MOPAC | MAYOR OF LONDON
OFFICE FOR POLICING AND CRIME

Briefing

What:	**LGE: Completed Cases Offending Analysis to inform PBR (Year 2)**
Date Provided:	Wednesday 12th December 2018
To:	Julia Mlambo & Caroline Tredwell
From:	Tom Davies & Lynne Grossmith (Evidence & Insight)

Overview

London Gangs Exit (LGE) provided data on **126** completed cases up to and including September 2018. 69 cases were closed between October 2016 and September 2017 (Completion Year 1); these cases featured in the previous PBR analysis in December 2017. **A further 57 cases were closed between October 2017 and September 2018 (Completion Year 2)**.   This briefing note provides a preliminary recorded offending and victimisation analysis on this cohort, as well as some initial exploration of longer term impact based on all completed cases to date.

Methodology

Analysis presented below is indicative only, therefore caution should be exercised when interpreting findings. The low case numbers, restricted period of analysis, relatively low prevalence of offending, and before and after methodology mean that robust causal statements as to LGE's impact on offending behaviour are not possible at this stage of the evaluation. Additionally, it should be noted that only completed cases are included in the analysis at this point. The final evaluation report seeks to utilise a matched control methodology, allowing for a more robust exploration of impact. Ongoing, closed and completed cases will also be included in the analysis.

Analysis compares all police recorded offending and victimisation six months before the date of referral to LGE, with the six months following. This time period allowed all but one of the completed cases to be included (n=56). Recorded crime incidents where the individual appears as EITHER Suspect OR Accused are included to maximise the offending sample. Only broad categories are included to maximise aggregated data[1].

Completed Cases: Descriptive analysis

There is little difference in the age or ethnic distribution of completed cases between year one and year two. There has been an increased proportion of females completing LGE in Year Two.

- Average age of 19.3 (Youngest 13, Oldest 28)
- 70% males (n=40); 30% females (n=17)
- 89% BAME (n=109)[2]; 11% White (n=6).

---

[1] These categories are: all offending, Violence Against the Person Offending (VAP), all victimisation, VAP victimisation. Due to matching procedure victimisation data is only available for individuals who have also appeared as suspects/accused in the data period retrieved, therefore individuals with no offending data are excluded from victimisation analysis (n=23)

[2] Majority Black African or Caribbean heritage (63%; n=36).

Case related information:

- All cases (n=57) were opened[3] between January 2016 and June 2018 and closed between October 2017 and September 2018.
- A PNC ID was identified for all but nine of the individuals.
- 16% (n=9) of individuals appear on a recent version of the MPS Gang Matrix (October 2018).[4]

Preliminary Offending Analysis

- **Average offending marginally increased and violent offending showed no change when comparing the six-month period before and after case opened date** (see Table 1).
- **Average victimisation (both overall and violent*) decreased in the six-month period following case opening.** Caution should be exercised in interpreting these results in line with the caveats in methodology.

- Individual offending and victimisation was very low prevalence in the time-period analysed:
    - All offending (Max=5; Violent Offending (Max=3)
    - All victimisation (Max=5); Violent victimisation (Max=4)

- 36 of the 57 individuals had no recorded offending in the period of analysis (that is, in the six months either side of their LGE referral).
    - Of the 21 with recorded offending in the period of analysis, 9 committed a lower number of offences after being referred to LGE, whilst 10 committed more.

- 23 individuals had no recorded victimisation during the period of analysis.[5]
    - Of the 11 individuals with recorded victimisation, 9 experienced a decrease and 2 experienced an increase in victimisation.

Table 1: Offending and Victimisation for 57 completed Cases (6 months before/after LGE referral)[6]

		Offending		Victimisation	
		Before	After	Before	After
Cohort		56	56	33	33
All	Incidents	23	24	16	6
	Individuals	13	15	9	5
	Proportion	23.2%	26.8%	27.3%	15.2%
	Cohort Average	0.41	0.43	0.48	0.18
Violence	Incidents	7	7	14	4
	Individuals	5	5	8	4
	Proportion	8.9%	8.9%	24.2%	12.1%
	Cohort Average	0.13	0.13	0.42	**0.12***

---

[3] Due to data extraction issues from Safer London Lamplight database, a mixture of 'case referred' and 'case opened' dates were provided; this will be standardised for the final report.
[4] Final report will include those who have *ever* appeared on Matrix in addition to currently appearing.
[5] Out of 34 eligible
* statistically significant (Wilcoxon Signed Rank)

- For **all offending**, 13 individuals were responsible for the 23 offences in the 6 months before LGE referral, compared to 15 individuals recording a total of 24 offences in the 6 months after referral.

- For **violence against the person**, 5 individuals were responsible for the 7 offences before referral; 5 individuals recorded a total of 7 offences after referral.

- 9 individuals were **victims** of a total of 16 offences before referral; 5 individuals were victims of a total of 6 offences after referral.

- 8 Individuals were **victims** of a total of 14 **violent offences** before LGE referral; 4 individuals were victims of a total of 4 violent offences after referral. **The decrease is statistically significant.**

Longer Term analysis of Year 2 Cohort

Analysis also explored longer term impact using a 12 month period either side of case opening; this reduced the cohort by nine (n=45). Results are similar, likely to be indicative of the different types of referrals accepted in Year 2:

- For **all offending**, 20 individuals were responsible for the 48 offences in the 12 months before LGE case opening, compared to 21 individuals recording a total of 44 offences in the 6 months after opening.

- For **violence against the person**, 11 individuals[7] were responsible for the 19 offences before case opening; 9 individuals recorded a total of 18 offences after case opening.

Victimisation analysis provides more positive indications, although the same caveats apply:

- 13 individuals were **victims** of a total of 21 offences before case opening; 4 individuals were victims of a total of 5 offences after case opening. **The decrease is statistically significant.**

- 16 Individuals were **victims** of a total of 12 **violent offences** before LGE case opening; 3 individuals were victims of a total of 3 violent offences after case opening. **The decrease is statistically significant.**

Longer Term Analysis: All Completed Cases

Further exploratory analysis was conducted on longer time periods before and after referral date, with findings similar to those reported in the October 2017 interim evaluation report. This will be developed in the version of this paper for publication by MOPAC in early 2019.

12(3) Months

Analysis explored offending and victimisation within the entire completed cases cohort (n=126) for 12 months before/after with a three month exclusion period from the referral date to allow time for the

---

[7] Out of an available cohort of 29

intervention to take effect. This reduces the cohort in scope for analysis (Offending, n=101; Victimisation, n=71)):

- Overall offending decreased, though not significantly. This is driven by the Year 1 cohort, with offending in Year 2 increasing slightly (not significant).
- Violent offending marginally increased amongst the cohort; the increase was <u>not</u> statistically significant.
  - In the 12 months before case opening, 27 individuals were responsible for 49 Violent offences; in the 12 months after the 3 months exclusion period 26 individuals were suspect or accused in 51 violent offences.
- **Consistent with other periods of analysis, victimisation and violent victimisation decreased both overall, and within Year 1 and Year 2. All decreases for the 12(3) time-period are statistically significant (*).**

Table 2: Offending and victimisation for completed cases by year and overall

All Completed Cases: 12(3) Months			Year 1		Year 2		Overall	
			Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Offending	**All**	**Cohort**	69	69	32	32	101	101
		Offences	118	96	30	35	148	131
		Offenders	34	29	15	17	49	46
		Proportion Off	49.3%	42.0%	46.9%	53.1%	48.5%	45.5%
		Cohort Average	1.71	1.39	0.94	1.09	1.47	1.30
	Violence	Offences	38	37	11	14	49	51
		Offenders	20	18	7	8	27	26
		Proportion Off	29.0%	26.1%	21.9%	25.0%	26.7%	25.7%
		Cohort Average	0.55	0.54	0.34	0.44	0.49	0.50
Victimisation	**All**	**Cohort**	49	49	22	22	71	71
		Victim Incidents	30	14	15	3	45	17
		Victims	17	11	10	3	27	14
		Proportion Vic	34.7%	22.4%	45.5%	13.6%	38.0%	19.7%
		Cohort Average	0.61	**0.29***	0.68	**0.14***	0.63	**0.24***
	Violence	Victim Incidents	21	8	14	2	35	10
		Victims	15	7	10	2	25	9
		Proportion Vic	30.6%	14.3%	45.5%	9.1%	35.2%	12.7%
		Cohort Average	0.43	**0.16***	0.64	**0.09***	0.49	**0.14***

The preliminary analysis described above indicates some key changes in the offending and victimisation patterns of those completing in Year 2 compared to Year 1. A greater proportion of Year 2 completions had no offending history before or after case opening, across all time-periods explored. Similarly, where offending is recorded, the Year 2 cohort includes less prolific individuals. The Year 2 cohort were more likely to be victims, and particularly victims of violence. This may in part be explained by changes in the types of individuals referred and accepted (i.e. more females at risk of violence or exploitation from gangs). This will be explored fully in the final evaluation report.

Next Steps

These findings are preliminary and data and findings are subject to change. The final evaluation report, which explores both the process of implementation and any impact of LGE, is scheduled for Early 2020. Analysis will utilise a matched control methodology, allowing for a more robust exploration of impact and factoring in needs and interventions received to understand 'what works'.