

New Deal for Communities

The National Evaluation

Research Reports

Measuring Success in Reducing Youth Crime

Research Report 47

The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit within the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister is currently sponsoring the 2002-2005 national evaluation of New Deal for Communities. This evaluation is being undertaken by a consortium of organisations co-ordinated by the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research at Sheffield Hallam University. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the NRU/ODPM.

Those wishing to know more about the evaluation should consult the evaluation's web site in the first instance <http://ndcevaluation.adc.shu.ac.uk/ndcevaluation/h>



Sheffield
Hallam University

Measuring Success in Reducing Youth Crime

Research Report 47

Authors:

Sue Adamson

***Centre for Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Hull***

November 2004
ISBN: 1 84387 16 10

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
1. Introduction	1
2. Why is a tool necessary?	1
3. Methodology	3
4. Section 1: Project details	3
5. Section 2: Measurement of changes in crime and disorder levels from recorded statistics	4
6. Section 3: Changes in Youth Offending	5
7. Section 4: Engagement of young people	7
8. Section 5: Evidence of changes in young people	7
9. Section 6: Views of stakeholders	8
10. Summary guide to completion	8
11. Further Research	9
References	11
Appendix 1: Data Collection Instrument	12

Executive Summary

- Youth crime problems have been identified in the majority of NDC Partnerships and a wide variety of interventions introduced to tackle them. All these schemes have a common need to know whether they are achieving “success.”
- Projects need to be able to show that their interventions work for a number of reasons. Firstly the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit lays emphasis in the New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme on an evidence based approach. Secondly, because of the NDC emphasis on sustainability and mainstreaming, projects need to be able to measure their performance towards targets and thus demonstrate success in order to convince local agencies and bodies that continued inputs in money or in kind are worthwhile. Thirdly the community based nature of NDC means that projects need to be able to prove their worth in order to maintain community support, combat cynicism, increase participation and build momentum.
- A primary difficulty encountered by many NDC Partnerships in assessing whether interventions are effective in reducing youth crime is a lack of baseline data. Few projects included youth offending statistics in their delivery plans and many based decisions to combat youth crime on the perceptions of residents expressed in consultation exercises. This has resulted in a lack of specific objectives for projects which in turn has led to difficulties in developing strategies and demonstrating results to the community and partner agencies.
- There is a wide variety of projects with a youth crime reduction objective. Projects differ in area covered (whole or part of NDC area), in targeted group (e.g. all young people, selected age groups, young offenders) and in intensity (e.g. sport and leisure activities, issue workshops, educational opportunities, one to one working). Some projects aim to reduce offending directly and others to impact on the causes of offending. This means that the task of measuring “success” is complex. Besides reductions in overall crime and youth offending statistics, it is necessary to consider outputs such as engagement of young people and interim outcomes such as changes in school attendance or behaviour which may in time impact on offending.
- A data collection checklist has been devised as a tool which NDC Projects and Partnerships can use to self assess their “success”. This checklist has been discussed in a few partnerships who were generally positive in anticipating availability of data and the value of the tool. These partnerships contributed suggestions for fields and potential sources of information. The tool has been available on the national evaluation website since July 2004 with an invitation to send in completed returns. As partnerships have not done so, the checklist is therefore here presented as an unvalidated tool.
- This report explains the derivation and purpose of the data fields in the tool and provides guidance to NDC projects in its completion. Essential points are:
 - basic project information should include the project area in relation to the NDC area, the intended beneficiaries and the objectives of the project. This information is important in assessment of other data collected by the tool and in deciding which fields are essential for any particular project
 - crime data is recommended for all projects which are part of a crime reduction strategy. Data for the NDC should be available from the NDC Community Safety Team and is the minimum requirement. Where the project area is different to the NDC area, data for the project area is desirable but may be difficult to obtain
 - data on youth offending is recommended if a project has an objective of reducing youth offending. Projects with a YOT input should expect to obtain area youth offending figures. Seriousness of offending is important as well as numbers of

offences/offenders. Diversionary projects should complete the more subjective assessment of offending reduction as a minimum

- all projects should complete the section on engagement of young people but the particular questions answered will vary with the type of project
- area wide measures related to education, truancy, exclusion and employment are recommended for projects with related project objectives, desirable in other projects. The more subjective questions concerning behavioural change should be completed by all projects although some questions may be more relevant to some projects than others
- all projects should complete the section concerning views of stakeholders

1. Introduction

Youth crime is a significant problem throughout the country with many young people involved at some point in minor illegal behaviour such as under age drinking, buying cigarettes or experimenting with soft drugs. A significant minority of these go on to acquire a criminal record while still adolescent. In areas of socio-economic deprivation, crime committed by young people is even more common than the national average adding to the difficulties of these areas. Not only does this impact on current crime levels but those young people who become persistent offenders may continue their offending in their adult years.

The problem is recognised in most of the New Deal for Communities (NDC) areas, 34 of the 39 NDCs having identified some kind of youth crime problem in the delivery plans, although the assessment of the issue has been carried out in a wide variety of ways. From the limited evidence presented, youth crime appears to be at least as great a problem as the national average and in many NDCs a significantly larger one (Adamson, 2003a). Disorder is even more closely associated by most people with young people, again particularly in NDCs. The NDC average in the first MORI survey (MORI, 2002) was 41% seeing teenagers hanging around on the street as a serious problem in the area and many of the NDCs identified youth anti-social behaviour, youth disturbance, juvenile nuisance or youths causing annoyance as severe problems in the delivery plans.

In response to these issues, NDC partnerships have introduced a wide variety of interventions. Some of these have been specifically aimed at young offenders or those at most risk of offending, falling into three principal types (Adamson, 2003b). These are:

- Youth Inclusion Programme
- Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme
- Acceptable Behaviour Contracts

Other projects have included various uses of restorative practices and work with specific groups of young offenders.

The other main group of interventions provides diversionary activities or facilities for all young people in the area. Under this umbrella the range of activities is very wide ranging from youth clubs, sport and after school activities to education, issue based workshops and mentoring (Adamson, 2003a).

What all these schemes have in common is a need to know whether they are achieving "success". However with such a wide variety of activities it is not necessarily obvious how "success" can be measured. This report will describe the development of a tool for measuring success, considering the kinds of pointers which could be used and ways in which these could be measured. The aim is a self assessment tool which projects can use after the end of the National Evaluation to monitor their own progress.

2. Why is a tool necessary?

The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (NRU) has identified the adoption of an evidence-based approach to delivering change (i.e., getting proof of what works in practice) as one of the keys to change of the New Deal for Communities programme. The NRU requires "Action based on evidence about **what works**' and what doesn't." (See website <http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/ndcomms.asp>. This means that NDCs and projects need to be able to demonstrate their achievements in

order to assess whether their interventions 'work' to satisfy the NRU. Furthermore, with the NDC emphasis on sustainability and mainstreaming, projects need to be able to measure their progress towards targets and thus demonstrate success in order to convince local agencies and bodies that continued inputs in money or in kind are worthwhile and to maintain community support, combat cynicism, increase participation and build momentum.

The first difficulty in demonstrating evidence of change is a lack of baseline data. At the time of the first delivery plans, 34 of the 39 NDCs identified a youth crime problem in their area. There is however no NDC wide youth crime survey and baseline information on youth crime levels was limited. Some NDCs provided data for example:

- in Southwark 26% of reported crime was said to be committed by those aged 10-17 compared with 20% in the borough as a whole
- in East Brighton 84 young offenders were resident in the area in 2000/2001
- in Bradford youth offending was more than twice that in the district as a whole

However many NDCs failed to quantify the problems at all, basing decisions to tackle youth crime mainly on perceptions of residents expressed in consultation exercises. NDC household surveys asked questions about youths hanging around on street corners but not specifically about youth involvement in crime. Some NDCs used higher than average youth populations (MORI, 2002) together with national figures for youth involvement in crime to justify youth crime interventions. Some NDCs have not considered the need for baseline information against which to measure progress even well into implementation. Objectives of projects are therefore stated in general terms and do not have measurable outcomes, leading to difficulties in developing strategies and justifying bids for funding. Other problems have been complaints by NDC residents (National Audit Office, 2004) of a lack of visible results and a lack of information about what is happening.

It is therefore necessary to demonstrate success but why is a tool required? Success demonstrated by providing simple evidence of reductions in youth crime as in total crime figures produced routinely by police forces would not necessitate a tool. However, recorded crime figures include offences committed by offenders of any age and are not necessarily a good measure of youth crime prevention. For example, in Bradford offending by young people resident in the NDC reduced to 2003 but overall crime figures did not. Even use of categories of crime often associated with youth offending presents problems as the association is not the same in all areas and there is no single source of youth crime figures.

Some police forces produce figures using cleared up crime known to have been committed by young people and may provide data concerning offences committed within the NDC area or offences committed by young people resident in the area. Youth Offending Teams can provide numbers of young offenders resident in their areas and of offences committed by those young people. However, it is not always possible to relate these data sources to specific areas such as NDC. Furthermore individual projects may not target the whole NDC area but only part of it or only certain groups within the area.

Some NDCs may have only one project with a youth crime prevention target while others will have several, all making different contributions to tackling the problem. Some projects aim to reduce youth offending directly and may have an immediate effect on youth offending statistics. Others tackle perceived causes of youth crime and are likely to be more long term in their impact. It may therefore be helpful to measure outputs such as engagement of young people and interim outcomes such as changes in school attendance or gains in employment which may in time impact on offending. Some outcomes such as crime and youth offending will be readily quantifiable. Others such as changes in

behaviour are softer outcomes and will be more difficult to assess. Some available data will be an obvious indicator while other data may be less relevant but nevertheless useable where better measures are lacking. Not all data will be equally useful to all projects.

Therefore measurement of youth crime prevention is complex. The wide variety of projects and target groups with differing widths of focus means that projects will need to collect different data sets to meaningfully assess their achievements.

As previously suggested, some NDCs have a number of projects to tackle youth crime, while others have one or two. Some information such as NDC wide crime, youth offending and education statistics will be common to all projects in an NDC. However information relating to client groups will be project specific. The assessment is therefore designed to be completed at the project level but it will be possible to combine the information at this level to derive an assessment of the NDC strategy to tackle youth crime. Some project specific data fields will not be relevant to all projects and some information may not be available for all the time periods specified. The following sections explain in more detail the derivation and purpose of the data fields comprising the assessment tool, keyed to the tables in the tool itself which is attached at Appendix 1.

3. Methodology

Experience from the case study work on youth crime in the first year of the national evaluation was used to produce a list of data collection fields which might be relevant to measuring success in projects with targets in youth crime reduction. In year two the list was discussed with community safety managers and project leaders in three case study NDCs to assess the likely availability of the suggested information, additional fields which projects felt should be included and the extent to which NDCs and projects might value a tool for measuring success. All three welcomed the idea and were generally positive in anticipating the availability of data. Comments included “Definitely of value” and “I think it will be a really useful tool”. Their ideas for additional fields and for potential sources of information were incorporated. In year three the data collection checklist was posted on the national evaluation website (<http://ndcevaluation.adc.shu.ac.uk/ndcevaluation/PartnershipInfo.asp>) and emailed to a limited number of youth crime case study NDCs with an invitation to complete and/or comment. A few minor improvements have since been incorporated. As partnerships have not sent in completed returns, the checklist is presented as an unvalidated tool.

4. Section 1: Project details

This section is intended to collect basic details about the project, starting in Table 1.1 with name and start date.

The NDC population aged 10-17 will provide a measure of the total population at risk of youth offending while the questions concerning beneficiaries/target group ascertain how much of that population may be the concern of the particular project. If the project is a diversionary scheme its intended beneficiaries/target group may be the whole youth population of the area or may be only those resident in a specific sub area. If the project works with young offenders the target group may be for example persistent young offenders or the “top 50” at risk or those on bail supervision or referral orders. The size of target group question is intended to assess the potential size of the project.

The age categories specified are intended to relate to stages in the criminal justice system but of course youth projects may cater for young people in age groupings which cut across

or lie within these. Some projects may specifically target BME groups but it is more likely that the BME groups represented will reflect those in the general population.

The objectives of the project may include youth crime reductions such as numbers of youth offences or seriousness of offending. They may also include output aims such as programme compliance and engagement of young people in projects and impacts on causes of youth crime such as increased educational attainment or reductions in youth unemployment.

Table 1.2 asks for information regarding the project target area. This is required in order to meaningfully relate area based statistics in crime, education, employment, truancy, exclusions and any other area wide information.

Completion guidance:

- both Table 1.1 and 1.2 are recommended.
- information on BME if relevant
- objectives of project are recommended as “success” should be measured against these

5. Section 2: Measurement of changes in crime and disorder levels from recorded statistics

This section collects information on recorded crime and disorder, almost all from police sources, working on the assumption that changes in youth offending will impact on these statistics.

As mentioned above recorded crime will include offences committed by offenders of any age and it is possible for crime committed by young people to reduce and for there to be no reduction in recorded crime. This may be because there is a simultaneous rise in crime committed by adults as happened in Hackney between 1998/2000 and 2001/2. Bradford similarly found that while there was evidence of reduction of youth offending, crime figures failed to reduce, one reason being an increase in violent crime associated with the establishment of 3 nightclubs in the area. Therefore recorded crime alone would not be a good indicator of success in youth crime reduction but can be useful allied with other indices.

The crime numbers are used to compute change from before the project start to an equal period after. It is a good idea to work in whole years so as to avoid any problem with the seasonality of crime figures. Table 2.1 collects numbers of a variety of categories of crime for two separate one year periods before and after the project start. The columns 2nd year before project start, 1st year project start etc each require 12 months data referred to the data of the project start. For example if a project started on 1 February 2001, one year before would be the period 1 February 2000 to 31 January 2001 and the second year before would be the period 1 February 1999 to 31 January 2000.

Table 2.2 requires information concerning the area to which the statistics in Table 2.1 relate. The project area may not be the same as the NDC (see Table 1.2). NDC and project areas may conform to police beats in which case crime figures should be readily available. If the area does not conform to police beats, an accurate selection using a Geographic Information System (GIS) may be possible. However in some NDCs crime data has been available only for an approximation of the NDC area, for example two beats which together cover the NDC/project area but also parts of the surrounding area.

In attempting to ascribe potential effect on crime figures by crime prevention projects it is necessary to take account of underlying trends which would affect crime levels whether the project was there or not. One way of doing this would be to use a comparator area without intervention. Numerous problems have been found with this approach, for example, the difficulty of identifying a sufficiently similar area that is not contiguous (to avoid displacement and diffusion of benefits effects) and the likelihood of any similar area identified having some alternative intervention. Therefore, the approach suggested here is remove trends from the observed changes for the project/NDC area by comparing with crime changes measured for identical periods for the police Basic Command Unit in which the project is situated. This data is collected in Table 2.3.

It is necessary to be aware that sometimes the boundaries of police areas are changed (Table 2.4). This happened in Leicester during the period of the NDC evaluation meaning that the crime rates for the periods before and after the NDC start were not comparable.

Table 2.5 and Table 2.6 use the data collected in Tables 2.1 and 2.3 to measure change in numbers and per cent for the NDC (or project area), the BCU and the BCU excluding the NDC (or project) area. If data for the full two years before and after are not available, a shorter period may be used to assess change but the two periods must be equal.

Table 2.7 concerns disorder data. Problems which lead to the community calling for youth crime prevention are often the result of perceptions of youth disorder as well as or rather than actual youth crime. For example the MORI surveys of 2002 and 2004 have showed 41 and 39% respectively of NDC residents regarding teenagers hanging around on the streets as a serious problem compared to 17% nationally. Disorder data for similar periods to crime data could be available from the police, local authority or other sources. Although similar types of information may not be available in all project areas and therefore comparability between areas may not be possible, data which is available may provide an indicator of progress for individual projects/NDCs. Another measure could be successive surveys of the MORI type but it is important that the questions asked are the same in successive sweeps for the results to be comparable. As for crime data there are issues relating to the area for which data is collected (Table 2.8) and change data can be calculated (Table 2.9).

Completion Guidance:

- crime reduction data are recommended if the project is part of a crime reduction strategy
- data for the NDC should be available from the NDC Community Safety Team and is the minimum requirement
- where the project area is different to the NDC area, data for the project area is desirable but may be difficult to obtain
- disorder data should be collected where the project aims to impact on problems such as young people hanging around on the streets

6. Section 3: Changes in Youth Offending

There may be a number of different measures of youth offending in the NDC area or project area if this is different from the NDC. As for crime and disorder these will be selected for the relevant area and the selection may be more or less accurate depending on the sophistication of the method used (Table 3.1). NDCs have variously used the actual NDC boundary, approximations in wards or beats, and postcodes to select data.

Some of the measures in Table 3.2 may be derived from police data such as breakdowns of cleared up crime by age. Others such as young offenders resident in the area, offences committed by those young offenders and seriousness of those offences may be obtained from the YOT database. It may be useful to collect both police data on offences committed in the area and YOT data on offences committed by young offenders resident in the area. In Bradford, for example, while offences committed by young residents have decreased, a problem has been recognised of offences committed in the area by young people resident in surrounding deprived areas.

Table 3.2 also includes client group related indicators of reduction in youth offending which may be used as well as area based youth offending data, or if such data is not available. Projects may be able to show evidence of reduced offending in their own client group, in arrests or seriousness of offences. For example Youth Inclusion Programme monitoring data routinely record offending rates performance of the engaged target group. These statistics can be used in the same way as crime and disorder figures to assess change (Table 3.3).

The ultimate aim of projects working with young people who have already offended is to prevent re-offending. Some NDC projects such as the TISSP in Bradford routinely collect data on desistance in relation to their client group. However, many young people do not succeed in completely stopping committing crime but, nevertheless, commit less crime or less serious crime. An interesting point here is that the YIP offending rate is a combination of changes in frequency and seriousness of offending. One NDC has found that a large proportion of its YIP “top 50” have reduced their frequency of offending but that the offences still committed are more serious, thereby contributing to an offending rate that fails to meet YJB targets. This underlines the complexity of youth crime reduction. Projects should not consider only numbers of offences but also should where possible take into account the seriousness or gravity score when considering “success”. Table 3.4 provides three measures of re-offending related to client groups.

As was stated at the beginning of this report, projects with objectives in youth crime reduction are varied, including not only offender based programmes led by statutory criminal justice system agencies but also youth diversionary activities and educational projects which may be led by the Youth Service, by charities or by voluntary groups. These may not have access to full records of offending and may not be set up to record such data for all clients. There are examples of NDC projects who are included by the NDC partnership as contributing to youth crime reduction targets but who themselves regard their priority as being impacting on issues of deprivation and exclusion which may in turn reduce youth offending. These projects may nevertheless be able to show evidence of reduced offending among young people involved in the project in a more subjective way (Table 3.5).

Completion Guidance:

- youth offending data are recommended if a project has an objective of reducing youth offending
- projects with a YOT input should expect to obtain area youth offending figures
- seriousness of offending is important as well as numbers of offences/offenders
- diversionary projects should complete Table 3.5 as a minimum

7. Section 4: Engagement of young people

All projects will be able to show evidence of their success in working with their target young people through outputs in terms of numbers and types of young people. Projects will vary in how they can measure this, according to whether they have a clearly defined target group or whether their clients may include any young person in the area. For example, youth clubs may be able to provide the number of young people engaged per year or the number attending per month. A Youth Inclusion Project will however also be able to provide the percentage of the target “top 50” engaged. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 should therefore be completed as applicable. Table 4.3 considers the type of young people involved, requiring a simple yes/no answer or a percentage of clients assessment if this is available. If a project engages known offenders or those excluded from school it has potential for impacting on their behaviour. In some NDCs the young people most excluded and at risk of offending are those from ethnic minority backgrounds so that in these areas it is important to engage these young people. The questions relating to the activities of the project are intended as a measure of its intensity in relation to preventing youth offending.

Completion Guidance:

- all projects should complete the first question in Table 4.1 but the other questions will be relevant only to some
- complete Table 4.2 if the project has a particular target group
- all projects should complete Table 4.3 although some will not be able to provide percentages

8. Section 5: Evidence of changes in young people

Changes in young people generally, other than in offending behaviour may be seen as achievements and may in the long term impact on offending behaviour. As previously some figures may be available for the area (Table 5.1) and be used to calculate change (Table 5.3). The suggested fields include truancy and school exclusion, measures of educational attainment and youth employment. Table 5.2 provides for an indication of the relationship between these figures and the NDC or project area. Among the NDCs with whom the data collection instrument was discussed, this type of data was felt to be the most problematic. For example, data on truancy and exclusions may be held by school rather than area and if children from the area attend several schools the task of collating data may be considerable. The national Youth Inclusion Programme, for whom truancy and exclusion were key targets, has had severe difficulties in obtaining such information and in the quality of what has been forthcoming in spite of letters from the YJB to local schools emphasizing that YIPs have the backing of the DfES (Morgan Harris Burrows, 2003).

Table 5.4 therefore seeks to tabulate information that may be available within projects in relation to their clients, both concerning truancy, educational attainment and employment and for a range of behavioural change which may be noted. This part of the tool is based on judgements of change in young people involved in projects and is in the form of tick boxes. It may be based on recorded evidence from repeated assessments of individuals or may be more subjective opinions of project leaders or workers. Where it is based on subjective judgements the assessment may not be so robust as the more evidence based material and provision is made in the instrument to indicate the basis. However, this does also mean that all projects should be able to review their clients and produce these indicators. Perhaps more than any other section there is scope here for projects to include other measures which may be particularly relevant to them. For example, projects with a

YOT involvement may be able to use successive ASSET scores to derive a measure of reduced risk of offending.

Completion Guidance:

- measures in Table 5.1 are recommended for projects with related project objectives, desirable in other projects
- all projects should complete Table 5.4 although some questions may be more relevant to some projects than others

9. Section 6: Views of stakeholders

Views of staff concerned in projects, stakeholders and the community can also be indicators of success. The simple tick box approach of this checklist does not attempt to capture stakeholders' views in detail or be a substitute for detailed evaluation but rather uses that detailed evaluation to provide a simple measure which can contribute to measuring success of youth crime prevention projects. Table 6.1 seeks information on views of NDC officers and partner agencies which might be obtained by interview or questionnaire. Additional partner agencies would depend on those with involvement in the project but the YOT, schools and social services are obvious candidates. Where different members of a group such as the NDC steering group have different views, percentages could be assigned to the boxes. It would also be possible to add the views of project workers, community representatives, parents and young people to this table. Questions on perceptions of projects could be added to community surveys carried out for other reasons, workers could be interviewed or complete a brief assessment and parents and young people could be asked to complete a brief questionnaire on completion of a programme or activity. However, young people may be reluctant to fill in forms for reasons of literacy, concern about anonymity or general impatience. Some NDCs who have introduced such feedback processes have found very poor responses. In addition, some NDCs have foreseen problems in obtaining views of parents who effectively wash their hands of the young people and fail to support their activities. For example only one parent turned up for a project AGM. It was felt that there would however be less difficulty with parents with whom close work had been carried out for example concerning sexual assaults and ABCs. These problems mean that perceptions of the opinions of these groups may depend on comments received and recorded for only a small sample of these groups. For this reason Table 6.2 has been devised as a less rigorous but still useful measure.

Completion Guidance:

- all projects should be able to complete this section

10. Summary guide to completion

It is seen above that all projects which are part of an NDC's crime reduction strategy should aim to assess their performance by completing Sections 1 and 2. All projects should be able to assess views of stakeholders in Section 6. However, for Sections 3, 4 and 5 the questions which projects will find relevant will vary with the type of projects they are and their objectives. For example if a project has an objective in increasing educational attainment, it is recommended that the relevant questions in Section 5 are answered. Table 1 below is an attempt to suggest for which questions some sample types of project might be expected to provide information. Answers to as many of the questions as possible are desirable but it is recognised that some projects will have more information

routinely held or easily accessible than others. Recommended information should therefore be regarded as the absolute minimum and will vary with type of project and project objectives. It will be seen that the first questions concerning area wide statistics are not marked as recommended for any of the suggested types of project. Such indicators are strongly recommended if the project has a stated aim to reduce youth offending in the area although they are desirable for all projects. Of the example projects, the Youth Inclusion Programme nationally states its objectives in terms of reductions in recorded crime levels and impacts on behaviour of those on the scheme. Therefore area wide youth offending statistics may not be currently collected although with the YOT input to the programme it would be expected that they might be readily available. For other projects access to such statistics will depend very much on the extent to which the NDC Community Safety Team is serious about evaluation, generates data sets and provides assistance to individual projects. For example at least one NDC which is using principally youth clubs as a diversionary measure to tackle youth crime has nevertheless produced detailed figures of youth offending in the area.

Generally the more subjective assessments are principally aimed at projects which do not have access to figures. However, if projects feel that it would be helpful complete these as well as the statistics there is no reason why they should not. The table is not definitive but merely designed as a guide to completion. It is emphasised that this is a self assessment tool and projects should complete it in the way that they find helpful to them.

11. Further Research

As has been stated the tool for measuring success in youth crime reduction has been designed to help partnerships monitor their progress after the end of the NDC National Evaluation. As also mentioned the tool is at present unvalidated. The Crime Theme Team would therefore welcome any comments from partnerships on the tool. Especially welcome will be the returns of any attempts to compete it with comments on the experiences incurred in the process. These may be emailed to S.E.Adamson@hull.ac.uk.

Table 1: Recommended fields for sample project types

	YIP	Youth Club	Mentoring Project for young offenders	Alternative Education Project
Offences committed in the area by young people aged 10-17				
Young offenders resident in the area				
Offences committed by young offenders resident in the area				
Average gravity score of offences committed by young offenders resident in area				
Arrests of young offenders on scheme	recommended		recommended	
Average gravity score of offences committed by young offenders on scheme	recommended		recommended	
Evidence of reduced frequency of offending by young people on the scheme		recommended		recommended
Evidence of reduced seriousness of offending by young people on the scheme		recommended		recommended
Number of young people engaged	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Average number attending activity		recommended		recommended

per session				
Average number attending activity per month		recommended	recommended	recommended
% target group engaged	recommended		recommended	
Project engages known offenders?	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Project engages those excluded from school/self excluders	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Project engages ethnic minorities	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Young people engaged in sport/leisure activities	recommended	recommended		
Young people take part in workshops/group sessions	recommended	recommended		recommended
Young people take part in one to one sessions	recommended		recommended	recommended
Truancy	recommended			recommended
Fixed term school exclusions	recommended			recommended
Permanent school exclusions	recommended			recommended
% attaining 5+ A*-C				recommended
% attaining level 5 Key Stage 3				recommended
Employment aged 16-18				recommended
Increased school attendance	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Alternative education attendance	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Gaining college entry	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Accessing training schemes	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Increased qualifications	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Gaining employment	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Increased punctuality	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Improved relations with adults	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Improved relations with peers	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Increased confidence	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Increased social skills	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Increased participation in leisure activities	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Improved relations with police	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended
Improved willingness to enter into restorative justice	recommended	recommended	recommended	recommended

References

Adamson, S. (2003a) *Youth Crime - Diversionary approaches to reduction - Research Report 5*. Sheffield, CRESR.

Adamson, S (2003b) *Youth Crime: Offender Based Approaches to Reduction - Research Report 4*. Sheffield, CRESR.

Morgan Harris Burrows (2003) *Evaluation of the Youth Inclusion Programme - End of Phase 1 Report*. London, Youth Justice Board.

MORI (2002) *New Deal for Communities Household Survey*. Research Study conducted for the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit and Sheffield Hallam University.

National Audit Office (2004) *An early progress report on the New Deal for Communities programme*. London, The Stationery Office.

Website links

<http://ndcevaluation.adc.shu.ac.uk/ndcevaluation/PartnershipInfo.asp>

NDC National Evaluation partnership information site for electronic version of self assessment tool

<http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/ndcomms.asp>

Neighbourhood Renewal Unit

Appendix 1: Data Collection Instrument

Measuring Success in Youth Crime Prevention

1. Project details

Table 1.1

Name of project						
Name of NDC						
Start date of project						
NDC population age 10-17						
Who are the intended beneficiaries/ target group?						
How many intended beneficiaries, size of target group						
Age of target group tick as appropriate	0-10		10-17		Other please specify	
Gender tick as appropriate	male		female		Both	
BME groups						
Objectives of project						

Table 1.2

	Yes	No
Is the project area the same as the NDC area?		
Is the project area within, but smaller than the NDC area?		
Does the project include areas outside the NDC?		

2. Measurement of changes in crime and disorder levels from recorded statistics

Table 2.1

NDC or project area crime numbers	2 nd year before project start	1 st year before project start	1 st year after project start	2 nd year after project start
Total crime				
Vehicle theft				
Theft from vehicle				
Other theft				
Robbery				
Burglary				
Violent crime				

Table 2.2

Tick as appropriate	Yes	No
Are the numbers for the NDC area?		
Are the numbers for the project area?		
Numbers are based on an accurate NDC/project area		
Numbers are based on an approximation only		
If an approximation please specify		

Table 2.3

Crime numbers for the police Basic Command Unit in which the NDC is situated	2 nd year before project start	1 st year before project start	1 st year after project start	2 nd year after project start
Total crime				
Vehicle theft				
Theft from vehicle				
Other theft				
Robbery				
Burglary				
Violent crime				

Table 2.4

	Yes	No
Have there been changes to the BCU boundaries in the period?		

Table 2.5

Change 2 years before to 2 years after	Change 2 years before to 2 years after			% Change 2 years before to 2 years after	
	NDC/ project area	BCU	BCU excluding NDC / Project area (BCU - NDC)	NDC/ project area	BCU excluding NDC/ Project area (BCU-NDC)
Total crime					
Vehicle theft					
Theft from vehicle					
Other theft					
Robbery					
Burglary					
Violent crime					

Table 2.6

Other change period please specify period					
	Change between other equal periods			% Change other periods	
	NDC /project area	BCU	BCU excluding NDC/ Project area (BCU-NDC)	NDC /project area	BCU excluding NDC/ Project area (BCU-NDC)
Total crime					
Vehicle theft					
Theft from vehicle					
Other theft					
Robbery					
Burglary					
Violent crime					

Table 2.7

Recorded figures for youth disorder and anti-social behaviour	2 nd year before project start	1 st year before project start	1 st year after project start	2 nd year after project start
Police calls to youth causing annoyance				
Local Authority figures for anti-social behaviour by youth				
Other measures				

If you have used local authority measures please define

If you have used other measures please explain what these are

Table 2.8

Disorder measures	Yes	No
Are the figures for the NDC area?		
Are the figures for the project area?		
Figures are based on an accurate NDC/project area		
Figures are based on an approximation only		

If an approximation please specify

Table 2.9

Change	% Change 2 years before to 2 years after	% Change between shorter equal periods
Youth causing annoyance		
Local Authority anti-social behaviour by youth		
Other measures		

Please specify change period if other than 2 years

3. Changes in youth offending

Table 3.1

Tick as appropriate	Yes	No
Are the figures for the NDC area?		
Are the figures for the project area?		
Figures are based on an accurate NDC/project area		
Figures are based on an approximation only		

If an approximation please specify

Table 3.2

Figures for NDC/project	2nd year before project start	1st year before project start	1st year after project start	2nd year after project start
Offences committed in the area by young people aged 10-17				
Young offenders resident in the area				
Offences committed by young offenders resident in the area				
Average gravity score of offences committed by young offenders resident in area				
Arrests of young offenders on scheme				
Average gravity score of offences committed by young offenders on scheme				
Other - please specify				

Table 3.3

Change	% Change 2 years before to 2 years after	% Change between shorter equal periods
Offences committed in the area by young people aged 10-17		
Young offenders resident in the area		
Offences committed by young offenders resident in the area		
Average gravity score of offences committed by young offenders resident in area		
Arrests of young offenders on scheme		
Average gravity score of offences committed by young offenders on scheme		
Other – please specify		

Please specify change period if other than 2 years

Table 3.4

	Percentage of clients			
	while on scheme		in first year after finishing scheme	
	1st year	2nd year	1st year	2nd year
Those not re-offending				
Those with fewer offences				
Those with less serious offences				
Other measure - please specify				

Table 3.5

Please tick	Evidence of reduced frequency of offending by young people on the scheme?	Evidence of reduced seriousness of offending by young people on the scheme?
No information		
At least one young person		
A few young people		
A minority of young people		
The majority of young people		

4. Engagement of young people

Table 4.1

	Year 1	Year 2
Number of young people engaged		
Average number attending activity per session		
Average number attending activity per month		

Table 4.2

	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
% target group engaged, please tick				

Table 4.3

	yes	no	% of clients if available
Project engages known offenders?			
Project engages those excluded from school/self excluders			
Project engages ethnic minorities			
Young people engaged in sport/leisure activities			
Young people take part in workshops/group sessions			
Young people take part in one to one sessions			
Other output - please specify			

5. Evidence of changes in young people

Table 5.1

NDC/project area wide statistics	2nd year before project start	1st year before project start	1st year after project start	2nd year after project start
Truancy				
Fixed term school exclusions				
Permanent school exclusions				
% attaining 5+ A*-C				
% attaining level 5 Key Stage 3				
Employment aged 16-18				
Other area wide measure of youth achievement - please specify				

Table 5.2

Tick as appropriate	Yes	No
Are the figures for the NDC area?		
Are the figures for the project area?		
Figures are based on an accurate NDC/project area		
Figures are based on an approximation only		

If an approximation please specify

Table 5.3

Area wide change	% Change 2 years before to 2 years after	% Change other equal periods
Truancy in area		
Fixed term school exclusions		
Permanent school exclusions		
% attaining 5+ A*-C		
% attaining level 5 Key Stage 3		
Employment aged 16-18		
Other area wide measure of youth achievement – please specify		

Please specify change period if other than 2 years

Table 5.4

Achievements by those on project - Tick as appropriate	No information	At least one young person	A few young people	A minority of young people	The majority of young people
Increased school attendance					
Alternative education attendance					
Gaining college entry					
Accessing training schemes					
Increased qualifications					
Gaining employment					
Increased punctuality					
Improved relations with adults					
Improved relations with peers					
Increased confidence					
Increased social skills					
Increased participation in leisure activities					
Improved relations with police					
Improved willingness to enter into restorative justice					
Other measure of client achievement - please specify					

Please asterisk items for which the assessment is based on documentary evidence

6. Views of stakeholders

Table 6.1

Views of staff/partners/ community Tick as appropriate	No information	Not a success	Partial success	Mainly successful	Completely successful
NDC Director					
NDC Community Safety Steering Group					
NDC Community Safety Manager					
Police					
Other partner agency - please specify					

Table 6.2

View project as a success	No information	At least one person	A few	A minority	The majority
Project workers					
Community representatives					
Parents					
Young people					
Other - please specify					