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Nature of the problem

In 1999 the Borough Commander expressed concern at the number of young people involved in crime, both as perpetrators and victims.
Truancy within the borough was very high.
Exclusion from schools was above the national average.
Concern at the high levels of anti-social behaviour by young people.
Concern that young people were not generally engaged in any positive activities.

The evidence used to define the problem

A youth crime profile evidenced that there had been significant increases in young people's involvement in crime:
Between 1998 and 2001 young people as offenders had risen by 29%; the correlation of youth on youth offences showed, as offender and as victims the peak ages had fallen from 17 years to 15 years indicating young people were involved in crime at an earlier age.

Two Mori polls were carried out in the Borough:
One where adults expressed concern at the high levels of crime by young people, and the lack of suitable resources provided for young people.
The second where young people indicated concern at the lack of provision for them.

Leo Burnett - an international marketing company - were early partners in the project. They carried out a number of focus group meeting to ascertain what provision young people needed.
The response to the problem

A large partnership was developed to secure funding, resources and support to deliver a youth access and inclusion project. This became the Karrot project. The Karrot project provides for young people aged 11 to 15:

A mobile, fully deployable, Internet café. "Bringing the world of the Web to the heart of the Inner City."

Eight activity workers employed by their professional bodies to work with young people in the areas of football, street-hockey, cricket, rugby, basketball, music, drama and art. Again, these resources are fully deployable.

A reward card scheme using smart card technology to award points to young people for good behaviour, good attendance at school and positive citizenship. The points are redeemable for access to services, opportunities and goods.

A website to provide information and support for young people.

The impact of the response and how this was measured

The project is being evaluated by Crime Concern and their interim report in January 2003 shows young people aged 10-14 as victims down 21%, as offenders down 22% and youth on youth crime down 34%.
Karrot is a project that I launched with Lord Warner in December 2001 and which I have maintained my involvement in. It is close to my heart as it is a truly inclusive project that is opening the eyes and minds of young people in one of the most disadvantaged areas of the United Kingdom.

When I launched the project I talked about life guards rescuing a stream of people who were falling in a river. I talked about how overwhelming it was when people are constantly falling in and how tiring it is to keep trying to pull them out. Worst of all how sad it is when people aren't rescued. I likened Karrot to that moment when you realise you have to stop pulling them out and go upstream and stop who ever it is that is pushing them in. I believed Karrot could do that for young people and stop young people being 'pushed' into a river of failure, where truancy and peer pressure lead to crime and lack of opportunity, where low expectancy led to low achievement and where a poor start blighted the lives of the future of London.

I recently returned to Southwark to take part in a Karrot Reward Day. The rewards were for good attendance at school and citizenship. The young people were enthusiastic and motivated. I was pleased to be able to spend some time talking to a group of about forty of them. It was not easy as the questions came fast and would have not have been out of place on the Today program. What came through was their desire to learn, to try and understand the world and the enthusiasm they had for life.
One of the great things about the project is its universal approach. It goes into all schools and pupil referral units in Southwark and is accessible to all. The Karrot team have taken the project outside of school, on to some of the most difficult estates in south London and been able to engage young people passing on positive experiences and messages. The future is more exciting with a major fashion show taking place at Tate Modern in early September involving big names in fashion, design and modelling.

What I am most glad to report is that this project has not just delivered 'warm feelings' it has delivered clear, unambiguous results. Youth crime in Southwark [offending, victimisation and youth on youth crime] are all significantly. So is the proportion of all crime that involves young people. School attendance is up and the relationships between the police and young people are more positive than they have been for a long time. This project is at the core of this success.

The success is however wider. The working with partners in the public sector have never been better. The engagement with major sports clubs, arts organisations and the new IT technologies has made Karrot something for all young people. Working with major companies [the list is large and involves many of the largest names in British Business] has sharpened the project and provided opportunities for learning and engagement for staff. It is this width of partnership and involvement that has made Karrot such a success for the young people of Southwark.

It is with all this in mind that I support the nomination of the Karrot project for the 2003 Tilley award for ‘Partnership Projects’.

Commissioner
Crime & Policing Group
Home Office
Queen Anne's Gate
LONDON
SW1H 9AT

28th May 2003

Dear Sir or Madam,

I understand that the police-led Karrot project has been nominated for The Tilley Award for implementing problem-oriented policing.

I am happy to support this nomination and its contribution to the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership’s strategic objective to address the underlying causes contributing to the offending behaviour amongst young people.

Karrot, together with the Safer Schools Partnership has facilitated a new relationship between the police and schools in the borough and its concept has been welcomed by both the Council and Headteachers as a useful addition to work around tackling issues of non attendance at school, diverting young people from crime and expanding the range of positive activities that they are engaged in.

Together with a focus from the Education services in the Borough, Karrot has contributed to the attendance rates in secondary schools in the borough being within 0.2% of the national average for the 2001/02 academic year, the highest level since Southwark became a Local Education Authority.

Yours sincerely

Sam Eastop
Strategy & Commissioning Manager
For and on behalf of the Strategic Director of Education & Culture
7th May 2003

Mr G Beattie
Crime & Policing Group
Home Office
Queen Anne’s Gate
LONDON
SW1H 9AT

Dear Mr Beattie

Karrot Project

We, at Steria, are proud to support the Karrot Project through our donations of technical and process consultancy. We believe that this project is benefiting the children of Southwark and, through them, the whole community. It should become the blueprint for similar projects in all our communities.

The project is rewarding good citizenship and raising the personal aspirations of children and young people. This raises their standards and expectations of themselves. Importantly, the project assists them to achieve their potential through the provision of mentoring and activities that encourage them to discover and develop their talents and skills.

We believe that the Metropolitan Police should be justly proud of this innovative and farsighted project – fighting crime by tackling the causes of crime.

Yours sincerely

John Torrie
Chief Executive Officer
Crime and Policing Group
The Home Office

7 May 2003

Dear Sergeant Scoular,

I am writing to confirm that Leo Burnett has been an active partner of the Southwark Metropolitan Police Partnership Team in the launch and roll out of the Karrot scheme.

We have provided strategic communications advice and worked with the Police team and the children of Southwark to develop a brand identity that would be acceptable to them. We have also been able to use the project to give young design students in Southwark the opportunity to gain their first professional experience, working with us to design the brand logo.

It has been of great personal and professional benefit to the staff who have worked on the project. Not only does it give them valuable experience and insight into understanding a teenage audience, but it has enabled us to share some of our expertise to help launch a ground-breaking initiative.

The Karrot project is inspirational, and the results we have seen so far indicate that as it starts to reach its crime reduction and higher school attendance objectives, it is already helping to inspire and improve the quality of life for many young people.

We are extremely pleased to be part of Karrot and to continue supporting it in the future.

We wish you every success for its future development.

Yours sincerely

Bruce Haines
Chief Executive Officer
Leo Burnett Group
Karrot Project - Effective Partnerships

Introduction

The Karrot Project is an access and inclusion initiative for young people in the London Borough of Southwark.

Southwark is the 9th most deprived borough in the country. It has a diverse community, which displays many of the symptoms of multiple disadvantages. The young people of the Borough live in a challenging environment, where the risks of becoming involved in crime and anti social behaviour are considerable. These risks are reflected in high numbers who are, or are at risk of, falling outside mainstream education and existing youth provision.

Aims of the Project.

The aims of the Project were to provide a positive approach to diverting young people away from crime, to improve school attendance, to reduce exclusions and to be inclusive of all young people aged 11 to 15.

The objectives of the project are:

- Increase access and take up of youth service provision by 25%
- Increase the access and use of leisure service provision by young people by 10%
- Through the smart card scheme promote attendance at school which will result in a 20% reduction in truancy.
- Increase levels of academic attainment.
- Reverse the established decline in user satisfaction levels of existing facilities for young people (As evidenced in the July 2000 Mori Poll)
- Reduce the levels of school exclusion in participating schools by 20%
- Reduce the levels of youth offending across the Borough by 10%
- Decrease levels of youth offending during school hours by 20%
- Change overall youth offending profile in order to reduce percentage of target age range as either victims or perpetrators of crime.
- Reduction in levels of antisocial behaviour committed by young people within the target age range.
Successful achievement of the objectives will result in a reduction in youth involvement in crime both as offenders and as victims; improved attendance and performance at school; young people feeling valued and engaged within society.

This project supports the London Borough of Southwark’s Crime and Disorder Strategy (Strategic Objective 6) in that it "Addresses the underlying causes contributing to offending behaviour amongst young people."

It receives substantial support from the local Politicians and Councillors.

Impacting on youth crime has a significant impact on volume crime figures within the Borough.

Southwark Police, in partnership with the Youth Offending Team, Education Department, Social Services & Youth Services, Leo Burnett and Steria (formerly Integris) developed the project.

**Definition of the problem**

**Research (Scan)**

Young people in Southwark were becoming increasingly involved in crime both as offenders and as victims. Youth-on-Youth crime was increasing and the age profile of this was reducing to a younger average age.

Poor attendance at school and high exclusion levels were seen as major contributors. Young people were disaffected and felt excluded from mainstream service provision.

In 1998 London Borough of Southwark had the 3rd highest level of crime in the Greater London area. (In 2002 they had moved down to 5th highest.)

Youth Offender Team (YOT) data tells us 17.5% of all crime committed in the borough is committed by a relatively small number of young people between 10 -17 years of age.
Youth crime profile financial year 1998

Chart 1

These charts show the correlation between youth offending on youth victims.

Chart 1 shows the peak ages in 1998 for offending as 17, and for victimisation as 16.

Chart 2 shows that 2 years later, in 2000, the peak age for offending is 15 and for victimisation is 15.

This evidenced indicated that we should target the age group 10-15 year old.
Young People in Southwark

First we looked at the demographics of the target age group.

The report "local audit of youth crime and Youth Justice services" published in 1998 by London Borough of Southwark showed:

- 25% live in overcrowded accommodation compared to a national rate of 10%
- 40% are members of single parent families, more than twice the overall rate for England and Wales.
- 40% brought up in non-earning households, about two and a half times the national average.
- 56% receive free school meals
- 60% of households received benefits

Then we looked at research

Mori polls

In February 2000 two surveys were published by Mori based on research carried out in the London borough of Southwark

Responding to the Lawrence Inquiry / Quality of Life. 
Researching Parents attitudes. 
(Mori February 2000.)

"Most people tend to associate the common forms of crime, such as muggings and vandalism, with young males teenagers and perceive criminal and anti-social behaviour to be direct results of a lack of things for young people to do."

"One of the main factors parents feel would help to reduce crime are more facilities for young people to go to. This has been a key theme in research both amongst parents and teenagers who make a direct link between boredom and involvement in crime. Parents want to see more youth clubs across the Borough, where there are a number of activities to keep teenagers occupied such as sport and music."

"Parents flag up the issues of cost and feel that such provisions should be affordable for those from less well-off backgrounds. Safety is also mentioned as a concern, and parents want assurances that a qualified person would supervise such activities."
Responding to the Lawrence Inquiry
Researching Young peoples attitudes in Southwark
(Mori February 2000)

"They feel there is a fundamental lack of things to do for young people in the area, and believe this issue needs to be addressed urgently, since boredom and frustration are seen as key triggers for involvement in crime."

"Suggestions from the street.
Involvement in crime is primarily seen as a result of boredom, frustration and lack of money. However there is an overwhelming belief that if there were more activities and facilities for young people, then crime could be reduced."

In July 2000 Mori published the bi-annual report based on research carried out in the London borough of Southwark

Southwark residents 2000.
(Mori July 2000)

This report found that in response to the question on what facilities needed improvement 33% responded "Facilities for the young people" this was the highest category. Southwark receives the worst satisfaction score for facilities for young people compared to any other London Borough in Mori's experience.

Home office

In 1995 Graham and Bowling's Home office research findings "Young People and Crime" noted the strongest influences on why young people started to offend are:

- Low parental supervision
- Poor relationships with parents
- Persistent truancy
- Associating with other involved in offending.
Audit Commission

The 1996 Audit Commission report "Misspent Youth" identified a range of risk factors associated with offending behaviour as:

- Gender - male
- Inadequate parenting
- Aggressive / hyperactive behaviour
- Peer group pressure
- Unstable living conditions
- Truancy / exclusion from school
- Lack of training / employment
- Drug / alcohol abuse.

Looking deeper locally

Leo Burnett an international marketing company were early partners in the project. They carried out a number of focus group meeting with young people to ascertain what provision young people needed. They also looked at how the young people would respond to our proposed interventions.

Their findings were very positive; the young people fully understood what we were proposing to do. They contributed to the development with such views as; "It is no good making rewards which are only going to be achieved by the top pupils in the class. Everyone must be able to achieve a reward."

Schools provided information on truancy and exclusions for baseline data.

Across 15 secondary schools we found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusion Type</th>
<th>Number of Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed exclusions of between 1 -5 days</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed exclusions of more than 5 days</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent exclusions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large proportions of the exclusions were for violence, bullying and threatening behaviour.
Members of the project development team consulted with young people at school assemblies.

Teachers were consulted who advised on appropriate ways of engaging young people.

Youth workers and housing staff from the London Borough of Southwark were also consulted.

We found that young people felt there was little or no provision for them within the community. They wanted access to relevant information and they wanted their positive behaviour and achievements recognised.

**Analysis**

**Crime data**

A youth crime profile was carried out for the Borough of Southwark; this was compared with a profile of the whole of London. Comparison was also made with a previous profile carried out in 1998.

Lucy Dawes from Government Office for London produced a research paper on the cost of crime in London. This research showed that in Southwark the cost of crime is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime types</th>
<th>Recorded crimes</th>
<th>Unreported crimes</th>
<th>Cost of Recorded crimes</th>
<th>Cost of unreported crimes</th>
<th>Total costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent crimes</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>17453</td>
<td>£130,356,000</td>
<td>£261,798,300</td>
<td>£392,154,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>9840</td>
<td>£10,231,900</td>
<td>£32,865,733</td>
<td>£43,097,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary dwelling</td>
<td>3049</td>
<td>5610</td>
<td>£7,012,700</td>
<td>£10,266,592</td>
<td>£17,279,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>£11,577,600</td>
<td>£2,149,333</td>
<td>£13,726,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>18605</strong></td>
<td><strong>43008</strong></td>
<td><strong>£161,338,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>£312,366,221</strong></td>
<td><strong>£473,724,921</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have already established from YOT data that a small number of young people aged 10-17 are responsible for 17.5% of all crime in the Borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Bodily harm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault on Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 18 Assault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 20 Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Non Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage Vehicle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deception</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Possession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent Assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfering Vehicle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Major Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a Conveyance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Pedal Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Snatch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening / abusive behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>3080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recorded violent offences by young people cost £6,336,000
Recorded residential burglary by young people cost £239,200
Recorded robbery by young people cost £2,425,200
Recorded vehicle theft by young people cost £326,400
Recorded theft from vehicles by young people cost £93,960

Cost of youth crime in these 5 categories £9,420,760

A 10% reduction in youth crime *in just* the 5 categories identified by Lucy DAWES would produce a saving of £942,076
Education

The links between truancy, disaffection, under-achievement, social exclusion and criminal activity are well documented. Children who are out of school are also more likely to be the victims of criminal acts, as well as obviously reducing their chances of achieving positive educational outcomes. All efforts to encourage attendance at school are therefore important and contribute to reducing the chances and effects of social exclusion.

Youth offending Team

YOT data shows that “offending rates peak between 15 and 18 years. This demonstrates the need for early investment to prevent and divert young people from offending.”

![Accused age profile]

1998 District audit showed that 852 10-17 year olds were processed through the courts of which 642 were found guilty.

YOT” Profile of young offenders needs for service ”
1996 figures showed that 297 young people were responsible for 884 convictions. 55 of these met the Governments definition of persistent offenders. 6 of these offenders were convicted of between 11- 15 offences each. Links between serious offending and persistence showed that just over half of these 55 were committing serious offences.

Supervision orders. (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>33 Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>33 Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17 years</td>
<td>77 Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17 years</td>
<td>69 Probation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A marketing and consultation strategy was developed by Leo Burnetts. They also ran a competition on the branding and logos for the project with local students from the Camberwell College of Art and the London College of Printing.

They also ran a competition on the branding and logos for the project with local students from the Camberwell College of Art and the London College of Printing.

In the development of the reward scheme idea more than 500 questionnaires were sent to young people to establish their views. Appendix 1 Leo Burnett also carried out a number of focus group meetings with young people.

The questionnaires were analysed and Leo Burnett fed in their findings from their focus groups with young people.

- The analysis revealed a lack of resources for young people to get involved with. They expressed enthusiasm for sporting activities, art, music and drama. They were very keen on IT and Internet services.
- The age group most vulnerable to involvement in crime was shown by the data to be 11 to 15 years old. Within Southwark there are 8,000 young people in this age range spread across 17 schools.
- Lack of information about the services that were provided. Poor access to information for them to make life choices with.
- Young people were very territorial and would not, for example, cross the Old Kent Road to access services.
- Young people felt there were no incentives for them to try and do well. Their efforts were often unrecognised or unrewarded. Many said that they only wanted someone to say well done or to tell their parents that they had done well.
The young people’s perspective

- Research showed that young people broadly align themselves with the core values of statutory services. (i.e: want to be educated, want to be law abiding and want to engage in leisure pursuits and be good citizens).
- Young people are attracted to the branding and imagery of non-statutory organisations.
- Young people find the WEB the most dynamic and attractive medium to access services. Provision for such access either at home, school or elsewhere is either limited or too expensive.
- Very low household ownership of household PC with WEB access, limited school access.
- Young people respond very positively to clear boundaries for behaviour and activity, provided they could see a positive outcome, e.g. a reward.

Police, Leo Burnetts, YOT and Community Safety staff took part in the analysis.

Presentations on the proposals were made to community groups such as the Police and Community Consultation Group (PCCG) who were able to make observations and suggestions to enhance the project.

Not all young people were consulted in the initial stages of the project, however all young people have had the opportunity to feedback on the project as it evolved through the web site and contact with the project staff.

The initial partnership

Metropolitan Police Service
Southwark Council
The Safer Southwark Partnership (CDRP)
The Southwark Education Authority
Southwark Youth Offending Team
Central Government Treasury ISB
Leo Burnett
McDonald’s
Steria (Formerly Integris)

See Appendix 2 for full partnership details
Responses to the problem

The challenge was to find responses to meet the needs of the young people and to find the financial resources to provide those responses.

The responses needed also to meet the needs of the wider community to provide a diversion for young people to steer them away from crime and anti social behaviour.

Responses needed also to meet the targets of the partners involved in the project: the police to reduce crime and victimisation; the education services to improve learning, reduce truancy and exclusion and impact on behaviour; the local authority to meet the social inclusion agenda, reduce graffiti and meet it obligations under Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act.

The analysis showed that young people wanted access to information in a user-friendly way, which was relevant to them. They wanted some form of activities that they could access on a regular basis. They wanted some form of recognition for achievement.

A four-tiered approach was adopted

- A Website. To inform young people
- An Activity Programme To engage young people in positive activities.
- A Reward Scheme To recognise their achievements
- A Mobile Internet Café To give them access to the world wide web and information.

All the responses are based on providing a positive diversion meeting the need of the young people. Each response is designed to complement the others, for example the website and the IT café or the activity workers working in school supporting the reward programme. There is no negative value in any response. For example, the reward points are not accrued if a pupil fails to attend, they do not lose points for non-attendance. The responses have been selected to provide a holistic approach to meeting the needs of the young people and the wider partnership.

An approach was made to McDonalds with the ideas. They started the ball rolling by making a financial donation. An application for funding was made to the Invest to Save Budget (ISB) at the Treasury, this application was successful. Further funding was secured from the neighbourhood renewal budget, Capital funds at the local authority and from Metropolitan Police Funds. Intergris provided consultancy on the development of the technology for the project.
The Solution

Operated within the Borough’s 17 Secondary School, 3 Children’s Homes, 5 JSI Projects, 4 Special Needs Schools, 3 pupil referral units, estates, parks, youth clubs and community groups. Including some 8,000 young people between the ages of 11 & 15.

Mobile Internet Café

A vehicle which was liveried and branded as part of the project was developed. It contains 13 state-of-the-art computer workstations, smart board technology, a wide variety of software packages including music making software, games and web site publishing software. The vehicle air-conditioned, has its own power supply, has disabled access and a rest / coffee area complete with drinks machine. This technology connected, through a firewall, to the Internet via a satellite link, provides broadband access. The project funded a youth worker post to work with the young people on the Internet café.

This met their need for IT and internet access. Being mobile it also gave us the solution to the territorial barriers that they operated within. Through the project website, it gave us the opportunity to publicise what services are already available locally in the Borough and also the National support services. The Karrot website also gave them access to information about the project and a means to feed back to the project and to express their views.

www.karrot.org.co.uk
Activity Programme

Partnerships were forged with a wide variety of organisations that could provide a diverse programme of activities.

These included:

- Millwall Football Club
- Surrey County Cricket Club
- London Knights Ice Hockey Club
- London Towers Basketball Club
- London Broncos Rugby League Club
- The London Institute
- The London Bubble Theatre Company

Each of these organisations were contracted to employ an activity worker to work with young people in the Borough of Southwark. These workers were fully deployable, they could be used in schools to supplement the curriculum, they could be used after school to develop clubs, they could be employed at a youth club, children's homes, Pupil referral units, community halls or at any other venue across the Borough. They have arranged tournaments between groups of young people and they have provided holiday scheme.

Divert Trust (now part of RPS Rainer) have been contracted to employ a staff member to co-ordinate the programme.

Again this response has dealt with the issue of territorial boundaries, it has provided a variety of different activities for young people across the whole borough. They not only deal with their own particular sport or discipline but they also act as mentors for young people providing positive role models, they deliver anti drugs messages, healthy life style and diet messages. They bring the support of their parent organisation to the project and the support of the National body of their sport or organisation. This strand is based on evidence of effective practice.

Reward Scheme

Working with the schools needs and pupils feedback an attendance and reward scheme was developed. It uses smart card technology to monitor attendance at school, this can also be used to reward positive behaviour or any acts of citizenship. Young people collect points for attendance, behaviour or citizenship and they then redeem their points for rewards. The rewards can be access to services such as tickets to a sporting event, or opportunities to take part in events or visits. They may receive goods in return for their points, such as a Karrot branded pencil case and contents, books supplied by Dorling Kindersley or a personal stereo.

By positive recognition we are encouraging young people to attend school, behave better whilst they are there and act in the manner of responsible citizens. This meets their need to have their achievements recognised, it also gives them an incentive to try and do well.
Web site

www.karrot.org.co.uk
The Karrot web site has provided young people with local information relevant to them. It gives them access to national support services. It also gives them access to games and a wide range of fun activities. They are able to feed back to the project team their views on the project as a whole and to contribute to its continued development.

Monitoring

To ensure ownership of the responses team building development days with the service providers were run. All the activity workers came together to develop their shared understanding of the aims of the project. Whilst the project has a framework and a delivery plan developed, it is flexible in its delivery.

The ISB funding required a implementation plan be developed and submitted. The project is managed by a partnership project board that reports to the Safer Southwark Partnership (CDRP). Quarterly reports are also sent to the ISB at the Treasury.

Since the initial funding was secured and the project development was under way the project has grown significantly in size. The partners now include numerous financial backers, service providers and support in kind.

The original costs of the project was £1,230,000. The overall budget is now well in excess of £2 million. A Net present value calculation was carried out with saving based on reduction in crime and other target areas.

Difficulties were identified at an early stage by a risk management process. The provision of a vehicle donated free by a sponsor was withdrawn at a late stage due to market forces. This was managed by the partnership seeking an innovative alternative within a limited budget. The technology for the reward cards scheme has proved problematic throughout the project. This is common when developing new IT systems from a specification. Again the reward scheme has progressed due to the innovative thinking of the project staff to minimise the impact on the young people.

The project is reviewed regularly by the project board, the ISB monitoring and the CDR Partnership. These processes have enabled the project to evolve. An example of this is where funding became available to run a summer activity scheme, the project used its network of contacts to enhance its ability to provide the services. It also used its contact with young people to ensure that the appropriate services were provided.

The success of this project is based in its problem-solving approach. Having scanned across a wide area, it then analysed the data available. This analysis has given us the ability to evidence the responses and the need to our prospective partners and supporters. Every organisation approached has supported this project. The responses are based on the analysis and are versatile enough to be changed if required.
Whilst the project has flexibility, it is founded on sound business practices to ensure its durability. All service providers have been contracted, and all good purchased have been tendered and procured by the Metropolitan Police Procurement services. The Internet Café has been developed under the supervision of the Metropolitan Police fleet maintenance staff. All suitable risks have been put under appropriate insurance cover and a full risk assessment process has been developed to ensure that the project is safe for peoples, staff and officers.

**Evaluation of the interventions**

The whole project is being independently evaluated by Crime Concern. This evaluation, which is action research, consists of a number of interim reports with the final report due in December 2003.

The interim reports are made to the project management board with recommendations on any action that is required. This enables the project board to make any changes necessary for the effective running of the project.

Police crime data has been used together with qualitative data to give progress to date. The Karrot project has contributed to attendance increasing at a faster rate than that nationally in recent years, and although levels of unauthorised absence are above national averages, authorised absence in both the primary and secondary sectors are below national levels.

The independent interim evaluation report by Crime Concern in January 2003 shows:

**Young people as victims of crime,**
- Victims under 18 are down 14%
- Victims aged 10-14 are down 21%
- Compared to the 2001 baseline data Under 18's are down 13%

**Young people as offenders,**
- Offenders under 18 are down 20%
- Offenders aged 10-14 are down 22%
- Offenders aged 15 –17 are down 23%

Youth offending on youth victims is down 34 %
Southwark Police Partnership Team working closely with Southwark Council and a whole range of other partners is planning to set up a reward card scheme for young people in Southwark.

Under the scheme:
If you are in year 7, 8 or 9
Go to school regularly and behave well, while you’re there ....
We’ll arrange an exciting package of rewards and opportunities for YOU!

Want to try doing something different or exciting but don’t know how to sort it out? ...
Maybe we can!
➤....A ticket for an event or performance?
➤....Fancy a bit of travel?
➤....A hobby or pastime you’d love to try?
➤....Fancy getting a particular thing for free?

ANYTHING YOU’D REALLY LIKE TO SAMPLE OR HAVE A GO AT?
To help us put the package together please could you answer the questions below:
If you can’t fill all the lines don’t worry, just write down what you can please.
Please tick these one of these two boxes then answer the following four questions:
Are you male or female?

Male
Female

If you had been to school for a week and had been perfectly behaved.
What would you see as an extra special reward for this?
1...............................................................2...............................................................3...............................................................

If you and a few of your friends had worked really hard together for a week.
What would you all like to do together as a reward for all your hard work?
1...............................................................2...............................................................3...............................................................

If you and all your friends had worked really hard for a month. You were the best class, the best behaved with the best attendance record.
What would you and your class like to do for a reward?
1...............................................................2...............................................................3...............................................................

If you were the best! You’d been the best class for a whole year! You had the best attendance and the best behavior.

What could we do to show how proud we are of your class effort?

1...............................................................2...............................................................3...............................................................

Thank you for helping us. we hope to have the reward scheme up and running by September 2001.
Organisations Involved in Karrot

The following is a list of organisation that Karrot has had dealings with.

Metropolitan Police
Southwark Council
Invest to Save Bugdet
McDonalds
Barclays Bank
Britain At War Experience
Bromcom
DIVERT Trust & RPS Rainer
Dorling Kindersley
Eagle Heights Bird of Prey Centre
Eurostar
Financial Times Group
Golf Foundation
HMS Belfast
Hotline Group Promotional Products
Imperial War Museum
KISS 100 Radio
Leo Burnett Advertising
London Broncos Rugby League
London Bubble Theatre Company
London Digital Printing Group Ltd
London Dungeon
London Fire Brigade
London Knights Ice Hockey
London Towers Basketball
Millwall Football Club
Nescafe
PriceWaterhouseCoopers
Rugby Football Union
Steria
Surrey Cricket Board
Sx3 Public Sector
Tate Modern
WS Atkins Consultants Ltd

This is not a conclusive list although it is quite extensive. It doesn’t include a lot of the companies that we have been working with in regard to the Fashion show. They are:

Tate Modern
The Princes Trust
Pringle
Youth Justice Board
Pringle
London Fashion Forum
DCMS
Live Consulting