diffuse potential conflicts</th>
<th>1= not a lot / 5= loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When communicating do you ever speak over people or shout to get your point across</th>
<th>1= never / 5= always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you able to spot a potential attack by looking into someone’s eyes</th>
<th>1= never / 5= always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you able to defend against a stabbing motion to the body</th>
<th>1= never / 5= always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whilst partners support the view that Uncut does have a positive view on young people’s knowledge and attitudes towards knife crime there are still questions about whether this specific focus is what is really required:

“If there were no Uncut where would you go for training – we’ve been looking for that for some time. We do work with young people in the area – we just provide as much positive activity for young people rather than follow the hype – it seems that everyone is doing something on knife crime. We will continue to focus on some of the most difficult young people - that’s our role – when we fail in that we need to find other solutions involving the right agencies in that. I don’t think it’s easy to find an off-the-shelf training. The issues are so unique to our area that we need to find ways to train our own workers.”

“The real hard-core problem is still drugs dealing and guns – that’s what needs to be tackled – we need to tackle underlying poverty gap.”

“Young people have big aspirations but they don’t have the means to meet them. We need to tackle the core issues of poverty which lead to problems like knife crime.”

INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDY - Part 3 – Impact of Uncut

Sean reports a marked change in Aaron’s attitude to his academic work and to his ability to reflect on his own behaviour. Aaron’s tutor notes a marked improvement in the quality of his academic work. In a recent struggle between Aaron and the school, one of the key issues was Aaron’s determination to go to school to sit an exam he had prepared for whilst some members of school staff were insisting he should be debarred. With Sean’s support, Aaron’s persistence and determination paid off and he was allowed to take the exam.

At the time of writing (march 2009) Aaron is working closely with Sean to organise an anniversary commemoration of last year’s killing.

Aaron says:

"Before when Sean was asking when did you last have a fight – I was still going out fighting. But when I came here Sean was giving me the real talks. He was talking about my life being a gamble. I was in the British judo squad. I got a Bronze. He told me I should stop gambling with my life. I thought about it – I thought there’s really no point in fighting. Stuff I’m doing with Sean – since he has been talking to me I’ve seen the change in me. I want to go to schools with him I want to talk to young people and tell them about knife crime and talk about my friend Amro and tell them how far Sean has got me. If I weren’t talking to Sean I don’t think I’d be doing Judo now. Him that’s got me more thinking about my life then the streets. Give me the urge to keep going with the judo. I’d probably still be out on the street. Probably in Jail. You never know”
Planning and management process for Uncut
The key change during 2008 in relation to management of Uncut has been Paddington Development Trust taking a more proactive stance to engage local partners in guiding Uncut’s work. A tangible result of this has been their ability to attract additional funding to create a new post for Uncut.

A killing of a local young man in early 2008 was a key factor in galvanising local partners into working together on the issue of knife crime in general, and supporting Uncut in particular.

Sean continues to be directly managed by Working With Men (submitting weekly monitoring forms and three-weekly supervision sessions) but more formalised support with Paddington Development Trust has ensured that local issues and priorities are central to planning and managing Uncut’s work.

How does Uncut influence others?
Schools, YOT and local youth projects have been extensively engaged in Uncut’s work during 2008. A lot of effort has gone into supporting these agencies to learn from Uncut’s work and to find ways to embed the key lessons into their practice.

Uncut has become something of a focal point for community responses to the killing that took place in March 2008. Sean was key to organising community gatherings for parents; he was called to give inputs to school assemblies; and Uncut produced a series of ‘public education’ posters. At the time of writing Uncut is one of the key organisers and promoters of a community memorial event.

Whilst it is difficult to discern a clear strategic influence from Uncut’s work, Paddington Development Trust have been able to attract additional local authority funding. This suggests some level of strategic support for the work and that the potential exists for Uncut to play a greater role in influencing local strategy, policy and funding decisions.

Stakeholders reported that they hoped for more strategic influence from Uncut being part of the fear and Fashion programme.

"More could be done to get value from the Fear and Fashion programme – media work should be done under F&F rather than individual projects. The weighty body of the Advisory Group is not used - it seems like a wasted opportunity. People would listen to it in a different way from the individual projects on its own. And policy stuff could operate more effectively there – how are we feeding into the Met – that could be a role for Fear and Fashion."

Overall assessment
Uncut is a good investment of resources if raising awareness of knife crime-related issues is a desired outcome. A very large number of young people have been reached. Local partners and young people themselves offer very positive feedback from this contact and Uncut programmes are widely recognised as good quality youth work interventions.
The individual Project Manager is a real asset to Uncut and to Fear and Fashion. Managing that asset carefully to avoid burn-out remains an issue. Careful consideration of the professional development needs and opportunities for the Project Manager is required.

This is evidenced by the additional investment of £50,000 by partners to extend and develop the project.

Key issues for future development of Uncut’s work include:

- Continuing to refine the evaluation processes for Uncut’s activities. Whilst some effort has gone into creating tools and systems for recording the impact on young people there is still little evidence of this being used by local partners, or indeed by Uncut itself, to understand the outcomes achieved and to make decisions about how to sustain or develop these outcomes for the local area. This may include assessing the training needs of local partners and identifying strategies for embedding the work.

- A key output from the Uncut work will be the tools it has developed with partners for awareness raising work. There is a need to support the project to devise and implement a definite plan for market-testing these tools to ensure they do actually create a lasting legacy.

- Paddington Development Trust have taken on a more formal role in reviewing and developing the work of Uncut during 2008. This is a welcome development in ensuring that Uncut is more fully plugged into local priorities and agendas. Responsibility for management of Sean’s workload continues to lie with Working With Men. The overall volume of work carried out remains high and may still be a cause for concern. Having an additional worker should present the opportunity to focus capacity more carefully rather than only be seen as an opportunity to do more.

- The additional focus on one-to-one work may be a welcome addition for the ability of Uncut to really engage with young people at risk of being involved in knife-crime, and to make a difference to their attitudes, aspirations and behaviour. There is a need to clarify the role of Uncut in delivering one-to-one work which will require more clarity around referral procedures and in relation to understanding the purpose and desired outcomes. There is a real possibility to use this work to understand more about how to make a difference to those young people most at risk but more careful consideration would need to be given to the tools and approaches used to measure this impact.

- The lessons from delivering Uncut activity need to be used to support local strategy and indeed strategy across London and beyond e.g. making sure that Uncut experience is used to inform the Mayor’s Time for Action. Uncut has made real progress in engaging local partners during 2008 and, at the time of writing requests are emerging to highlight Uncut as a case study within other publications and media. Further effort may be needed to develop Sean’s skills for to enable him to play a more strategic role.
6. Lessons and Challenges

The original brief for the evaluation describes the overall aim of the Fear and Fashion programme as follows:

- To develop exemplar projects working with young people to tackle knife culture so as to reduce the use and carrying of knives and other weapons and to provide alternatives and long-term change.

The brief identified the following intended outcomes for the programme:

- Raised awareness amongst young people about the consequences of carrying and using weapons
- Reduction in the frequency and patterns of young people carrying knives / weapons
- Reduction in the number of incidents using knives / weapons involving the key target group for this work
- Young people adopting alternative solutions to conflict resolution
- Young people reporting a reduction in the fear of crime
- Strong partnership structures established between partner agencies to tackle the issue
- Local strategies developed and implemented by partner agencies to discourage the carrying of weapons
- Models of good practice developed and disseminated / replicated
- Lessons learnt from the work contributing to Government policies on this issue

**Impact analysis**

This section seeks to summarise the extent to which outcomes achieved at project (or single intervention) level may be regarded as contributing to Fear & Fashion programme outcomes.

**Design of Interventions**

The interventions applied by the projects, with some exceptions, do not appear to be based on any rigorous examination of the evidence of what works in promoting behaviour change in young people. This is not unreasonable, the projects were funded as demonstration projects, i.e. to find out what works. Two of the projects, Uncut and Kickstart have explicitly run with this agenda. Their approach has been to pilot a number of small initiatives and programmes, in effect to ‘see what flies’. Two other projects, Leap and Rainer, have consistently applied methodologies that are considered to be tested and true. In the case of Leap this is the implementation of the conflict audit and associated follow-up work. In the case of Rainer it has been to deliver one-to-one case work mirroring the approach taken by the YOTs.
We have already noted that there is limited evidence on what works in relation to tackling the carrying and use of knives by young people. The knife crime review quotes a home office report\(^\text{19}\) that notes "campaigns to educate people about the dangers of carrying knives, are ... potentially effective strategies."

It further notes that with the exception of the ‘Be Safe’ programme there are few evaluations of such educational initiatives. The Be Safe evaluation found that, following an evaluation by Newham Youth Offending Team of 1000 young offenders who revealed they were habitual knife carriers and who then attended the ‘Be Safe’ Workshop, only 8.5% re-offended and only 1.75% were found in possession of a knife.

There are of course key differences between that evaluation and the evaluation of the Fear and Fashion projects. The ‘Be Safe’ work targeted ‘habitual knife carriers’, unlike the majority of the Fear and Fashion work, and the evaluation of ‘Be Safe’ tracked participants’ subsequent re-offending, a feature beyond the scope of this evaluation.

**‘Whole Systems’ Approach**

One of the issues with the different approaches to developing work applied by the Fear and Fashion projects is the difficulty of taking into account the ‘whole system’ of influences on a young person’s behaviour and attitudes. This has been recognized by some of the Fear and Fashion projects who have either made use of peer influences and/or have begun to explore the possibility of work with parents and families. We discuss the potential importance of harnessing peer influencers below.

The absence of a ‘whole systems’ approach may be mitigated by the Fear and Fashion intervention being nested within a multi-agency range of interventions in a young persons life. The evidence presented by projects suggests that this falls some way short of a strongly coordinated approach. Overall the absence of a whole systems approach may be seen as symptomatic of what the knife crime review called the "lack of a considered, clear strategy, based on high quality, research [which] characterises the government and police approach to the problem of knife related offences." Against this context, it may be unrealistic to expect the relatively small scale Fear and Fashion projects to develop a ‘whole systems’ approach in isolation.

**Information Sharing**

Linked to the above is the acknowledged need for better information sharing between agencies on young people who are known to be, or suspected to be, involved in knife crime. This would support the application of a whole systems approach and allow more effective targeting of interventions.

\(^{19}\) Reducing Homicide: A Review of the Possibilities, Home Office, January 2003
Targeting of Interventions
There is evidence that the majority of interventions are targeted at populations of young people using ‘local knowledge’ of hot spots, i.e. geographic areas or schools which appear to be experiencing higher than average levels of knife crime, or working with young people who are referred to them based on the knowledge of other professionals that they may be, or at risk of being, involved in knife crime. Given the limitation of the available data on knife crime this may in fact be a more nuanced and relevant method of targeting interventions than seeking to obtain and analyse data that is accepted as inherently flawed.

In addition to working with young people who may be involved with, or at risk of being involved with, knife crime a few projects have begun to work with young people who have been victims of knife crime or young people who have been affected by knife crime on friends/family members. While this may be in the spirit of the demonstration project nature of Fear and Fashion, the funders may wish to consider if pursuing this line of work offers opportunities to learn more about the planned outcomes from the programme.

Recruitment of Young People
How young people are recruited or attracted to participate is of course dependent on the purpose of the intervention and the setting in which it takes place. Several of the projects work with young people in schools, either working with particular year groups, or with young people in Learning Support Units. In these cases recruitment activity is unnecessary, the audience is effectively captive. It is notable however that all of the projects which began work in schools by targeting single year groups have begun, or are exploring the potential to work with young people in schools who are more likely to be at risk.

In relation to awareness-raising work, such as that delivered by Kickstart in the Expressions nights, a range of marketing activity is used, and one of the indicators of success is the effectiveness of marketing activity, i.e. do young people turn up, and do they turn up again? The Kickstart approach of working with young people to design and promote activities for other young people is a tried and tested method of ensuring that activities are ‘youth-proofed’ before action is taken.

The targeted work such as that delivered by Rainer, Uncut and Leap, employs a range of mechanisms to generate referrals. What is notable is that, with the possible exception of Leap, the projects are not systematically linked into the full possible range of agencies and databases that may help identify young people at particular risk.

This may be a function of the scale or features of the project, for example Rainer may only accept referrals from the YOT, and Uncut is not set up to accept significant numbers of referrals.
Evidence of Impact
We have discussed the challenges of generating evidence in Chapter 5. All of the projects have to a greater or lesser degree generated evidence that they have made some difference to individual young people they have engaged.

- ‘Distance travelled’ self assessment tools
- Observation of young people.

Both of these measures have their own inbuilt flaws, however in the absence of other measures or indicators they are the best evidence available to the evaluation.

In addition to the above evaluation of direct impact on young people’s attitudes, knowledge and behaviours, the projects who have sought to pilot different styles of intervention, Uncut and Kickstart, have performed some form of internal review of the effectiveness of each intervention. This has commonly taken the form of staff reflections and review of the interventions.

This is valuable but its effectiveness as an evaluation tool is limited by how robust the design of planned outcomes at the start. This type of review often focuses on simple measures such as the apparent enjoyment of participants; the extent to which knife crime was a feature of the intervention; or general management/planning of the interventions, rather than considering how to measure the difference made to participants’ attitudes, knowledge and behaviour. Having said that, many of the interventions piloted are of an informal education nature and too much emphasis being given to measuring the effect of interventions may negatively affect young people’s enjoyment and inclination to return to further sessions. As a final point on evidencing impact, projects have invested significant effort in recording their work (for the evaluation or to report to funders) and their reflections on its success, but some have been unclear about how to use this evidence to further develop the activity.

Overall the evidence available shows that the projects are effective in engaging young people in education and awareness raising activity on knife crime in future. Participant evaluations report increased knowledge of the consequences of knife crime and less inclination to be involved in knife crime. Whilst falling some way short of directly demonstrating changes in knife-related behaviour this evidence has some value in suggesting the contribution of the awareness-raising initiatives to influencing local and peer-group culture. There is also a question over the extent to which young people say one thing in evaluations of knife crime interventions and do another thing once they return to their peer group, as one young man interviewed for the Uncut consultation with young people offered:

“It wouldn’t work, people would come and be like, yeah I’m gonna stop carrying knives. Guaranteed when their back on road they will be like, I’m gonna jack this one, I’m gonna murk that one.”
It is beyond the evidence of this study to produce a strong conclusion on the impact of awareness raising work, particularly when it is targeted at the general population. However it is arguable that preventative work may have a greater value if it is formally linked to more intensive and targeted interventions as part of a spectrum of interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness Raising</th>
<th>Targeted Preventative</th>
<th>Ameliorative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General population</td>
<td>YP at risk</td>
<td>YP involved in knife crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Destination of Young People**

Few of the projects have any formal systems in place to track where participants go after their engagement with the Fear and Fashion project, or to assess their needs and refer them out to other agencies or programmes that may provide suitable ongoing support. This is not unusual for projects which engage with young people in informal, youth work settings. Arguably for other styles of intervention, such as school-based or criminal-justice, the opportunity exists to refer out and/or track young people. With the exception of the Leap project’s plans to place graduates of the intensive group work programme in youth work positions within Leap and partner organisations there is little evidence of this form of activity with the Fear and Fashion projects.

**Sustainability**

Sustaining the impact of work to tackle and prevent knife-related issues for young people will depend on a number of key factors. The skills and capacity of workers who engage young people in local agencies and services needs to be invested in as well as giving them access to effective tools and resources. Local partnerships and communities need to be informed by effective intelligence about what works and need to have clear routes to influence strategies, policy and funding decisions.

Despite pockets of success (such as Paddington Development Trust attracting an additional £50k to extend the work of Fear and Fashion-funded Uncut project), ensuring the sustainability of the work does not appear to have been an explicit priority for any of the Fear and Fashion projects. The interim stage in this evaluation is a good point to bring this issue further to the fore to help ensure that Fear and Fashion funding is used to leave a meaningful legacy in terms of addressing knife-related issues in the communities it has already invested in.
Overall analysis
This section presents our interim conclusions on the overall value of the projects; the capacity of the activities funded to contribute to useful learning; and developments that may maximise the effectiveness of the Fear and Fashion programme as a whole.

Overall, the consultant’s interim conclusions are that the Fear and Fashion programme has sponsored a good deal of strong youth work practice. But, with few exceptions, the evidence of impact on knife crime, or evidence that contributes to learning on what works in tackling knife crime is limited. It is not clear if the work delivered by the Fear and Fashion projects is significantly different to the work that the funded organisations would have delivered in any case.

Finally it is important to recognise how the context for the Fear and Fashion projects and the programme as a whole has changed since the projects and the evaluation were commissioned. At this point it may be important for the Fear and Fashion funders to reassess the specific purpose of the projects against this changing context and to re-frame the ‘unique selling point’ and desired outcomes they want projects to achieve within the existing funding and beyond.

Some specific factors to consider in deciding how best to take the work forward include:

- Good quality staff are essential to establishing rapport with young people and credibility with partners.

A universal theme coming out of our discussions with project partners, funders, managers and young people is that the personality and skills of the staff deployed to deliver the initiatives is a key determinant of success. Success in this case is defined as the ability of the staff to engage with young people; attract them to voluntary participation in activities; and establish credibility for the messages they deliver through those activities. Success is further defined as the ability to establish credibility in partners, in this case credibility is dependent on whether staff are perceived as being able to engage well with young people and deliver a consistent message to them without the risk of the staff being too closely aligned to the interests of the young people they work with to present a risk of failing to deliver challenge to young people’s views.

Fear and Fashion projects have all established credibility with local partners. They are recognised as delivering effective practice with young people. Funders could work with projects to transform this credibility into sustainable influence to support change within the localities they have already invested in.

20 We note that young people under 16 who commit offences without aggravating factors are now (since June 2008) expect to receive a caution coupled with referral to a knife education scheme to help them understand the dangers and consequences of carrying knives, and reduce the chances of re-offending.. This begs a question over the additionality of the Rainer project.
• **Harnessing peer influence is important in establishing credibility in young people.**

It is notable that all three of the projects applying Youth Work approaches are supporting young people to act as peer educators. Given that peer influence is an important factor in young people’s carrying and use of knives, it follows that peer influence may be an equally effective method of preventing it. The deployment of youth workers who are close in age and background identity to the young people they work with is a pragmatic response to this phenomenon. It is too early in the process to evaluate the additional impact of peer educators however the potential of developing peer education input to the projects’ work to multiply the impact of the project and to ensure that skills and knowledge remain in communities after the withdrawal of professional services is clear.

• **The projects do not have the scope or capacity to develop or facilitate a ‘whole systems’ approach to tackling knife crime.**

Fear and Fashion projects in themselves are not able to deliver the range and extent of activities and interventions required to make a real difference to knife crime in communities. Some impressive partnership work with schools and YOT has been developed by Fear and Fashion projects and evidence at this interim stage suggests that some of this partnership working has become increasingly sophisticated. Could projects do more to influence local partnerships to adopt information-sharing systems or joint approaches to generating intelligence or developing skills and capacity to address these issues? Should this become a specific focus for projects to explore this further in the remaining work?

Now that projects have been designed and delivered and have established credibility with local partners, it may become possible to support work towards supporting the ‘whole systems approach’ within localities. This would require a definite focus for the projects.

• **Output focused monitoring processes encourages output focused planning.**

Our review of the reports provided to funders by projects has identified that there is a distance between the evidence sought by funders, largely output based\(^\text{21}\), and the evidence sought by the evaluators, largely outcome based.

The evaluators have found working with projects to focus on outcomes rather than outputs has been a challenge – partly because an output focus is reinforced by the reporting mechanisms applied by the funders. There may be potential to learn from funding regimes such as Big Lottery; the Working Together Learning Together development programme for Social Inclusion Partnerships in Scotland where the focus was very explicitly on supporting those involved in delivery to focus on planning and recording outcomes of activity.

\(^{21}\) We accept that the funders monitoring forms do seek evidence of achievement of outcomes. We note however that the evidence offered by projects in response to this question is often more correctly viewed as evidence of outputs. We are not aware if this is challenged at all by funders.
Interim Conclusions and issues for Fear and Fashion funders
These conclusions are the product of the evaluators own reflection on the evidence gathered through the evaluation and should be treated as for discussion only at this stage. The consultants would welcome the opportunity to clarify the nature of the legacy Fear and Fashion funders want to / will be able to leave behind

- Investment in small scale, localised projects may not produce the scale of impact, on knife crime or on the development of practice that the funders envisaged.
- Investment in creating and supporting good quality practitioners could be a more effective and cost-effective approach and may create a more lasting legacy for the investment made by Fear and Fashion. This could be delivered, for example, through supporting knowledge exchange or practitioner partnering/mentoring schemes?
- The creation and support of peer educators may prove to be an effective, and cost-effective, method of investing in community capacity and sustaining the impact of an intervention over the longer term.
7. Next steps

The proposed evaluation work programme for the remainder of 2009 includes the following components:

- The survey with young people will repeated with young people participating in Fear and Fashion projects activities later this year and responses will be compared with the baseline survey.
- Individual case studies will be generated to capture the experience of young people who have been engaged in all four Fear and Fashion projects. They will be presented as podcasts to be hosted on the Fear and Fashion website.
- Activities and materials from all four projects will be analysed.
- Perceptions of local partners of all projects will be collected and analysed.
- A final report will be produced by December this year.

An immediate priority is to present the interim findings to the Fear and Fashion funders group and to ask them to consider the key issues and challenges outlined in this report.

We would like to work with the funders group to identify how best to use the evaluation to support projects to identify their strategies for sustaining what works within local communities and for ensuring effective exit strategies for other aspects.

The Fear and Fashion funders group also needs to consider how they want to disseminate the experience and lessons from the four Fear and Fashion projects. The original brief for the evaluation indicated the desire to present the evaluation findings in a conference. We would encourage funders to consider the specific purpose for this conference now so that the remaining year of the existing project funding and evaluation work can help support that in the best way possible. The conference could be used as a platform to present evidence to seek to influence policy. Equally the focus of dissemination could be firmly on bringing local partners together to identify the implications of lessons from the four projects for building real local strategies. Each of these, or indeed other, purposes would benefit from a different specific focus for the evaluation work during 2009.

We warmly welcome the opportunity to discuss the findings and ideas contained in this report with Fear and Fashion funders.