SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS REPORT

Secondary Data Analysis of Youth Diversion in London

Neeraj Rahal, Tim Hardy, Leonie Nicks, Dr. Laure Bokobza, Ed Flahavan

June 2025





About the Youth Endowment Fund

The Youth Endowment Fund (YEF) is a charity with a mission that matters. We exist to prevent children and young people becoming involved in violence. We do this by finding out what works and building a movement to put this knowledge into practice.

Children and young people at risk of becoming involved in violence deserve services that give them the best chance of a positive future. To make sure that happens, we'll fund promising projects and then use the very best evaluation to find out what works. Just as we benefit from robust trials in medicine, young people deserve support grounded in the evidence. We'll build that knowledge through our various grant rounds and funding activity.

And just as important, is understanding children and young people's lives. Through our Youth Advisory Board and national network of peer researchers, we'll ensure they influence our work and we understand and are addressing their needs. But none of this will make a difference if all we do is produce reports that stay on a shelf.

Together, we need to look at the evidence and agree what works, then build a movement to make sure that young people get the very best support possible. Our strategy sets out how we'll do it. At its heart, it says that we will fund good work, find what works and work for change. You can read it <u>here</u>.

For more information about the YEF or this report, please contact:

Youth Endowment Fund 1st Floor 64 Great Eastern Street London EC2A 3QR

www.youthendowmentfund.org.uk

hello@youthendowmentfund.org.uk

Registered Charity Number: 1185413

Contents

About the Youth Endowment Fund	2
Contents	3
Acknowledgements	4
Executive summary	5
Introduction	8
Methods	20
Results	47
Conclusions and implications	117
References	125
Annnex	129

Acknowledgements

About the research team

This independent report, funded by the YEF, was researched and written by the Behavioural Insights Team (BIT). The team includes:

- Ed Flahavan (**principal investigator**) oversaw the design and delivery of all research activities. Ed is the Director of BIT's Home Affairs and Education team. Ed has worked at BIT since 2016 and has managed and delivered a range of research projects within crime and security policy areas.
- Leonie Nicks (**project oversight**) provided oversight on the management of the research project and delivery of data collection, analysis and reporting. Leonie is Head of Home Affairs & Security and has worked at BIT since 2018.
- Neeraj Rahal (**project lead**) led day-to-day project management, data collection and reporting. Neeraj has worked at BIT since 2022, with a background in forensic psychology and anti-financial crime.
- Tim Hardy (senior quantitative researcher) led the analysis of quantitative data. Tim has worked at BIT since 2019 and specialises in trial design and quantitative data analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations.
- Dr Laure Bokobza (**research quality assurance**) conducted quality assurance on quantitative research outputs. Laure has worked at BIT since 2022. She specialises in the design, implementation and evaluation of complex projects involving quantitative methods and has five years of experience in this area.

Further acknowledgements

BIT would also like to thank the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) for its support in facilitating access to data, without which this project would not have been possible. We would also like to thank Tom McBride from the Ending Youth Violence Lab and Iain Brennan from the University of Hull for their comments on an earlier version of this report.

Executive summary

About the project

Diversion is an approach aimed at preventing reoffending by providing alternatives to formal criminal justice proceedings, typically used with first-time and less serious offending (Youth Endowment Fund, 2024). It has been shown to be effective, but there is limited evidence from the UK (Keenan et al., 2024). The report explores the characteristics of children and young people (CYP) diverted in London, the variation in diversions for CYP across all London boroughs and whether there's a relationship between receiving a diversion and reoffending. The analysis looks at patterns across all offending, violent offences and knife-related offences. It uses data from 2015 to 2022 from the London Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) on reported crimes, stop and searches, and arrests involving CYP. The total dataset includes records of 264,932 CYP who interacted with the police.

Key findings

	Seriousness and frequency of offending explain some but not all of the differences in which CYP are diverted	
The majority of CYP in London receiving a formal disposal are now diverted	Between 2015 and 2022, the number of CYP in contact with the police fell by 17%. The proportion receiving a diversion or escalation (e.g. sentenced or charged) also fell – down from 63% to 48%, driven by an increase in victims being unwilling to prosecute. Of CYP diverted or escalated, the majority are now diverted (54% in 2022). Escalations fell from 31% in 2020 to 22% in 2022.	
CYP involved in serious and prolific offending are diverted less often, but there are outliers	45% of boys are diverted vs 67% of girls. 88% of 10-year-olds are diverted vs 32% of 17-year-olds. 55% of White CYP are diverted vs 42% of Black CYP. 51% of CYP with no prior arrests are diverted vs 41% with four prior arrests. 35% of CYP with five or more prior arrests are diverted, yet 48% of lower-harm offences led to a diversion vs 38% of moderate-harm offences and 17% of high-harm offences.	
Black CYP are diverted less often, even when controlling for the seriousness of offending	After controlling for the seriousness and frequency of offending, Black CYP are still diverted less often than White CYP. These factors, plus their broader characteristics (e.g. age and gender), explain around half the difference in diversion rates with White CYP (falling from 16%pts to 9%pts ¹).	
	There are also unexplained differences in the rate of diversion across London boroughs	
CYP in outer London have the highest rates of diversion	The raw difference between the highest and lowest rates of diversion across boroughs was 24%pts (66% compared to 41%). Outer London boroughs, particularly Bromley (66%), Bexley (65%) and Kingston Upon Thames (65%), have the highest diversion rates. Inner London boroughs, such as Haringey (43%), Lambeth (42%) and Hackney (41%), show the lowest.	
Controlling for the profile of who offends and the type of offending explains some but not all of these differences	After controlling for individual- and offence-level factors, the spread between the highest and lowest boroughs falls from 26%pts ² to 22%pts. Bromley (61%), Bexley (60%), Hammersmith and Fulham (59%), Merton (58%) and Kingston Upon Thames (58%) had significantly higher diversion rates compared to Newham (49%) – the borough with the median rate of diversion. Harrow (39%), Tower Hamlets (42%) and Greenwich (42%) were significantly lower.	

¹The 16%pt difference is based on a restricted sample covering 2019–2022 to allow for the inclusion of prior arrests. ²The 26%pt difference is based on a restricted sample covering 2019–2022 to allow for the inclusion of prior arrests.

	Children and young people diverted are less likely to reoffend
Controlling for individual and offence level factors, diversion is associated with lower reoffending	Raw differences show diverted CYP are less likely to be arrested than those escalated: 3% vs 8.% after six months and 4% vs 12% after 12 months. Controlling for individual- and offence-level factors, diverted CYP are still less likely to be arrested: 4%pts at six months and 5%pts at 12 months.
Diversion may be more beneficial in reducing violent reoffending and for Black CYP	When controlling for individual- and offence-level factors, the reduction in arrests appears greater for violent offences compared to any offence with – 8%pts at 12 months (vs 5%pts for any offence). Diversion is associated with a 6%pt reduction in arrests at six months for Black CYPs compared to 5%pts for White CYP.
The apparent reduction in reoffending may be due to study limitations	It's not possible to fully control for all the factors that explain why diverted CYP are less likely to reoffend. There may be contextual factors not captured in the data but considered at the time a decision is taken over whether to divert.
	CYP involved in knife offending are less likely to be diverted than those involved in other types of offending. Diversion for knife offences is associated with reduced reoffending
Most CYP involved in knife offences have no prior arrests	CYP involved in knife offences fell by 32% between 2015 and 2021. Most CYP (68%) had no previous arrests for any offence. 13% had three or more previous arrests for knife offences. Older CYP are overrepresented (70% aged 15-17), as are Black CYP (51%) - twice as likely relative to Black CYPs' share of the population.
CYP involved in knife crime are less likely to be diverted compared to those involved in any offending	CYP involved in knife offences are less likely to be diverted, accounting for 17% of outcomes on average between 2015 and 2022 compared to 26% for all offences. They were more likely to be escalated (58% 2015–2022 vs 29% for all offences). Black CYP have the lowest rate of diversion compared to escalated outcomes for knife offences across ethnic groups (17.2% vs 35% for White and Asian CYP).
Diversion for knife offences is associated with lower reoffending	CYP diverted for knife-related offences are less likely to be arrested (when controlling for individual- and offence-level factors) by 9%pts at six months. At 12 months, the reduction in reoffending was 8%pts, although this wasn't significant

--

- - - -

Interpretation and implications

This research finds that the number of CYP receiving any formal disposal (diversion or escalation) has fallen in London since 2015 due to a growing number of victims being unwilling to prosecute. Among formal disposals, diversion is being used more frequently, particularly post-Covid-19. On the whole, when used, diversions are being targeted at first-time and less serious offending, yet there remain unexplained differences in who receives them. A minority of persistent offenders and those involved in more serious and violent crimes are diverted. Black children are significantly less likely to receive them, even after controlling for the types of offences they've been involved with. And there are areas of London that experience higher or lower diversion rates than we might otherwise expect. The analysis finds tentative evidence that receiving a diversion may reduce the likelihood of reoffending, particularly violent reoffending and for Black CYP. This study reinforces the findings from the wider literature on the potential benefits of diversion and extends it by using recent data on a large UK population. However, more work is needed to establish whether the relationship between diversion and reoffending is causal. It's important to bear in mind that this analysis was limited by the data that was available. It's not possible to observe all the contextual and offence-level information that would have been considered when deciding whether to diversions are used in other parts of the country.

How have outcomes been defined?

The data used in this report includes CYP who were alleged to have committed or suspected of being involved in a crime. The disposal outcomes they receive are split into three groups:

- **Indeterminate outcomes:** it's not clear whether the CYP was involved in an offence, and they were ultimately let go without any further criminal justice involvement or action being taken against them.
- **Diverted outcomes:** the child is suspected of having committed an offence, and the outcome aims to avoid or minimise their involvement in further formal criminal justice processes.
- **Escalated outcomes:** the child is suspected of having committed an offence, and the outcomes lead to further involvement in formal criminal justice processes. This includes arrest, charge and summons.

The specific disposal outcomes within these three categories reflect internal MPS classifications about how alleged or suspected crimes are resolved. These outcomes do not reflect the standard Home Office outcomes codes, which were not provided in the data supplied for this study.

Diverted outcomes

Diversionary outcomes are typically divided into *informal* diversion schemes that divert children from all formal outcomes and do not result in a criminal record and *formal* out-of-court disposals, which can involve a formal caution that may lead to a criminal record but still divert the individual away from court. For the purposes of this study, these specifically include:

Informal diversion

- **Community resolution**: this is an outcome commonly involving restorative justice approaches. CYP are required to accept responsibility for the offence to be eligible.
- Not in the public interest: this is used when the police decide not to pursue an offence, determining it is not in the public interest to proceed with prosecution or take any further action. An admission of guilt or responsibility is not required.
- Warning (informal): verbal warnings are provided by police officers, typically for low-level offences.
- **Triage**: this is a suite of voluntary interventions, ranging from light-touch sessions to structured programmes (e.g. drug and alcohol counselling and mentoring programmes), which are typically provided through the youth justice service. CYP are required to admit to an offence to be referred. It's possible to receive triage alongside another diversionary outcome, formal or informal.

Formal diversion

- **Youth caution**: this is a formal warning issued by the police when it is not in the public interest to prosecute. When used appropriately, cautions can divert individuals from court and further experience of the justice system.
- Youth conditional caution: this involves a compulsory assessment and package of interventions. If they fail to comply, they can be prosecuted for the original offence. Cautions and conditional cautions remain on the child's criminal record and can appear on an enhanced criminal record check.

Introduction

Context

Youth diversion broadly refers to schemes or activities that do not result in a criminal record, avoid escalation into the formal criminal justice system (CJS) and provide an alternative outcome for children and young people (CYP) who have committed offences (Youth Justice Board [YJB], 2021). The overall aim of diverting a children or young person is to minimise their involvement in the CJS in order to prevent future offending while providing an appropriate response to their offending. There is a diverse range of interventions that are considered 'diversions' from the CJS, which have evolved over time (Keenan et al., 2024). Two elements of diversions provide a useful framework for outlining the diversity of diversion: i) when diversion is provided and ii) what support or conditions, if any, are provided.

Diversion can be provided at different stages of the criminal justice process. This can be at the point of arrest, before being charged with an offence or at court (as an alternative type of sentencing) (Youth Endowment Fund, 2024). The Youth Endowment Fund refers to diversion as 'pre-court diversion', which focuses on diverting CYP before they are charged with offences. This report adopts a similar definition (see <u>Definition of Key Concepts</u> below for further details).

Diversion can also involve requiring CYP to comply with certain conditions or providing them with different kinds of support services, but this is not a feature of all diversions. Where support services are provided, these can vary in their focus (e.g. substance abuse, housing, education or mental well-being) and their intensity, ranging from structured intervention programmes to infrequent calls with a youth case worker. These support services are typically provided by Youth Justice Service (YJS) teams or voluntary and community sector organisations in partnership with YJS teams.

The decision to divert a child or young person and the type of diversion to provide is determined by a range of factors regarding the circumstances of the CYP and their offending. Diversion is considered appropriate and proportionate for first-time involvement of a CYP in 'low-level' offences (i.e. offences which do not cause substantial harm to victims compared to other offences). In England and Wales, the Child Gravity Matrix (CGM) is typically used by police and YJS teams to determine what type of diversion is suitable for a CYP (Keenan et al., 2024). The CGM quantifies the seriousness of an offence using a 1–5 rating scale (where 1 is the least severe and 5 is the most severe) (National Police Chief's Council, 2022). Offences with scores of 5 are usually required to result in prosecution, with lower scores indicating different types of diversions may be more appropriate. The CGM outlines factors which indicate a diversion may not be appropriate, which include (but are not limited to):

- Previous offences
- Premeditation of the offence

- Vulnerability of victims
- Use of weapons

Other factors also highlight when it may be more suitable to provide a diversion, such as:

- Lack of previous offences
- Remorse
- Level of developmental maturity or other educational needs
- Coercion by others (especially adults)

However, CYP who have a history of offending or have committed serious violent offences are not deemed suitable for diversion. These cases are perceived to pose a higher risk to public safety, requiring more strict controls (e.g. incarceration) compared to being diverted (Petrosino et al., 2010). Regardless, the CGM and other policy guidance highlight that decisions to divert CYP should take an individualised approach which considers the unique circumstances of CYP and their needs, not just the factors listed in the CGM (YJB, 2024a). Taken together, policy guidance for diversions is typically provided for CYP involved in less serious offending with few or no prior history of offending.

Youth diversion has shown promising evidence in reducing reoffending (Gaffney et al., 2021; Youth Endowment Fund, 2024). By contrast, when CYP who are involved in criminal activities progress through the formal CJS (e.g., court proceedings or incarceration), they are more likely to commit additional offences. For example, an international meta-analysis of 29 studies involving over 7,300 CYP found that formal processing through the CJS increased the prevalence, incidence and severity of future offences (Petrosino et al., 2010).

However, there is limited research into the effects of youth diversion in the UK. While there have been a few studies investigating the effects of youth diversion, the majority of studies are from the US, so they may not apply in the UK (Wilson et al., 2018). There have been only two UK-published studies on the effect of diversion, both of which were conducted over 10 years ago (Wilson et al., 2018). A recent review of diversion practices in England and Wales also highlighted that many existing studies into youth diversion were not rigorous and often had small sample sizes (Keenan et al., 2024).

Over the past decade, there has been a substantial decrease in the number of CYP receiving a first warning, caution or conviction (i.e. 'first-time entrants' [FTE]), corresponding with an increase in the use of diversionary outcomes. The number of FTE fell from 23,614 in 2013 to 8,278 in 2023 (a fall of 65%). One contributing factor to this trend appears to be the introduction of the Youth Crime Action Programme in 2008, which aimed to reduce the number of FTE (HM Government, 2008; Sutherland et al., 2017). Additionally, the promotion of child-centred approaches within youth justice policy also encouraged the use of diversion (Bateman, 2022). There has also been an increase in specific diversion programmes which provide tailored and structured support to individuals, particularly CYP (Crest, 2022).

However, there is limited information about the provision and outcomes of youth diversion within the UK. It was not until April 2020 that the YJB began collecting aggregate data on the total number of CYP receiving certain types of youth diversions from YJS (YJB, 2023). Currently, it is unclear how many CYP are being diverted, what their profiles are and what the effects of being diverted are on outcomes such as recidivism.

Both the magistrates' and Crown court have an ongoing backlog of cases, which has risen in recent years. At the end of December 2023, magistrates' courts had 370,000 outstanding cases, while the outstanding cases at the Crown court were at an all-time high of 67,600 cases at the end of December 2024 (Sturge, 2024). Against the backdrop of increased pressure on courts leading to delays in hearing and prosecuting cases, there is interest in the potential for youth diversion to keep CYP out of the CJS, reduce reoffending and improve life outcomes (Crest, 2022).

Knife crime and violence involving children

Knife crime has become an increasingly important topic for CYP, youth justice practitioners and policymakers. Reducing knife crime is an explicit priority for the current Labour government, which aims to halve knife crime by 2034 (Labour Party, 2024).

Knife crime has remained at historically elevated levels compared to a decade ago, with particular impacts on CYP. Police-recorded data illustrate knife-enabled crime is now 75% higher than in 2012/13, even after accounting for temporary reductions during Covid-19 lockdown restrictions (Office of National Statistics, 2024).

The impact of knife crime on CYP is especially evident when examining hospital admission data for knife injuries. In 2022/23, 17% of hospital admissions for knife injuries were CYP aged 18 or younger (House of Commons, 2023). Additionally, nearly half of all knife-related homicides involve victims under 24 years old (Popham, 2024). Combined with the fact that nearly one in five knife possession offences involves CYP aged 10–17 years, there is a need for clarity in delivering targeted and effective interventions to help protect CYP from the harms of knife-related offences (Ministry of Justice, 2023). However, there is limited empirical evidence on the effect that diversion has on CYP in the UK, specifically involving knife crime.

Research aim

This research has two main aims. First, we seek to describe the characteristics of CYP diverted from the CJS in Greater London.³ Second, we aim to establish the relationship between

³ Excluding the City of London and British Transport Police offences.

diversion and reoffending, particularly when looking at violent offending. The focus on these trends is between 1 January 2015 and 30 September 2022.

Research questions (RQs)

This report focuses on presenting the results of the following research questions:

- 1. What are the characteristics of CYP who are diverted, and how do they compare with those of CYP who are not diverted? (RQ1)
- 2. Is there variation across London boroughs in the use of different types of diversion and in who is diverted? (RQ2)
- 3. What is the relationship between diversion and reoffending? (RQ3)

Our research questions have evolved from our <u>initial study plan</u>, which was developed prior to researchers having sight of either the MPS or YJS data.⁴

In consultation with the Youth Endowment Fund, we have refined the scope of this research project to focus its key aims, as well as further analyses, exploring i) the characteristics of CYP who are involved in knife offences, ii) the characteristics of CYP diverted for knife offences and iii) the relationship between diversion and (re)arrest for CYP involved in knife offences. Additional information regarding the scope of this exploratory analysis is provided in the <u>Annex</u> of this report.

We also provide information about avenues of research explored during the initial stages of the project (including the feasibility of analysis using quasi-experimental designs) in the <u>Annex</u> of this report.

Hypotheses

RQ1: What are the characteristics of CYP who are diverted, and how do they compare with those of CYP who are not diverted?

We hypothesise that a higher volume of male CYP are diverted, but female CYP are proportionately more likely to be diverted (compared to male CYP). CYP from ethnic minority backgrounds are also hypothesised to be less likely to be diverted compared to White CYP.

There is limited information available about the characteristics of CYP who are diverted in the UK. One study in the UK identifies the characteristics of CYP (n = 1,027) in an evaluation of a pilot diversion scheme in six sites across the UK (Haines et al., 2012). Overall, researchers found that CYP involved in the diversion scheme were, on average, 14.7 years old, predominantly male (71%) and predominantly White British or Northern European (67.5%).

⁴ <u>https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Protocol_Diversions_MPS.pdf</u>

While this included pilot sites in two London boroughs, it is unclear how representative this is of existing characteristics of CYP in London who are diverted from the youth CJS. This is particularly true because London's population is more diverse compared to populations served by other police forces in the UK (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2019). Nevertheless, this suggests that male CYP from White backgrounds may be more likely to be diverted, compared to other ethnicity minority groups. Moreover, there are generally more male CYP who are involved in the CJS (YJB, 2024b). This suggests that diversion is more prevalent for male CYP (regardless of ethnicity).

However, compared to male CYP, female CYP may be more likely to be diverted. Female CYP are less likely to come into contact with the CJS, and if they do, it is for less serious offences and less prolific offending (Bateman, 2020). This makes offending female CYP more likely to be considered for diversion rather than being arrested, charged or summonsed. This aligns with other broader research, which finds that female CYP are less likely to be processed to courts compared to male CYP after controlling for variables such as age, offence seriousness and previous contact with the CJS (Leiber & Mack, 2003).

Additionally, CYP from Black and Asian backgrounds have been found to be significantly more likely to plead not guilty in court compared to White CYP (Uhrig, 2016). This suggests that individuals from Black and ethnic minority backgrounds could also be less likely to admit to an offence when arrested and/or charged with an offence. However, we note that this is based on individuals pleading guilty *in court*, and the same trends may not necessarily hold for individuals admitting their offences to the police. Regardless, given that CYP have to admit to offending to be diverted, it is plausible that CYP from ethnic minority backgrounds may be less likely to meet this criterion (compared to White CYP) and, thus, not be diverted from the CJS (Ely et al., 2019).

RQ2: Is there variation across London boroughs in the use of different types of diversion and in who is diverted?

We do not have preferred hypotheses for this research question.

Although there is some limited information suggesting variation in the implementation of youth diversion practices across London, this evidence relies on anecdotal and incomplete survey data (Ely et al., 2019). Moreover, there is no data indicating geographic variation in whether CYP admit to an offence. As a result, the current state of diversionary activities across London, including differences in the types of diversion, remains unclear.

RQ3: What is the relationship between diversion and reoffending?

We hypothesise that i) there is a negative relationship between diversion and subsequent arrest rates (within six months) compared to CYP who are not diverted out of the CJS and ii)

diversion has a smaller relationship with reduced arrest rates for CYP from Black or other ethnic minority backgrounds compared to White CYP.

The first hypothesis is based on meta-analytic studies of youth diversion evaluations, which have found that any type of pre-court diversion is associated with a reduction in reoffending rates compared to CYP who are not diverted (Wilson & Hoge, 2013; Wilson et al., 2018). While another meta-analysis found a nonsignificant negative relationship between youth diversion and the prevalence of reoffending (i.e. whether an individual reoffends at all), it found a significant negative effect of youth diversion on the incidence of reoffending (i.e. the average number of offences). This suggests that diversion reduces the frequency at which CYP reoffend (i.e. diverted CYP committed significantly fewer offences on average) (Petrosino et al., 2010). Another review of the evidence of pre-court diversion by the YEF found that pre-court diversion activities reduce reoffending by approximately 13% (Youth Endowment Fund, 2024). The research in this review and these meta-analyses were primarily based on studies from the US, so it is unclear how applicable they may be to the UK CJS.

Regarding the second hypothesis, one meta-analysis of youth diversion evaluations found the effect sizes for reoffending in studies with a majority of Black participants provided with pre-court diversion outcomes were not statistically significant. Conversely, in studies with a majority of White participants who were diverted, there were significant reductions in reoffending (Wilson & Hoge, 2013). This may indicate racial or ethnic background as a factor which impacts CYP experience and outcomes with the diversion process.

Key concepts

Terms	Background and definition used
Crime harm/crime	Crime harm/severity refers to how harmful a criminal offence is,
severity	both to the victims and the broader public, in proportion to other
	offences.
	Crime harm looks at the damage caused by or the negative impact of an offence weighted according to the relative seriousness of different crime types rather than treating all crimes as equally harmful.
	We use the Cambridge Crime Harm Index (CCHI) as our proxy for
	crime harm (see <u>Table 6</u> for further details).

Table 1: Description and definition of key concepts and terms used within this report

Disposal outcome	A disposal outcome refers to how an alleged or suspected incident			
	of criminal behaviour is resolved by police. For the purposes of this			
	study, this refers to three types of outcomes (as defined above):			
	Diverted outcomes Escalated outcomes			
	Escalated outcomes			
	Indeterminate outcomes			
	reflect internal MPS data about how alleged or suspected crimes are			
	resolved. These outcomes do not reflect police-recorded Home			
	resolved. These outcomes do not reflect police-recorded Home			
	<u>Office outcome codes</u> . ³ Home Office outcome codes were not			
Discoursions (discourts d	provided in the MPS data for this study.			
Diversion/diverted	Definitions of youth diversion vary across studies and organisations,			
outcomes	which are considered diversionany (Youth Justice Logal Control			
	2024) A common element across definitions for youth diversion			
	2024). A common element across deminitions for youth diversion			
	CIS (Contro for Justice Innegation, 2021) However, there appear to			
	be different interpretations of how much involvement with the CIS			
	be different interpretations of how much involvement with the CJS			
	different points in the CIS (e.g. pre-charge, post-charge or in court)			
	(Gaffney et al., 2021: Centre for Justice Innovation, 2022)			
	(Gatthey et al., 2021; Centre for Justice Innovation, 2022).			
	For this project, we conceptualise youth diversion as providing CYP			
	with alternatives to being charged or prosecuted with criminal			
	offences. This definition excludes out-of-court-disposals (OOCDs)			
	provided by courts to CYP. This is because once an individual is			
	charged with and/or prosecuted for an offence, they may be			
	considered to have been substantively involved in the formal CJS			
	(regardless of the outcome of any prosecution).			
	Alternatives to being charged or prosecuted can include both			
	informal non-statutory or formal statutory OOCDs (HM Inspectorate			
	of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire &			
	Rescue Services, 2018). Statutory OOCDs divert CYP from the court			
	system but still involve contact with the CJS (which is included on a			
	criminal record).			

⁵https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-recorded-crime-open-data-tables/police-recorded-crimeand-outcomes-open-data-tables-user-guide#crime-outcomes-open-data

Give	Given this distinction, we have opted to break down diversion into			
two	two main types:			
• 1	nformal diversion: this is where a CYP with a linked offence			
r	eceives an alternative outcome which avoids a criminal record			
6	and escalation into the formal youth justice system. This may			
i	nvolve being referred to specific diversionary schemes or having			
t	he YJS deliver support services (including intervention			
1	programmes), which may or may not be voluntary. This type of			
0	liversion includes the following outcomes:			
ā) Community resolution : this is a diversionary outcome that			
	can only be used when children have accepted responsibility			
	for an offence. It is an outcome commonly delivered, but not			
	limited to, using restorative justice approaches (YJB, 2021).			
	CYP are required to accept responsibility for the offence (a			
	lower standard than required for admitting guilt for an			
	offence) in order to be issued with a community resolution			
	(National Police Chief's Council, 2022). Receipt of a			
	community resolution is recorded on Metropolitan police			
	service (MPS) systems, but it is not recorded on the Police			
	National Computer and does not form part of a formal			
	criminal record (HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM			
	Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services.			
	2018).			
t	 Triage: this is a suite of voluntary interventions ranging from 			
	light-touch sessions to structured programmes (e.g. drug and			
	alcohol counselling, mentoring programmes or restorative			
	iustice interventions) typically provided by YJS, though they			
	can involve third sector organisations. Interventions aim to			
	provide holistic support to children (and their parents or			
	carers) as an alternative to being formally processed through			
	the justice system (Centre for Justice Innovation, 2021)			
	Based on conversations with the MPS, we understand that			
	CVP are required to admit to an offence in order to be			
	referred to VIS for triage			
	Not in the public interest: this is used when the police			
	decide not to pursue an offence, determining it is not in the			
	nublic interact to proceed with procedution or take any			
	further action (VID 2021) An admission of aviit or			
	romonosibility from the CVD is not required			
	responsibility from the CYP is not required.			

	d) Warning (informal): this is a verbal warning provided by			
	police officers, typically for low-level offences (College of			
	Policing, 2024). This outcome is not listed on any criminal			
	record.			
	• Formal diversion: this is where a CYP with a linked offence			
	receives an alternative outcome which minimises their			
	involvement with the formal youth justice system. This type of			
	diversion includes:			
	a) Youth caution : this is a formal caution provided by police a an alternative to charging the CVP with an offence. The CVP			
	must admit to the offence, and police must have enough			
	avidence to prove an offence was committed. Following a			
	wouth coution CVD are referred to the VIS, which may offer			
	an accossment and additional services or intervention			
	an assessment and additional services of intervention			
	record and can be disclosed to employers in some			
	circumstances (VIB 2023)			
	b) Youth conditional caution : this is a formal caution provided			
	by police with one or more conditions attached A CYP is			
	referred to VIS for assessment, which recommends			
	conditions attached to the conditional caution. If a CVP does			
	not adhere to these conditions, they could be processited for			
	the original offence. The CVP must admit to the offence and			
	consent to the conditions linked with the conditional caution			
	(Ministry of Justice, 2012)			
	(Winnstry of Justice, 2013).			
	Unless informal or formal diversions are specifically identified,			
	diversions or a diverted outcome includes both.			
Escalation,	These refer to outcomes of alleged offences that entail further			
escalated criminal	involvement in the CJS. These outcomes include being:			
justice outcomes	Arrested			
or escalated	Charged			
outcomes	Summoned			
Indeterminate	This refers to any disposal outcome apart from diverted or escalated			
outcomes	outcomes (as specified above). These outcomes indicate that it is			
	not clear whether an offence has been committed. These outcomes			
	include (but are not limited to):			
	No further action			
	 Insufficient evidence to proceed 			
	 Misuncient evidence to proceed Victim withdrawal from an investigation 			
	 vicum withurawai from an investigation 			

	Suspect deceased		
Knife offences or knife-related offences	 For the purpose of our analysis, knife offences (or knife-related offences) refer to the following specific types of suspected or alleged offences: Possession of an article with a blade or point Knife-enabled homicide Knife-enabled violence (with injury) Knife-enabled robbery 		
Knife possession	We define knife possession as any suspected or alleged offence which involves the possession of an article with a blade or point.		
Knife-enabled offence	 We define knife-enabled offences as a knife being used in the attempted or actual commission of the following types of offences: Homicide Violence (with injury) Bobbery 		
Offending	For the purposes of this study, offending refers to any type of behaviour suspected or alleged to be illegal or criminal behaviour that has come to the attention of police.		
Repeatedly involved CYP or repeated knife offences	We use this term to refer to unique CYP who have at least three knife offences.		
Violent offending	 For this study, we define violent offending as criminal acts which involve actual, threatened or attempted physical harm (including harm of a sexual nature) against another person.⁶ This definition includes: Contact sexual offences Manslaughter Kidnapping/abduction This definition excludes the following types of offences: Non-contact sexual offences (e.g. indecent images of children or voyeurism) 		

⁶Our definition is adapted from the definition of violence outlined in YEF's Outcomes Framework. (Youth Endowment Fund (2022) YEF Outcomes Framework. Retrieved from: <u>https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/YEF-Outcomes-Framework-August-2022.pdf</u>

	 Trafficking, exploitation/sexual exploitation and modern slavery Harm to animals Corporate manslaughter 			
	 Possession of weapons 			
Incident case or case	This refers to a single incident of police contact with an individual who was either stopped for, suspected of or accused of a crime (or			
	multiple crimes) on a single day.			
	A single case can have more than one outcome if it includes multiple offences.			

Ethics

This project sought ethical review from the MPS Police's Research and Ethics Committee (MetREC) prior to undertaking any data collection or analysis. MetREC provides independent advice on ethical considerations for research being undertaken or sponsored by the MPS. It also is the first policing-specific research ethics committee in the UK.⁷ MetREC ensures that policies, standards and safeguards are implemented appropriately and effectively to protect the fundamental rights and dignity of research participants. The MetREC chair received a summary of the research project and advised that the project was fine to proceed, as it had minimal risk of harm. Given that the scope of the project was limited to the review of secondary data, the project did not receive ethical scrutiny from the full MetREC panel.

Data access and protection

Data access and security

This project involved obtaining individual-level personal data (including sensitive personal data) from the MPS. Given the sensitivity of the data for this project, researchers adhered to the following principles and procedures:

- **Restricted transfer of data.** Data for the project was accessed and analysed within the MPS's secure IT environment. No identifiable police or YJS data was transferred between the MPS and BIT, in line with the MPS's procedures for handling police data. No identifiable or personal police data was kept on BIT's internal systems.
- **Restricted access from the MPS.** Only a single BIT researcher was provided with access to the MPS's internal data system. This researcher received security vetting from the MPS Police prior to being provided with access to the MPS's internal IT system. Access

⁷Metropolitan Police (n.d.). About the MPS Research Ethics Committee (MetREC). Retrieved from: <u>https://www.met.police.uk/police-forces/metropolitan-police/areas/about-us/about-the-met/met-research-ethics-committee-metrec/</u>

to the data was also restricted to key personnel within the MPS's Strategic Insight Unit, which was supporting this research project.

- **Data retention.** All personal data for this project will be retained on the MPS's internal IT systems until August 2025, in line with the MPS's data retention policy. This will allow for the specific length of time required for any follow-up requests before the data is securely deleted.
- Aggregated reporting of data. No findings have been reported in a way that would make it possible to identify individual CYP. Data for the impact evaluation is only reported in an aggregated and anonymous manner. Additionally, following the completion of our main analyses, the dataset has been pseudonymised to protect individuals' identities, replacing personal identifiers with a unique study ID. The data could not be pseudonymised prior to the main analyses, given that personal identifiers were required to link different datasets, and the approach to linking the data was refined and validated as part of the analysis stage.

Data sharing and protection

Prior to obtaining any data from the MPS's internal systems, the MPS completed a Data Protection Impact Assessment. This also detailed the justifications and rationale for obtaining and processing MPS and YJS data for this project and the relevant data security measures for handling data for this project.

Methods

We begin this section by outlining the sources of data for this project and how these datasets were cleaned and merged. We present key definitions and outcome measures and outline the research design to address our research questions.

Data sources

The following datasets analysed for this report come from the MPS Police:

- Crime Reporting Information System (CRIS). This dataset contains information about police-recorded crime. This includes information about suspects and victims (e.g. name, date of birth and ethnicity), as well as the alleged offences and whether individuals were arrested. Crime reports in this dataset are specific to an incident (not the individual). Therefore, multiple individuals may be captured within a single CRIS report. Importantly, this dataset does not contain information about whether individuals were proceeded against or were convicted of offences. Therefore, offences within this dataset are alleged or suspected offences.
- **Stops.** This dataset captures details of individuals stopped and searched by the MPS. This dataset also includes the outcomes for individuals who were stopped and searched (including being arrested or being provided with a community resolution).
- National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS). This dataset captures information about an individual when they are brought into custody and holds data related to the investigation of a crime for an individual. This also includes information about the arrest and information about the investigation outcome.

In Table 2 below, we summarise the data fields available from each of these three data sources and which research questions they inform.

These datasets cover the period 1st January 2015 to 30th September 2022.

Table 2: Overview of data used for this report

Dataset	Unit of observation	Key information	Number of unique observations ⁸	Research question addressed
CRIS	One row per combination of forename, surname, date of birth, date of	Name Date of birth Date of crime	147,582	RQ1 RQ2 RQ3

⁸This is the number of unique identifiable individuals in these datasets, following data cleaning procedures (refer to <u>Data cleaning</u> section below for details).

Dataset	Unit of observation	Key information	Number of unique observations ⁸	Research question addressed
	crime, crime number, crime characteristics (e.g. Home Office code), outcome characteristics (e.g. outcome of crime reports and associated dates,) and whether the individual is accused or suspected of an offence	Sex Ethnicity (self- defined) Ethnicity (officer- defined) Borough (location of crime) Type of offence (including Home Office codes) Disposal outcomes for alleged offence (e.g. arrest, caution or conditional caution) and associated dates		
Stops*	One row per combination of forename, surname, date of birth, date of stop, stop characteristics (e.g. reason for stop) and outcome characteristics (e.g. outcome type and reason for outcome)	Name Date of birth Sex Date of stop Ethnicity (self- defined) Ethnicity (officer- defined) Borough (location of stop) Type of offence (reason for stop) Disposal outcomes and associated dates	158,980	RQ1 RQ3
NSPIS	One row per combination of forename, surname, date of birth, date of detention and outcome characteristics	Name Date of birth Sex Date of detention Ethnicity (self- defined) Ethnicity (officer- defined) Offence title Disposal outcomes and associated dates	31,175	RQ1 RQ2 RQ3

*Note: we did not obtain data from Stops on whether the outcome of a stop was linked to the initial reason for conducting the search. This includes whether weapons or other prohibited articles/objects were found during a search.

Data cleaning

Prior to merging datasets, we cleaned the data to remove individuals with no identifiable names and duplicates.

To clean the data for the names of individuals, we removed any names with non-alphabetical characters other than hyphens and periods. We then filtered out observations where either the forename or surname wasn't likely to be a name (e.g. where the name was blank or 'declined'). In addition, we excluded observations where the forename and surname were both two characters or fewer. We also filtered out any observations which did not have a date of birth.

We combined each dataset such that there was one row for each combination of individual (defined as a unique combination of forename, surname and date of birth) and date, where 'date' refers to the date of the alleged/suspected crime for CRIS, date of stop for Stops and date of intervention start for YJS data. In other words, each row in CRIS/Stops refers to an '<u>incident case</u>' rather than a unique CYP.

Table 3 below provides a summary of the number and proportion of data (by rows) which were removed from the dataset during the cleaning process.

Dataset	Initial number of rows	Number of rows after data cleaning	Number of rows removed and consolidated during cleaning
CRIS	743,124	254,737	488,387 (65.7% of rows)
Stops	284,922	258,234	26,688 (9.4% of rows)
NSPIS	264,281	53,284	210,997 (79.8% of rows)

Table 3: Overview of data removed or consolidated during cleaning procedures

For CRIS and NSPIS data, the percentage of rows removed during cleaning is particularly high. This is because data is structured to have multiple (duplicated) rows for the same reported crime when multiple values are provided for different variables (for example, when more than one offence or outcome of a crime is listed). In addition to removing duplicate data, we coarsened demographic characteristics to create consistent sex and ethnicity variables across CRIS and Stops.

Data linkage

We used a unique identifier to merge CRIS, Stops and NSPIS into a combined dataset. This identifier is a string of characters consisting of an individual's forename, surname and date of birth. We used this method of linking data, as these data fields (i.e. name(s) and date of birth) were the most consistently captured across MPS datasets.

Merging data

We merged the datasets in stages, as we received the data at different times. We were initially provided with CRIS and Stops data and later provided with NSPIS data. Figure 1 below provides a high-level summary of the stages of merging the data.

Figure 1: Summary of data cleaning and merging process



When merging data into a combined dataset, we first appended CRIS data to Stops data. Then, if an individual (defined by forename, surname and date of birth) and date of crime combination appeared in both CRIS and Stops, the information from both datasets was combined into one row. This means that the combined dataset is at the CYP–crime–date level. Data from NSPIS was then merged with the combined CRIS/Stops data by a combination of individual and crime numbers. This information was used to identify whether offences were violence- or knife-related and to identify any other diverted and escalated outcomes which do not appear in CRIS/Stops.

We did not add individuals who only appeared in NSPIS to the combined CRIS/Stops dataset for two reasons: (i) NSPIS does not have data on sex or basic command units (BCUs), and (ii) the offence start date in NSPIS has a different qualitative meaning to the crime-recorded date in CRIS/Stops.⁹

There are three relevant demographic characteristics which are recorded in both the CRIS and Stops datasets: sex, ethnicity and borough. When merging these data together, information in CRIS is prioritised over information in Stops (unless it is unknown/missing in CRIS, in which case we take the information from Stops).

⁹ 5,668 cases in NSPIS do not merge to CRIS/Stops by a combination of forename, surname and date of birth. This is 10.8% of the observations in the cleaned NSPIS dataset but only 1.2% of the observations in the cleaned CRIS/Stops dataset. The exclusion of these observations is very unlikely to change the findings from this report.

Information on the offence type and disposal outcomes differs across the CRIS and Stops datasets. This is partly due to the relevant variables being coded differently across datasets and partly because information present in one dataset is missing from the other. When combining datasets, we include all the different offence types and disposal outcomes for cases that appear in both CRIS and Stops. This allows us to look across all the relevant variables when constructing other key variables for the analysis. For example, we define a diversion as occurring for a specific case if a diverted outcome is present in either CRIS or Stops.

Dataset	Number of observations	Number of unique CYP
CRIS	254,657	147,582
Stops	258,210	155,880
NSPIS	52,511	31,175
Combined dataset (CRIS, Stops and NSPIS)	487,212	264,932

Table 4: Overview of	observations in data	asets after data cleaning
----------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

Handling of internally inconsistent data

When merging data into the combined dataset, there were some inconsistencies in characteristics for linked CYP. We observed the following rates of disagreement between the CRIS and Stops datasets.

- Ethnicity (officer-defined): 2.4%
- Sex: 0.3%
- Borough: 4.2%

Where there were inconsistencies between datasets, we took the value from CRIS.

Limitations in merging data

In order to merge datasets, we relied on observations in the data where all the following identifiers were present: forename, surname and date of birth. There may be individuals who were captured in these datasets that we have not been able to include in our analysis because there is no reliable way to link these observations either within a dataset or in matching these to other datasets.

A broader limitation of using data within police systems is that this is dependent on the information recorded by police officers. Police officers may have entered information in error or relied on their own subjective assessment to record information – particularly in the case of officer-identified ethnicity. Therefore, our analysis may reflect these errors or subjective judgements.

Missing data

In Table 5 below, we outline the proportion of data missing in key variables across the CRIS and Stops datasets.

Data field	Missingness in CRIS	Missingness in Stops	Missingness in NSPIS data
Before removing duplicates a	nd data cleaning		
Names ¹⁰	32.1%	0.01%	0%
Date of birth ¹¹	4.9%	2.3%	0%
After data cleaning			
Sex	4.3%	0.6%	N/A ¹²
Ethnicity (self-defined)	55.2%	49.2%	0% ¹³
Ethnicity (officer-defined)	22.2%	14.2%	

Table 5: Outline of the proportion of missingness in datasets

Where there is missing or incomplete data to identify certain characteristics (e.g. sex, ethnicity), as well as where sex/ethnicity is internally inconsistent within a case, we have listed this as 'missing/unknown'.

 $^{^{10}\}mbox{Defined}$ as missing if either forename or surname was missing from the data

 $^{^{11}\}mbox{Date}$ of birth was calculated before datasets were compressed

¹²This variable was not provided in YJS data

¹³YJS data provides only data field for ethnicity which is recorded by YJS staff

Variables and measurement

Table 6: Measurements of key concepts

Concept	Definition
Crime severity or crime harm	We use the CCHI to define the severity (or degree of harm) caused by offences (Sherman et al., 2016). The CCHI assigns different weights to offences based on their severity, using the number of days of imprisonment (recommended as the 'starting point' for a sentence) within sentencing guidelines. ¹⁴ For offences with non-custodial sentences, the CCHI converts the sentence into equivalent days. For fines, this means calculating how many days working at minimum wage it would take to pay the fine. For community sentences, the hours/days of service are converted into equivalent days. CCHI scores range from 0.1 to 5,475 across offences. We use this variable along with the offence type variable (defined below) to control for the alleged or suspected offences committed.
	This CCHI associates Home Office offence codes for offences with an index value. Home Office offence codes only appear in CRIS, meaning our analysis of crime harm is limited to cases appearing in CRIS (including cases that appear in both CRIS and Stops).
	For both our descriptive and regression analysis, we apply a single CCHI score to an incident case. Where a case has multiple offences, we select the offence corresponding to the highest CCHI score.
	Descriptive analysis
	For our descriptive analysis, we categorised the CCHI values into three levels to aid in interpreting crime harm for our analysis:
	 High harm: >2,000 CCHI score Medium harm: 500–2,000 CCHI score Low harm: <500 CCHI score
	These categorisations were based on inspecting the distribution of CCHI scores and types of sentences for offences (e.g. whole-life sentences or

¹⁴The Sentencing Council publishes sentencing guidelines for judges and magistrates. More information about the sentencing guidelines is available at <u>www.sentencingcouncil.org.uk/sentencing-and-the-council/about-sentencing-guidelines</u>

	length of determinate sentences) in order to identify relevant cut-off		
	points to categorise CCHI scores.		
	<u>Regression analysis</u>		
	We use the natural logarithm of the CCHI score as a covariate in regression analysis. We have performed a logarithmic transformation of CCHI scores because the distribution of scores has a right skew (a small number of crimes have scores in the hundreds/thousands, but most offences have scores of 10 and under).		
	does not appear in the non-missing data) before applying the transformation. We also include an indicator for the CCHI score being missing as a covariate.		
Diverted	A case is defined as 'diverted' if the relevant CYP receives a diverted outcome (defined in Key concepts). We specify being diverted differently depending on our research questions.		
	For RQ1 and RQ3, we exclude cases which received both diverted and escalated outcomes. For these research questions, a case being diverted means it received a diverted outcome but not an escalated outcome.		
	For RQ2, a case is diverted if it receives a diverted outcome, regardless of whether it also received an escalated outcome.		
	This is identified by examining the disposal outcomes in the CRIS, Stops and NSPIS datasets. We provide a mapping of outcome values from these datasets to the types and methods of diversion in <u>Appendix A</u> .		
Escalated	A case is defined as 'escalated' if the relevant CYP receives an escalated outcome (defined in Key concepts). We note that individuals who breach the terms of their diversion (where this is required by a specific type of diversion, e.g. youth conditional caution) are likely to subsequently receive an escalated outcome. However, we are unable to specifically identify cases where CYP breached the requirements of such diversions. We rely solely on the outcomes listed in the data to identify whether a case is escalated or diverted.		
	We specify being escalated differently, depending on our research question:		

	 For RQ1 and RQ3, where we exclude cases which received both diversionary and escalated outcomes, a case being escalated means it received an escalated outcome but not a diverted outcome. For RQ2, a case is escalated if it received an escalated outcome, regardless of whether it also received a diverted outcome. This is identified by examining the disposal outcomes in the CRIS, Stops and NSPIS datasets. We provide a mapping of outcome values from these datasets to escalated outcomes in <u>Appendix A</u>.
Indeterminat	A case is defined as having an indeterminate outcome (defined in Key concepts) if the relevant CYP did not receive either an escalated or diverted outcome for that case. This is identified by examining the disposal outcomes in the CRIS, Stops and NSPIS datasets.
e (outcomes)	We provide a mapping of outcome values from these datasets to indeterminate outcomes in <u>Appendix A</u> .
Knife	A knife offence is defined as being either i) a knife possession offence or
offences or	ii) a knife-enabled offence(s).
knife-related	The definitions of these two broad types of knife offences are provided
offences	below.
Knife- enabled offences	 Knife-enabled offences are identified based only on information contained in the CRIS dataset. This is because CRIS contains an additional data field which captures the 'features' of offences. These features include values indicating whether a knife/bladed instrument was present during an offence (regardless of whether the offence was a knife-related offence). To identify knife-enabled homicide, knife-enabled violence and knife- enabled robbery, we first select the following 'minor' offence types: Knife-enabled homicide: 'Homicide' Knife-enabled violence: 'Violence with injury' Knife-enabled robbery: 'Robbery of business property' or 'Robbery of personal property' For each of these minor offence categories, we define the offence as that kind of knife-enabled offence if it also contained any of the following features: Knife or bladed instrument

	Sharp or pointed instrument
	Knife or other sharp instrument used to injure
	Knife or sharp used as a threat or attempt to injure
Knife possession offences	 Knife possession offences are identified across CRIS, Stops and NSPIS by filtering for the following values: CRIS: offences in CRIS are grouped into i) 'major' offence types (consisting of 12 unique values) and 'minor' offence types (consisting of 51 unique values). The minor offence category '193 – Possession of Article with Blade or Point' is defined as representing a knife possession offence. Stops: an offence is defined as a knife possession offence if an outcome reason for an associated stop is listed as 'E: Pointed/bladed articles'. NSPIS: an offence is defined as a knife possession offence if it is listed as any of the following: Possess a flick knife or gravity knife Possess knife blade/sharp pointed article in a public place – Criminal Justice Act 1988 Possess knife blade or sharply pointed article Unauthorised possession in prison of knife or offensive weapon
Previous arrests	We calculated the number of previous arrests by CYP by examining the period from 1 st January 2015 to 31 st December 2018. The number of previous arrests is used as a covariate in the regression analysis. We have chosen to use roughly the first half of the period covered by our data (1 st January 2015 to 30 th September 2022) to form this variable and the second half as the sample in the regression analysis. This allows us to construct a covariate with a lot of predictive power for our regressions while not reducing the sample for these analyses excessively. For the descriptive analysis (RQ1 and RQ2), we tabulate the number of previous arrests over this period by CYP (using one observation per CYP who appears in the dataset from 1 January 2019 onwards).
Type of diversion	Diversions are categorised as one or more of community resolution, triage, not in the public interest, warning (informal), youth caution or youth conditional caution.

	This is identified by examining the disposal outcomes in the combined		
	CRIS, Stops and NSPIS datasets. We provide a mapping of outcome values		
	from these datasets to types of diversion in <u>Appendix A</u> .		
Type of	For CRIS data, offences are grouped into i) major offence types (consisting		
offence or	of 12 unique values) and minor offence types (consisting of 51 unique		
offence type	values). For Stops data, we use the 12 categories listed as the reasons for		
	an outcome of stopping an individual as a proxy for the type of offence.		
	Where there are multiple offences within each incident case, we take the		
	most recent offence type (as dictated by the associated disposal dates;		
	ties are broken using random numbers).		
	Descriptive analysis		
	In the descriptive analysis (RQ1 and RQ2), we present the offence type in		
	CRIS and the offence type in Stops separately.		
	We use the following major offence types for data in CRIS:		
	we use the following major offence types for data in exis.		
	Arson and Criminal Damage		
	Burglary		
	Robbery		
	Drug Offences		
	Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society		
	Other Accepted Crime		
	Possession of Weapons		
	Public Order Offences		
	Sexual Offences		
	• Theft		
	Vehicle Offences		
	Violence Against the Person		
	We also use the following categories from data in Stops:		
	Anticipated Violence		
	Articles To Cause Criminal Damage		
	• Drugs		
	Firearms		
	Fireworks		
	Going Equipped		
	Other Object		

 Other Power
Psychoactive Substances
Stolen Property
Terrorism
Weapons, Points & Blades
Regression analysis
For the purposes of our analysis, we look at the major type of offence unless the major type is violence against the person. In this case, we split this into homicide/violence with injury vs violence without injury based on the minor type. This gives 13 categories:
Homicide/Violence With Injury
Violence Without Injury
Sexual Offences
Robbery
Burglary
Vehicle Offences
• Theft
Arson and Criminal Damage
Drug Offences
Possession Of Weapons
Public Order Offences
Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society
Other Accepted Crime
For Stops data, we use the 12 categories from Stops data for the reason for stopping an individual but combine rare categories (which are identified as Firearms, Other Power, Articles to Cause Criminal Damage, Terrorism, Other Object, Psychoactive Substances and Fireworks) into the category Other Code. This gives six categories:
Stolen Property
• Drugs
Weapons, Points & Blades
Going Equipped
Anticipated violence
Other Code

	In the regression analysis, we code offence type as a series of binary
	variables (one for each offence type in CRIS or Stops) since one case can
	be associated with multiple offence types.
Violent offence	We define violent offences as criminal acts which involve actual, threatened or attempted physical harm (including harm of a sexual nature) against another person. These offences were identified across CRIS, Stops and NSPIS data:
	 Violent offences in CRIS were identified by first inspecting Home Office offence codes to identify the offence codes for violent offences. CRIS contains Home Office offence codes for all offences within its crime reports. Offences in CRIS were then filtered to match the Home Office offence codes for violent offences, as identified by researchers. Stops does not have a data field explicitly labelled to identify the type of offence associated with a stop. Violent offences in Stops were based on inspecting the data field that lists the reason for a Stop outcome and identifying relevant values which aligned with the conceptual definition of violence. Violent offences in NSPIS were identified by inspecting CJS offence codes linked to specific offences in NSPIS contain CJS codes linked to offences in its reporting systems. These CJS codes were then used to filter for violent offences in NSPIS.
	violent, then the whole case is categorised as violent. Similarly, if there are multiple offences on the same day with the same person, the case is categorised as violent.
	We provide the list of specific values used to identify violent offences in <u>Appendix B</u> .

Outcome measures

We use one primary outcome measure and one secondary outcome measure to address RQ3 (What is the relationship between diversion and reoffending?).

Table 7: Overview of outcome measures

Outcome	Definition	Туре
Primary outcome	We define arrest within six months of the initial offence date as occurring if either of the following is true:	Binary
	 In data derived from CRIS or Stops, the CYP (identified by forename, surname and date of birth) has an arrest disposal outcome listed within 183 days (six months) that is linked to a different crime-recorded date. In data derived from NSPIS, the CYP (as identified by forename, surname and date of birth) appears between 31 days and 183 days (i.e. six months) from the initial crime-recorded date with a different crime number to any associated with the initial offence. 	
	We use a cutoff of six months for our primary outcome measure to allow for a more sensitive measure of arrest. This helps capture the short-term relationship between diversion and arrest while reducing the influence of confounding factors which may be more likely to affect this relationship over time (e.g. change in life circumstances).	
Secondary outcome	 We define arrest within 12 months of the initial offence date as occurring if either of the following is true: In data derived from CRIS or Stops, the CYP (identified by forename, surname and date of birth) has an arrest disposal outcome listed within 365 days (12 months) that is linked to a different crime-recorded date. In data derived from NSPIS, the CYP (as identified by forename, surname and date of birth) appears between 31 days and 365 days (i.e. 12 months) from the initial crime-recorded date with a different crime number to any associated with the initial offence. 	Binary

We use a cutoff of 12 months for our secondary outcome	
measure to identify whether the relationship between	
diversion and arrest is sustained over a longer time period.	

For the arrest data derived from NSPIS, we apply a minimum time period of 31 days from the initial crime-recorded date to identify arrests within six (or 12) months of the initial offence date. This is done to reduce the chance that we incorrectly identify an arrest related to the initial offence as one associated with a new offence.

Specification of demographic variables

Below, we outline how we have measured key demographic variables from the data available for this initial analysis.

Sex

Within the datasets available, sex was the only variable related to capturing sex or gender. This was only captured under two values: i) male and ii) female.

Ethnicity (officer-identified)

We have consolidated the values for the ethnicity variable from CRIS and Stops into four categories: i) White, ii) Black, iii) Asian and iv) Middle Eastern. Note that these categories are based on the categories used in the police dataset during this period, and we recognise that they do not align with standard categories used elsewhere by the government.¹⁵ For example, there is no category that recognises CYP from mixed or multiple ethnic groups.

We use officer-identified ethnicity as the ethnicity variable. Ideally, we would use selfreported ethnicity as the ethnicity variable, but the rate of missingness is substantially higher (refer to <u>Missing Data</u> for additional details). This means that CYP are categorised as being the ethnicity that they appear to the officer.

Together, these are two important limitations of the ethnicity data: i) officers may make errors in identifying the ethnicity of a CYP and ii) the options they are selecting from do not represent all ethnicities.

Age

We calculated the age of CYP at the time that the (alleged) crime was recorded based on the reported date of birth.

¹⁵See:<u>https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/census2021dictionary/variablesbytopic/ethnicgroupnationalidentitylan</u> guageandreligionvariablescensus2021/ethnicgroup/classifications

Location

We used the borough where an alleged offence or stop occurred to specify the location of crime outcomes. During the time period of our data, the MPS shifted from a model of 32 BCUs based in each borough to 12 BCUs (from 2018). For ease of interpretation, we have provided information at the borough level. However, this does not reflect the use of diverted or escalated outcomes from specific BCUs.

Sample

The sample includes CYP aged 10–17 years between 1 January 2015 and 30 September 2022. Individual CYP may appear once or multiple times in this data. This means that the youngest CYP may only become eligible to appear in this dataset near the end of the period covered.

We use the three main types of disposal outcomes (escalation, diversion and indeterminate) to split the sample for all of our analyses. We take observations in the combined dataset to identify escalated and diverted outcomes. Cases can include multiple offences and multiple outcomes. As a result, a single case may be classified as both diverted and escalated. We illustrate the volume of cases which have different outcomes in Table 8 below.

Outcome	Number of cases	
Diverted	45,726	
Escalated	80,111	
Indeterminate (exclusively)	323,467	
Diverted and escalated (no indeterminate outcomes)	8,205	
Mixed outcomes (any combination of two or three outcomes across diverted, escalated or indeterminate – not including diverted and escalated with no indeterminate outcomes)	29,703	
Total number of cases	487,212	

Table 8: Number of outcomes across cases in the combined dataset

Sample for RQ1 and RQ3

Our sample includes CYP aged 10–17 years in 2015–2022 in the combined dataset described above (i.e. observations from CRIS, Stops and NSPIS). Our analysis for RQ1 and RQ3 uses incident cases which result in either i) diverted outcomes (but no escalated outcomes) or ii) escalated outcomes (but no diverted outcomes).

We exclude incident cases which received both diverted and escalated outcomes from our sample, given that the impact of an escalated outcome may mitigate the effects of a diverted outcome (and vice versa). However, we do not exclude diverted or escalated cases that also received indeterminate outcomes.

Further, we only take observations from CRIS and NSPIS (not Stops) to identify indeterminate outcomes. This is because there is a different threshold for incident cases to be recorded in CRIS and NSPIS compared to Stops, regardless of the outcome. Incidents in CRIS are typically more victim-focused, where a CYP is suspected or accused of being involved in an actual offence. Incident cases in Stops are typically based on officer's proactive detection of stop and search. As such, an indeterminate outcome could indicate instances in which no harm or offence has been committed by CYP, which is reflected in a high proportion of cases in Stops being associated with no further action. Home Office data indicates that for a large majority of stops with a no further action outcome, no prohibited objects/articles were found.¹⁶ Therefore, excluding these cases from our sample reduces the likelihood of skewing our analysis, given the included cases are more comparable with respect to whether individuals could reasonably be suspected or accused of an offence.

There are 72,146 cases in the combined dataset with diverted (as well as potentially indeterminate) outcomes and 102,301 cases with escalated (as well as potentially indeterminate) outcomes. Of these, we exclude 10,702 cases (14.8% of diversions and 10.5% of escalations) which have both diverted and escalated outcomes. Overall, this leaves 61,444 cases with diverted outcomes and 91,599 cases with escalated outcomes.

Outcome	Number of cases
Diverted (including indeterminate outcomes)	61,444
Escalated (including indeterminate outcomes)	91,599
Indeterminate (exclusively)	118,383
Total number of cases	271,426

Table 9: Number	r of outcomes across	cases in the sam	ple for RO1	and RO3
	of outcomes across	cases in the sam	pic for hQr	and ngs

¹⁶ Home Office (2024). *Stop and search and arrests, year ending March 2023 (second edition)*. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/stop-and-search-and-arrests-year-ending-march-2023</u>
Sample for RQ2

For this research question, our sample consists of CYP aged 10–17 years from 2015–2022, using data only from CRIS and NSPIS. We use this dataset because it has more consistent location data.

Our sample for analysis includes incident cases which resulted in either diversion or escalation (including cases which received both and cases which received an indeterminate outcome on top of a diversion and/or an escalation). This sample consists of 136,274 cases, including 67,064 cases which received diverted outcomes.

For RQ1, 2 and 3, Table 10 below summarises what sample is being used, what outcome variable is being used and what type of analysis is being performed.

Table 10: Sample,	outcome and	analysis for	RQ1, 2 and 3
-------------------	-------------	--------------	--------------

RQ	Sample	Outcome	Analysis
1	Main sample is combined CRIS/Stops/NSPIS dataset, filtered to include cases with only diversion or only escalation (but not both)	N/A (descriptives) Primary outcome is whether the CYP was diverted after initial offence date	Descriptives Regression
2	Main sample is CRIS dataset (augmented with NSPIS data), filtered to include cases with either diverted or escalated outcomes	N/A (descriptives) Primary outcome is whether the CYP was diverted after initial offence date.	Descriptives Regression
3	Main sample is combined CRIS/Stops/NSPIS dataset, filtered to include cases with only diversion or only escalation (but not both) and that represent first offences after 1 Jan 2019	Primary outcome is being arrested within six months of initial offence date	Regression

Sample for descriptives of the number of CYP involved in knife offences

Our sample for this analysis includes CYP aged 10–17 years from 2015 to 2022 in the combined dataset (i.e. observations from CRIS, Stops and NSPIS, as described in the main body of the report).

We identified cases which had at least three knife offences by counting the number of kniferelated offences by CYPs and then filtering them to include only knife-related offences associated with CYP who had at least three knife-related offences overall.

We then filtered the sample using the same parameters for RQ1 and RQ3. This includes incident cases which result in either i) diverted outcomes (but no escalated outcomes) or ii) escalated outcomes (but no diverted outcomes). We excluded incident cases which received both diverted and escalated outcomes from our sample, given the impact of an escalated outcome may mitigate the effects of a diverted outcome (and vice versa). However, we did not exclude diverted or escalated cases that also received indeterminate outcomes.

As with the sample for RQ1 and RQ3, we excluded cases from Stops which resulted in an indeterminate outcome (e.g., no further action). We include cases from CRIS and NSPIS which result in an indeterminate outcome. Given that we were unable to observe whether indeterminate outcomes in Stops result in a prohibited object/article being found, this approach provides a more comparable threshold for including cases from across the different police datasets.

Sample for descriptives of disposal outcomes and diversions of all CYP for knife offences

Our sample for this analysis includes CYP aged 10–17 years from 2015 to 2022 in the combined dataset. We first filtered this dataset to identify cases involving any knife offences. We then applied the sample parameters as in the sample for RQ1 and RQ3.

Note that we used a slightly different sample to examine the differences in diversion rates across boroughs. We applied the same parameters in the sample for RQ2, filtering for cases which resulted in either diversion or escalation (including cases which received both and cases which received an indeterminate outcome on top of a diversion and/or an escalation). This sample allows for a comparison with the rate of diversion presented in RQ2.

Sample for an analysis of the relationship between diversion and arrest for CYP involved in knife offences

Our sample for this analysis includes CYP aged 10–17 years from 2015 to 2022 in the combined dataset (i.e. observations from CRIS, Stops and NSPIS). After filtering cases for knife offences, we applied the sample parameters as in the sample for RQ1 and RQ3.

Table 11 below summarises what sample is being used, what outcome variable is being used and what type of analysis is being performed for each research theme in the exploratory knife offence analyses.

Research theme	Sample	Outcome	Analysis methods
Descriptives of the number of CYP involved in knife offences	Main sample is combined CRIS/Stops/NSPIS dataset, filtered to include cases with knife offences only	N/A	Descriptives
Descriptive summary of diversions for CYP involved in knife offences	Main sample is combined CRIS/Stops/NSPIS dataset, filtered to include cases with only diversion or only escalation (but not both) and knife offences only	N/A	Descriptives
Relationship between diversion and arrest for CYP involved in knife offences	Main sample is combined CRIS/Stops/NSPIS dataset, filtered to include cases with only diversion or only escalation (but not both) and knife offences only	Primary outcome is being arrested within six months of initial offence date	Regression ¹⁷

Research design

Research design for RQ1: what are the characteristics of CYP who are diverted, and how does this compare to CYP who are not diverted?

Descriptive analysis

We provide summary descriptive statistics for characteristics of CYP who have been diverted, as well as those for CYP who have received an escalated outcome. We provide two sets of descriptive statistics: i) descriptive statistics for all offences and ii) descriptive statistics for violent offences.

¹⁷ We use the same set of regression specifications as in our main analysis for research question 3 (what is the relationship between diversion and reoffending). See the Research Design section below.

We examine the following demographic characteristics: sex, age and ethnicity for CYP diverted and escalated. We also present descriptives on the following offence-related characteristics: number of previous arrests, type of offence, type of diversion and offence severity.

Regression analysis

We performed a regression analysis to investigate the relationship between the likelihood of diversion and ethnicity (White and Black CYP). These ethnic groups were selected for comparison because they represented the highest and lowest rates of diversion. Additionally, the sample sizes were not large enough to support comparisons between other ethnic groups. This analysis is correlational and should not be interpreted as evidence of a causal relationship.

The sample used in this analysis is similar to the sample used for the main regression analyses (see the Research design for RQ3 subsection below). Specifically, it includes the first incident cases of each CYP aged 10–17 years from January 2019 to March 2022 if they resulted in either diversion or escalation (but not both). Unlike the main regression analysis of the impact of diversion on re-arrest, we only included CYP of White or Black ethnicity (as defined by the officer).

The primary outcome is whether CYP were diverted after the initial offence date. We estimated this using the following logistic model:

$$diverted_i \sim bernoulli(p_i)$$
; $logit(p_i) = \alpha + \beta_B black_i + \beta_C X_i$

Here:

- *i* indexes the case
- *diverted* is a binary outcome for whether the CYP was diverted after the initial offence date
- *black* is a binary variable which equals 1 if the CYP is Black (as defined by the police officer) and 0 if they are White (note that the sample excludes all other ethnicities as well as unknown/missing values)
- X is a set of covariates

We have used the following covariates:

- Number of previous cases in 2015–2018 (categorised as 0, 1, 2, 3–5, 6+)
- Number of previous arrests in 2015–2018 (categorised as 0, 1, 2, 3-5, 6+)¹⁸
- Sex (categorised as male, female or unknown/missing)
- Age (coded as a categorical variable, with one category for each year)

¹⁸ This does not include the initial offence.

- Location of crime (borough of the police force that dealt with the case)
- Year and quarter
- Type of offence (coded as a set of binary variables, one for each offence type)¹⁹
- Whether the CYP was accused or only suspected of a crime (CRIS only)
- Crime severity/crime harm

Note: this is the same set of covariates as our main regression analysis (RQ3), except the ethnicity variable is binary instead of categorical.

Research design for RQ2: is there variation across London boroughs in the use of different types of diversion and in who is diverted?

Descriptive analysis

For these research questions, we provide summary descriptive statistics to identify the proportion of CYP provided with different types of diverted outcomes (compared to receiving other outcomes) across London boroughs.

Regression analysis

We also performed a regression analysis to examine differences in diversion rates across boroughs after controlling for other observable individual-level characteristics which could affect the likelihood of diversion. This analysis is correlational and should not be interpreted as evidence of causality.

The sample and specification are the same as the regression analysis for RQ1 (noted above), except that this regression model includes all ethnicities of CYP (not just White CYP and Black CYP). A categorical variable for ethnicity (White, Black, Asian, Middle Eastern or unknown/missing) is therefore used instead of two categories (White and Black CYP).

This model is run on case-level data. To examine the differences in diversion rates between boroughs after adjusting for covariates, we compare the estimated coefficients (converted into percentage-point effects based on the diversion rate for the median borough, Newham) on the categorical variable for the location of the crime (borough in which the police deal with the case).

Research design for RQ3: what is the relationship between diversion and reoffending?

We performed regression analyses to investigate the relationship between being diverted and reoffending. These analyses are correlational and should not be interpreted causally.

¹⁹ Note that offence type is recorded differently in CRIS and Stops, so this is also controlling for whether a CYP is appearing in CRIS or Stops.

Our main sample for the analyses uses each CYP's first offence between January 2019 and March 2022 (and then examines whether they were arrested after this point). We included control variables related to previous criminal history using data from 2015–2018²⁰ because these variables have a lot of predictive power in terms of reoffending. This means that we are more likely to be comparing diverted CYP with non-diverted CYP with a similar underlying likelihood of reoffending.

The primary outcome is whether a CYP was arrested within six months of the date associated with the initial offence.²¹ Since this is a binary outcome, we used logistic regression models. We then convert estimated coefficients back to percentage-point effects at the rate of arrest for non-diverted CYP in the analysis sample.

The regression model for the main specification is shown below:

arrest.
$$6m_i \sim bernoulli(p_i)$$
; $logit(p_i) = \alpha + \beta_T diverted. 6m_i + \beta_C X_i$

Here:

- *i* indexes a case
- *arrest.6m* is a binary outcome for whether the CYP was arrested within six months of the initial offence date
- *diverted.6m* is a binary variable for the CYP receiving a diverted outcome within six months of the initial offence date
- X is a set of covariates

We have used the following covariates:²²

- Number of previous cases in 2015–2018 (categorised as 0, 1, 2, 3-5, 6+)
- Number of previous arrests in 2015–2018 (categorised as 0, 1, 2, 3-5, 6+)²³
- Sex (categorised as male, female or unknown/missing)
- Ethnicity (as defined by the police officer; categorised as White, Black, Asian, Middle Eastern or unknown/missing)
- Age (coded as a categorical variable, with one category for each year)

²⁰ This excludes cases whose initial offences were before January 2019.

²¹ We cannot observe this outcome for the last six months of our data (i.e. between April and September 2022), so this period is cut off.

²² In our initial study plan we suggested using the following variables as controls: sex, self-identified ethnicity, age, number of previous arrests, type of offence, location of crime (BCU), year and season (spring, summer, autumn or winter). We deviated from this list to gain a more thorough coverage of criminal history. This was done by controlling for the number of previous offences in addition to the number of previous offences where outcomes of an arrest, charge or summons was taken against a CYP.

²³ This does not include the initial offence.

- Location of crime (borough of the police force that dealt with case)²⁴
- Year and quarter
- Type of offence (coded as a set of binary variables, one for each offence type)²⁵
- Whether the CYP was accused or only suspected of a crime (CRIS only)²⁶
- Crime severity/crime harm

Given the explanatory nature of our (non-randomised) analysis, we selected a rich set of covariates to proxy for the underlying likelihood of CYP committing an offence. While some covariates may provide relatively lower levels of explanatory power, these help provide a clearer picture of the association between diversion and offending.

For the main sample, we ran seven regressions, which investigate different outcome variables, subgroups populations and independent variables:

Table 12: Description of regression models

#	Regression model description
1	Association between diversion and arrest within six months of the initial offence
2	Association between diversion and arrest within 12 months of the initial offence ²⁷
3	Association between diversion and arrest within six months of the initial offence (for White CYP only)
4	Association between diversion and arrest within six months of the initial offence (for ethnic minority CYP only)
5	Association between formal diversion/informal diversion and arrest within six months of the initial offence ²⁸
6	Association between specific types of diversion (community resolution, triage, not in public interest, warning (informal), youth caution and youth conditional caution) and arrest within six months of the initial offence ²⁹

²⁴ We include location to help control for underlying area-specific factors which might affect the likelihood of CYPs committing offences or being suspected of committing offences.

²⁵ Note that offence type is recorded differently in CRIS and Stops, so this is also controlling for whether a CYP is appearing in CRIS or Stops.

²⁶ We include this covariate as a proxy of the likelihood that CYPs in the CRIS dataset have been involved in or committed an offence. We assume that being accused or suspected of a crime is related to the underlying probability of offending.

²⁷ For the 12-month arrest outcome, we must exclude a larger portion of our data (the last 12 months, i.e. between October 2021 and September 2022).

²⁸ For this regression, we also excluded cases where the CYP received both formal and informal diversions.

²⁹ For this regression, we also excluded cases where the CYsP received multiple specific types of diversion.

7	Association between diversion and arrest within six months of initial offence (for
	Black CYP only)

We also ran the regression analysis on a sample which had been filtered further to only include cases where the initial offence was violent.

Methodological considerations and limitations

Time period

Where we outline data in years over the period of our dataset (2015–2022), these are listed in calendar years. However, the data for 2022 is not a complete calendar year and only has values from 1 Jan 2022 to 30 September 2022. Therefore, data from the last quarter of 2022 is missing.

Demographic characteristics

Descriptive summary statistics for the sex and ethnicity of CYP are based on individual, unique CYP in our combined dataset (i.e. we take one observation per CYP). Specifically, sex and ethnicity are identified from each unique CYP's first reported incident case.

In contrast, for age (which frequently varies within CYP across incident cases), we use all incident cases, meaning that CYP with multiple incident cases are more heavily weighted.³⁰ This approach is preferable to presenting the type of outcome by age at the individual CYP level, which would require defining one age per CYP (e.g. age at their first or last recorded crime outcome) rather than one age per outcome. This would entail a loss of precision and muddle result interpretation. However, presenting outcomes by age across CYP means that CYP who were provided with more than one outcome appear more than once. This should be taken into account in the interpretation of the results.

The descriptive analysis for sex and ethnicity is also limited by missing and/or contradictory data within datasets, as these observations are coded as unknown/missing for the relevant characteristic. Nevertheless, we report results for this group of observations where relevant.

Previous arrests

The number of previous arrests for CYP is based on the time period available for our data (2015–2022). This means that if CYP in our data were arrested prior to 2015, this information

³⁰ We acknowledge that individuals may identify with a different gender or ethnicity over time. However, the data does not identify whether a change in a CYP's gender or ethnicity is due to CYPs reporting a different gender or ethnicity or errors in recording this data. Therefore, we believe our approach is the most feasible way to identify these characteristics.

is not captured within our dataset. Therefore, our calculation of previous arrests may not reflect the total number of previous arrests for CYP.

Crime harm

We only rely on data within the CRIS dataset to measure crime harm using the CCHI. This is because CRIS contains Home Office offence codes, which enable us to match offences in CRIS to relevant CHHI scores. Data in Stops and NSPIS do not contain Home Office offence codes, so we have not included data originating from these datasets when measuring crime harm.

A key limitation of the CCHI is that it does not provide crime harm scores for all offences in CRIS. This is because the CCHI is based on sentencing guidelines and sentencing guidelines are not published for every offence. Overall, 73.1% of cases in CRIS can be matched to a CCHI score via their Home Office offence code.

This index was last aligned with the sentencing guidelines for England and Wales on 6 October 2020. There may have been subsequent changes within the sentencing guidelines, such as the 'starting point' for the length of imprisonment for different offences or new offences which may have been added to the sentencing guidelines. These changes would affect the calculation of crime harm metrics for the CCHI. Our analysis of crime harm using the CCHI does not reflect the current sentencing guidelines.

The CCHI is also a static measure of crime harm. There may have been changes within the sentencing guidelines between 2015 and 2022, which could have impacted the weight of crime harm assigned to different crimes. Nonetheless, this provides a more consistent measure of crime harm for comparison across time.

Outcome data

The disposal outcomes used in this report (i.e. diverted, escalated and indeterminate outcomes) reflect internal MPS data about how alleged or suspected crimes are resolved. These outcomes do not reflect police-recorded Home Office outcome codes. Home Office outcome codes were not provided in the MPS data for this study. Therefore, the findings from this study cannot be compared to publicly available data which relies on police-recorded Home Office outcome codes.

For instance, Outcome 22 is an outcome code which refers to 'Diversionary, educational or intervention activity, resulting from the crime report, has been undertaken and it is not in the public interest to take any further action'.³¹ However, we are unable to identify which

³¹ <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-recorded-crime-open-data-tables/police-recorded-crime-and-outcomes-open-data-tables-user-guide#crime-outcomes-open-data</u>

specific types of diversion outcomes in the MPS data correspond with Outcome 22. It is also worth noting that according to a freedom of information request made to the MPS, Outcome 22 was rarely used during the time period covered by the study.³²

Methodological considerations and limitations for RQ2

The data used in this analysis is based on the CRIS dataset, which offers more detailed information about the location of diversions and the different types of offences that are diverted. We identify the borough based on the BCU recorded as responding to the alleged crime incident.

Within the CRIS dataset, an 'Other' category is included for cases where a specific borough is not listed. In some instances, the location data is entirely missing. Combined, these 'Other' and missing locations account for 0.8% of the total volume of cases. This category could reflect offences which took place across multiple boroughs or where the location of the crime is not linked to a specific address – for example, a theft committed on an underground tube train travelling between stations may not be linked to a particular borough. Alternatively, it could also be explained by discrepancies in data recording processes.

To ensure clarity, we have excluded the 'Other' category and cases with missing data from our analysis. However, it is important to note differences in diversion rates between identified and unidentified borough locations. In identified boroughs, the average rate of diversion is 49.6%, compared to a higher rate of 58.5% for 'Other' locations. Cases with missing location data exhibit a significantly lower diversion rate of 18.0%.

Sample sizes for exploratory knife offence analyses

When examining differences between different groups of CYP involved in knife offences, some sample sizes become very small. For instance, our subsample of CYP with more than three knife offences is only 2.4% of the sample of CYP with any type of offence. This means that percentage differences between these two should be interpreted with caution, as they may not reliably represent true patterns in the broader population.

³² <u>https://www.met.police.uk/foi-ai/metropolitan-police/d/april-2022/use-of-police-outcome-code-22-outcome-22-on-mps-crime-reports-from-april-2021-to-march-2022/</u>

Main results

RQ1: what are the characteristics of CYP who are diverted, and how does this compare to CYP who are not diverted?

Key findings

- The number of CYP who came into contact with police in London declined by 17% from 2015 to 2022. Of those in contact, the proportion who were diverted and escalated also declined over this period. This was offset by a proportionally greater increase in CYP with indeterminate outcomes.
- The growth in indeterminate outcomes can largely be explained by an increase in 'victim(s) unwilling to prosecute', which grew from 48% of CYP with indeterminate outcomes in 2015 to 63% in 2022.
- Among CYP diverted or escalated, a growing share is being diverted, particularly after the pandemic. In 2020, 43% of CYP receiving a formal disposal were diverted, increasing to 54% in 2022.
- Triage and not in the public interest are the most common types of diversion for all offences, accounting for 31.7% and 25.9%, respectively, between 2015 and 2022. These were also the most common types of diversion for violent offences.
- CYP who are diverted are disproportionately younger (88% of 10-year-olds compared to 32% of 17-year-olds), female (67% of females compared to 45% of males) and White (55% of White CYP are diverted compared to 42% of Black CYP).
- Having more previous arrests decreases the likelihood of being diverted. For example, 51% of CYP with no previous arrests were diverted, compared to 41% with four previous arrests. However, a notably high 35% of CYP with five or more previous arrests were still diverted.
- Less harmful offences are more likely to lead to a diversion. Theft is the most common type of offence that results in CYP being diverted compared to being escalated. The rate of diversion is lowest for robbery.
- We explored how much of the difference between Black and White diversion rates can be accounted for by the nature and type of offending (i.e. is it that Black CYP commit more serious offences and more persistently offend, leading to lower diversion rates?) After controlling for these factors, the difference fell by around half, to 9%. Therefore, it appears much of the difference in diversion rates between Black and White CYP cannot be explained by the types of offences they've committed alone.

We outline the differences in key characteristics of CYP who are diverted compared to those who are not. We focus on those CYP who only ever received a diverted outcome (diverted) and those who only ever received an escalated outcome (i.e. not diverted).

When comparing the characteristics of CYP, we excluded individuals who only had indeterminate outcomes, i.e. those neither escalated nor diverted (323,467 cases in the combined dataset, or 66.4%). However, when examining overall trends, we included indeterminate outcomes to provide context on the volume of cases which come into contact with police.

Note on outcomes

Diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes in this section and throughout this report do not refer to police-recorded outcome codes (e.g. Outcome 22).³³ Diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes have been categorised based on the specific types of disposal outcomes within the MPS data available for this report. While the outcomes noted in this report may overlap with police-recorded outcome codes (e.g. community resolution or youth caution), the findings in this report should not be interpreted as representing the use of police-recorded outcome codes in dealing with incidents of crime.

In places where we have provided figures, the underlying data is also provided in tables in <u>Appendix C</u>.

Findings

Overall trends in outcomes for CYP (all offences)

There is a consistent downward trend in the overall number of CYP coming into contact with the MPS for any offence, from 30,060 in 2015 to 24,970 in 2021 (–16.9%). Alongside the decrease in overall CYP contact with the police, outcomes that were given across the period also shifted. In particular, a far lower proportion of CYP was escalated (22.1%) in 2022 compared to 2015 (34.4%), while the proportion given an indeterminate outcome increased from 36.5% in 2015 to 52.1% in 2022. The proportion diverted was similar across the period, with a slight decrease from 29.1% in 2015 to 25.7% in 2022. These results suggest that the decline in escalation was driven more by an increase in the proportion of indeterminate outcomes than diversion.

³³ For details on police recorded outcome codes see <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-recorded-crime-open-data-tables/police-recorded-crime-and-outcomes-open-data-tables-user-guide</u>



Figure 2: Number of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes between 2015 and 2021³⁴

However, it is worth noting that this period covers the Covid-19 pandemic, so it is also possible that the shift in outcomes relates to differences in the kinds of offences committed during this period and general contact with the police compared to the pre-pandemic period. Changes in the proportions of CYP escalated, diverted and given indeterminate outcomes were more stable during the pre-pandemic period (2015–2019) and more dynamic during the pandemic period (2020–2022). Nonetheless, even though the shift from escalation to indeterminate outcomes accelerated during the pandemic, it had started before the pandemic, suggesting that it is a longer-term trend.

At the start of the pre-pandemic period, more CYP were escalated than diverted. In 2015, of the CYP who came into contact with the police, 34.4% were escalated, while 29.1% were diverted (54.1% and 45.9%, respectively, out of children who were either escalated or diverted). However, this changed during the pandemic period, when diverted CYP became slightly more prevalent than escalated CYP. By 2022, 25.7% of CYP were diverted compared to 22.1% escalated CYP (53.% and 46.2%, respectively, out of those children who were either

³⁴ We have shown the volume of unique CYPs from 2015 to 2021, as we do not have data for the full year in 2022. The volume of CYPs in 2022 is not directly comparable with volumes in 2015–2022.

diverted or escalated). This represents a shift from a higher proportion escalated than diverted to a higher proportion diverted than escalated.

The proportion of escalated cases decreased between 2015 and 2022 by 8.7%pts, but the pace of change was not consistent. During the pre-pandemic period, there was a more gradual decline (-14.5%) in the proportion of CYP with escalated outcomes (from 34.4% in 2015 to 29.4% in 2019). During the pandemic period, there was a much more pronounced decrease (-28.0%) in the proportion of CYP with escalated outcomes (from 30.7% of CYP in 2020 to 22.1% of CYP in 2022). This suggests that the overall decline in escalated CYP accelerated during the pandemic period, though the trend towards reducing the proportion of escalated CYP began during the pre-pandemic period (Youth Endowment Fund, 2022).

At the same time, the proportion of diverted CYP remained somewhat stable between 2015 and 2022. During the pre-pandemic period, the proportion of diverted CYP actually decreased from 29.1% in 2015 to 24.9% in 2019 (representing a relative decline of 14.3%). However, during the pandemic period, the rate of diversion increased slightly from 23.4% in 2020 to 25.7% in 2022. The increase in diversion during this period may have been associated with the Covid-19 pandemic and related lockdown policies.





During this period, the increase in indeterminate outcomes was primarily driven by an increase in 'victim unwilling to prosecute', which accounted for 63% of CYP with indeterminate outcomes by 2022, up from 48% in 2015. The second most common indeterminate outcome was 'insufficient evidence', which fell from 55% in 2015 to 38% in 2022. Meanwhile, 'no further action' outcomes fell from 13% of CYP with indeterminate outcomes in 2015 to 4% in 2022. For a breakdown of indeterminate outcomes during this period, refer to Table 34 (see <u>Appendix C</u>).

Characteristics of CYP who are diverted or escalated (all offences)

The rate of diversion for offences presented in the figures below refers to the proportion of diverted cases out of diverted and/or escalated cases. This rate excludes indeterminate outcomes (refer to the <u>Sample</u> section for details). This reflects characteristics associated with diversion or escalation outcomes rather than characteristics of CYP with any police contact.

Age

Overall, we find there is a consistent trend of younger CYP receiving diverted outcomes at a higher rate than older CYP. CYP aged 10–14 years appear more likely to be diverted compared to being escalated. For instance, more than 85% of incident cases result in a diversion for CYP aged 10 and 11.

From age 14 onwards, escalated outcomes become more common than diverted outcomes. Indeed, by age 17, only about 1 in 3 incident cases results in a diverted outcome.



Figure 4: Number of incident cases across ages of CYP

The majority of the CYP in our sample are male. Male CYP represent a much higher volume of incident cases, and a higher proportion of these (55.2%) receive an escalated outcome rather than a diverted outcome compared to female CYP (32.7%).

Conversely, out of those who receive either a diversion or escalation, a much larger proportion of female CYP receive a diverted outcome (67.3%) compared to male CYP (44.8%).

There are a relatively small number of CYP whose sex is not identifiable in the data, but a higher proportion of these CYP (77.2%) also received a diversion.



Figure 5: Sex of CYP diverted or escalated between 2015 and 2022

Ethnicity

To contextualise the results of diverted outcomes for CYP by ethnicity, we first outline the overall volumes of CYP from different ethnic backgrounds in the combined dataset from 2015 to 2022:³⁵

• White CYP: 115,154 (21.0% diverted, 17.8% escalated, 61.2% indeterminate)

Sex

³⁵ These figures are based on any diversionary, any escalatory and any indeterminate outcomes to provide overall figures of diversionary outcomes provided to ethnic minority CYPs. This includes CYPs who may have received more than one diversionary/escalatory/indeterminate outcome within a single incident case. We also note the ethnicity categories presented in this analysis were constrained by existing ethnicity categories used in police data and do not conform to current standard ethnicity categories used in government. In particular, it was not possible based on the police classifications to separate out children from mixed ethnicity backgrounds.

- Black CYP: 124,451 (15.7% diverted, 20.5% escalated, 63.8% indeterminate)
- Asian CYP: 33,533 (17.6% diverted, 17.0% escalated, 65.5% indeterminate)
- Middle Eastern CYP: 8,086 (14.6% diverted, 15.1% escalated, 70.3% indeterminate)

Compared to the local population, Black CYP are overrepresented in our sample, making up 44.3% of all cases of CYP who came into contact with the police (excluding CYP with unknown/missing ethnicity data). Based on estimates of the population of CYP aged 10–17 years between 2015 and 2022 in London, 24.7% of the CYP population was Black, 45.3% was White, 25.3% was Asian and 4.7% was Middle Eastern.³⁶ Therefore, Black CYP are nearly doubly overrepresented in the sample (87.7%).

However, across ethnic groups, Black CYP receive the lowest proportion of diverted outcomes (compared to escalated outcomes). Of the four main ethnic groups defined in this analysis, White CYP have the highest rate of diversion (54.7%), whereas Black CYP have a 42.0% rate of diversion. Asian and Middle Eastern CYP have relatively similar rates of diversion (50.6% and 48.9%, respectively).

It is worth noting that a substantial proportion of the sample has unknown/missing ethnicity in the combined dataset (17.5% of those who are either diverted or escalated). If we had information on the 'true' ethnicities of these CYP, the summary statistics could meaningfully change.



Figure 6: Ethnicity of CYP diverted or escalated between 2015 and 2022

³⁶ Estimates were based on ethnic group projection estimates from the Greater London Authority. See <u>https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ethnic-group-population-projections</u>. We provide the filtered data used to calculate population estimates in <u>Appendix F</u>.

Previous arrests (2015–2018)

Most CYP (according to their first offence from 2019 onwards) have no prior arrests in the 2015–2018 period, regardless of whether they are diverted or escalated. CYP who are alleged or suspected of an offence without a prior arrest have an almost equal chance of being diverted (51.4%) or escalated (48.6%), whereas CYP with previous arrests are escalated at higher rates than diverted. There are a small number of CYP with relatively high numbers of previous arrests. For CYP who were diverted, there was one CYP who had 27 prior arrests (none of which resulted in an escalated outcome). For CYP who were escalated, there was one CYP who had 36 prior arrests. These were, respectively, the highest number of previous offences in each group of CYP.

There is a downward relationship in the rate of diversion as the number of previous arrests increases. For CYP with one to four previous offences, the rate of diversion progressively decreases but remains relatively stable (from 46.0% to 41.5%). There is a pronounced drop in the diversion rate of CYP if they have five or more offences, with a 35.0% rate of diversion for this group.



Figure 7: Diverted or escalated CYP based on previous arrests

Type of offence

Offences in crime reports (CRIS)

Theft offences are the most likely to be diverted, with nearly two out of three incident cases of theft (65.7%) resulting in a diversion. Other types of offences with high rates of diversion

are arson and criminal damage (62.1%), miscellaneous crimes against society (57.2%) and drug offences (55.0%). Robbery offences are the least likely type of offence to result in a diversion (7.9%). Vehicle offences (17.1%), burglary offences (19.9%) and possession of weapons (26.6%) also have lower rates of diversion. Vehicle offences can include comparatively low harm offences (e.g. using mobile phones while driving), which could be deemed suitable for diversion. However, fixed penalty notices and fines have been categorised as escalatory outcomes. As such, this may account for the relatively low rates of diversion (compared to being escalated) for vehicle offences.

There are very similar rates of diversion for violence against the person (51.1%) and sexual offences (51.4%). Despite including relatively serious crimes, these two types of offences do not have low rates of diversion.

The rate of diversion does not appear to be related to the volume of offences, suggesting that more common offences are not more likely to result in diversion. For instance, there are relatively fewer arson and criminal damage (7,083 incident cases) and miscellaneous crimes against society offences (5,406). On the other hand, theft offences have more incident cases (13,788) than the two prior offence types combined. However, all three offence types have high rates of diversion.







Figure 9: Offence types in CRIS with lower proportions of diverted outcomes

Reasons for stop and search (Stops)

We primarily use the reasons for a stop and search as a proxy for the type of offence for which a CYP was stopped. We also note cases resulting in indeterminate outcomes from Stops have been excluded from our sample (see the Sample section for further details). Overall, CYP have more escalated outcomes (79.0% of cases) compared to diverted outcomes (21.0%) for cases in Stops (when looking only at CYP with diverted and/or escalated outcomes).³⁷

The reason for a stop with the highest proportion of diverted outcomes (compared to escalated outcomes) are fireworks, psychoactive substances and articles to cause criminal damage. However, these types of offences have very low volumes. Escalated and diverted cases for these types of offences account for only 1.5% of cases (662 cases) which have a stop reason.

Drug offences have the highest volume of both diverted and escalated outcomes (18,135 cases), with a comparatively higher proportion of diversions. Nearly a third of all stops for drug offences result in a diversion (32.1%), compared to an escalated outcome. In comparison, theft and violence-related offences have a much lower proportion of diverted incident cases. Weapons, points and blades ('weapons') have the second highest volume of both diverted and escalated outcomes. However, this is associated with a substantially lower proportion of diversions (9.8%). Firearms have a similarly low proportion of diverted cases (9.4%). Stolen property and going equipped have the third and fourth highest offence volume

³⁷This also includes cases which appear in Stops, and are linked with incident cases for the same CYP in CRIS.

of both diverted and escalated cases (8,793 cases and 3,418 cases, respectively). However, these also have a much lower proportion of diverted cases (15.8% and 12.3%, respectively).



Figure 10: Stop outcome reasons with higher proportions of diverted outcomes

Figure 11: Stop outcome reasons with lower proportions of diverted outcomes



Diverted outcomes

Informal diversions are given to CYP in about a third of all incident cases (34.7%). This is almost four times more than the rate at which formal diversions are given (8.5%). A total of 13,014 cases have formal diversion outcomes, while 53,091 cases have informal diversion.³⁸

When looking at the specific methods of diversion, triage and not in the public interest are the most common types of diverted outcomes across both informal and formal types of diversion. Looking at formal diversions specifically, a youth caution is much more likely to be given to CYP (16.0% of all types of diversion) compared to a youth conditional caution (4.3%).





Severity of crime⁴⁰

There is a consistent trend of less harmful offences having greater rates of diversion. A lower proportion of medium harm offences have a diverted outcome (37.8%) compared to low harm offences (48%). High harm offences have the lowest proportion of diverted outcomes (17%).

³⁸ This includes incident cases which involve more than one diversionary outcome. There are 4,661 cases which include both a formal and informal type of diversion for different offences.

³⁹ Formal diversions include youth caution and youth conditional caution. Informal diversions include community resolution, triage, not in the public interest and (informal) warnings

⁴⁰ Not all offences have a corresponding CCHI score. Only 73.1% of cases in CRIS can be matched to a between CCHI score via their Home Office offence code. Cases that appear only in Stops do not have Home Office offence codes so cannot be linked to CCHI data.



Figure 13: Crime harm across diverted outcomes

Overall trends in outcomes for CYP across time (violent offences)

The number of CYP coming into contact with the police for violent offences remained relatively stable between 2015 (12,070) and 2021 (11,526). As with all offences, the proportion of CYP who were escalated declined, although even more sharply, from 28.7% in 2015 to 12.5% in 2022, while the proportion given an indeterminate outcome greatly increased, from 47.3% in 2015 to 71.7% in 2022. The decrease in the proportion diverted was also more pronounced than for all offences, from 24.0% in 2015 to 15.8% in 2022. These trends highlight the growing use of indeterminate outcomes for responding to CYP involved in violent offences.

Unlike for all offences, the pace of change across outcomes was relatively stable across both the pre-pandemic and pandemic periods. This, alongside the relatively stable volume of violent offences across the period, suggests that the change in outcomes may be more due to changes in policing.



Figure 14: Number of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes for violent offences between 2015 and 2021⁴¹

 $^{^{41}}$ We have shown the volume of unique CYP from 2015-2021 as we do not have data for the full year in 2022. The volume of CYP in 2022 is not directly comparable with volumes in 2015 – 2022.



Figure 15: Proportion of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes for violent offences between 2015 and 2022

Characteristics of CYP who are diverted or escalated (violent offences)

We present descriptive statistics for incident cases which have been diverted for a violent offence compared to diversions for non-violent offences. The rate of diversion for violent offences presented in the figures below refers to the proportion of diverted cases for violent offences out of diverted and/or escalated violent cases. Similarly, the rate of diversion for non-violent offences refers to the proportion of incident cases diverted for non-violent offences out of diverted and/or escalated non-violent incident cases. These rates do not incorporate indeterminate outcomes.

Age

Younger CYP have slightly higher rates of diversion (vs escalation) for violent offences compared to non-violent offences. The proportion of diverted cases for violent offences ranges from 85.4% to 41.4% for 11–15-year-old CYP. This is slightly higher than the proportion of cases diverted for non-violent offences across the same age group (82.7% to 37.1%). Meanwhile, 17-year-old CYP involved in violence have a lower proportion of diverted outcomes compared to 17-year-olds involved in non-violent offences. This could suggest a greater emphasis on providing diverted outcomes for younger CYP involved in violence compared to other types of offences.



Figure 16: Number of incident cases across ages of CYP for violent offences

Sex

There are similar rates of diversion across sexes when comparing the proportion of CYP diverted (vs escalated) for violent offences against the proportion of CYP diverted (vs escalated) for non-violent offences. Male CYP have lower rates of diversion for both violent (43.9%) and non-violent offences (42.6%) compared to female CYP diverted for violent (62.8%) and non-violent offences (68.9%). This suggests that male and female CYP have a similar likelihood of being diverted for violent offences as for non-violent offences.

There was a small number of CYP associated with violent offences whose sex was not identifiable or recorded in the data. However, given the relatively small number of CYP, it is unlikely to change the overall trend.



Figure 17: Sex of CYP diverted for violent offences (compared to all non-violent offences) between 2015 and 2022

Ethnicity

The rate of diversion (compared to being escalated) is higher across all ethnicities for violent offences compared to non-violent offences. This difference was the least pronounced for White CYP, who had very similar rates of diversion for non-violent (53.3%) and violent offences (54.3%).

Across both violent and non-violent offences, Black CYP had the lowest rate of diversion (42.4% for violent offences, 39.1% for non-violent offences) compared to other ethnic groups. The proportion of Asian CYP diverted for violent offences (51.9%) is slightly higher than for Black CYP, while Middle Eastern CYP have the highest rate of diversion for violent offences (55.1%).



Figure 18: Ethnicity of CYP diverted (vs escalated) for violent offences compared to being diverted for non-violent offences (2015–2022)

Previous arrests (2015–2018)

Most CYP diverted for violent offences had no previous offences in the 2015–2018 period (93.1%, according to their first offence as recorded from 2019 onwards). CYP have a higher rate of diversion (vs being escalated) for non-violent offences than for violent offences across CYP with prior arrests. However, for CYP with no prior arrests, a higher proportion are diverted for violent offences (57.6%) than non-violent offences (49.4%). This could suggest a slightly greater emphasis on diverting CYP when their first suspected offence is associated with violence.



Figure 19: Diverted CYP for violent offences (compared to nonviolent offences) between 2015 and 2022 based on previous arrests

Type of offence⁴²

CYP diverted for violent offences are most likely to be diverted (vs being escalated) for an offence of violence against the person (51.7%) or sexual offences (51.3%). Vehicle offences also have a comparatively high diversion rate of 45.1% (vs being escalated). Rates of diversion associated with violent offences are much lower for other types of (non-violent) offences, given our specification of offences defined as violent. For non-violent offences, diversions were most prevalent for theft (66.6%), arson and criminal damage (62.4%), miscellaneous crimes against society (57.6%) and drug offences (55.5%).

Across both violent and non-violent offences, rates of diversion do not appear to be driven by the volume of offences across different offence types. For instance, the volume of diversions for violent offences is much higher for violence against the person offences (15,651 cases) compared to sexual offences (1,409), although these have roughly similar rates of diversion. Similarly, non-violent offences, drug offences and miscellaneous crime against society, have roughly similar rates of diversion, although the volume of cases for drug offences (13,691) is higher than for miscellaneous crimes against society (3,065).

⁴² We only present offence types using data on the type of offence from CRIS. We do not present the reason for stops, given there were very few observations in Stops which aligned with our definition of violence. This is likely due to the context in which stop and search occurs.



Figure 20: Common diversions for violent offences (compared to non-violent offences) across different offence types

Note: individual cases are categorised as violent or non-violent based on more granular Home Office codes than the higher-level categories presented in the graph, which are based on police data. This means that some non-violent offences sit under categories such as violence against the person (e.g. endangering life at sea), and some violent offences sit under categories such as theft (e.g. aggravated vehicle taking). We also do not define non-contact offences (e.g. stalking) as violent offences; this can also sit under the violence against the person category within the broad Home Office categories.



Figure 21: Less common diversions for violent offences (compared to non-violent offences) across different offence types

Diverted (violent) Diverted (non-violent) Proportion of CYP diverted for violent offence Proportion of CYP diverted for non-violent offences

Type of diversion

Nearly a third of all diversions are for violent offences, while 21.7% of all cases involve violent offences. This implies that diversions are over-applied to violent offences.

Informal diversions are more common for both violent (85.6% of cases) and non-violent offences (79.4% of cases), but there are differences in the prevalence of specific types of diversion when comparing violent and non-violent offences.

For violent offences, not in the public interest is the most common specific type of diversion (20.0% of all cases, escalated and diverted). In contrast, not in the public interest accounts for only 10.1% of non-violent offences. Non-violent offences are also slightly more likely to result in a community resolution (10.8% of cases) compared to violent offences (6.4% of cases).

Meanwhile, the proportion of cases resulting in triage and both types of formal diversion (youth caution and youth conditional caution) are similar for both violent (14.9%, 7.9% and 2.1%, respectively) and non-violent cases (15.8%, 7.9% and 2.4%, respectively).



Figure 22: Proportion of diverted outcomes across violent and non-violent incident cases⁴³

Severity of crime⁴⁴

Most violent offences were associated with lower harm CCHI scores, as with all offence types. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there were a greater number of violent offences with escalated

 ⁴³Formal diversions include youth caution and youth conditional caution. Informal diversions include triage, not in the public interest, community resolution, youth caution, youth conditional caution and (informal) warning.
⁴⁴Nearly 99% of violent offences in CRIS could be matched to CCHI scores, compared to 73.1% across all offence types.

outcomes (compared to diverted outcomes) with high and medium crime harm scores, although it is worth noting that the numbers here are very small.

When comparing violent to non-violent cases, the proportion of diverted outcomes (vs escalated outcomes) for high harm and medium harm offences was much higher for non-violent offences (80.0% and 51.1%, respectively) than for violent offences (16.4% and 18.7%, respectively).

This could indicate that certain non-violent offences are treated differently than violent offences when considering whether diversions are appropriate outcomes. However, we note that the range of scores for the crime harm categories is relatively large and that there are very small numbers in the high and very high harm categories, so there is a high level of uncertainty about whether this difference is more than random chance. Taken together, this could also indicate that these trends may not be reflective of consistent trends in the treatment of more harmful offences.





Ethnicity: regression analysis findings

As noted above, White CYP and Black CYP experience noticeably different rates of diversion based on the raw data. We explored to what degree this difference could be attributed to observable factors in our datasets, such as age, type of offence, severity of offence and number of previous offences (see Research design for more details).

We find there is a strong statistically significant difference between the likelihood of diversion for Black CYPs compared to White CYP. In terms of the unadjusted figures, 59.5% of White CYP are diverted compared to 43.5% of Black CYP – a 16.01%pt difference (p < 0.001).⁴⁵ This difference is roughly halved to an estimated 8.88%pts (p < 0.001) after controlling for observable individual-level characteristics, which is still a large and statistically significant gap.

This highlights that some of the differences between the rates of diversion for White CYP and Black CYP can be explained by individual-level characteristics (e.g. the number of previous arrests and the severity of offences). However, there is still a meaningful gap between the diversion rates of White CYP and Black CYP after accounting for the observable characteristics in our datasets. This remaining difference could be explained by other unobserved socioeconomic factors (e.g. deprivation and provision of youth services), individual-level CYP characteristics typically associated with offending and related to socioeconomic factors (e.g. mental health diagnosis, substance use and family support), experiences of discrimination or racism, or other circumstantial factors (e.g. perceived cooperation with police during the investigation) that affect White and Black CYP differently.

This difference could also reflect systemic or individual-level differences in policing behaviour, including potential bias in the decision to divert Black CYP or not. We cannot tell from our analysis which of these explanations is most likely.

	Model: receiving a diversion
Mean diversion rate for White CYP (%)	59.53
Difference in diversion rate for Black CYP – not adjusting for covariates (%pts)	-16.01***
Difference in diversion rate for Black CYP – after adjusting for covariates (%pts)	-8.80***
Number of observations	17,318

Table 13: Regression analysis investigating the relationship between the likelihood of being diverted and ethnicity (White CYP and Black CYP)⁴⁶

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

⁴⁵ Note that the unadjusted average rate of diversion for White CYPs is different to the rate of diversion presented above in Figure 5. This is because our sample for this regression analysis only includes diversion from 2019 to 2022 in order to control for prior arrests in the 2015 to 2018 period. See <u>Sample</u> for further details.

⁴⁶ Due to the small sample sizes, we did not conduct regression analyses investigating the difference in diversion rates for CYPs from other ethnic groups.

RQ2: Is there variation across London boroughs in the use of different types of diversion and in who is diverted?

Key findings

- Overall, we found that there has been an increase in the rate of diversion (as a proportion of diverted and escalated cases) across boroughs from 2015 to 2022
- Outer London areas, such as Bromley, Bexley and Kingston Upon Thames, were the boroughs with the highest average rates of diversion for CYP.
- Generally, White and Asian CYP experience higher rates of diversion (vs escalation) compared to Black CYP, although this pattern varies by borough. White CYP are mostly diverted at rates between 50% and 60%, while Black CYP are diverted at slightly lower rates, typically between 40% and 50%.
- Similar types of offences were likely to result in diverted outcomes across boroughs, with drug offences and arson and criminal damage offences being the most likely to result in diversion.
- In most boroughs, formal diversion was used in roughly one in 10 cases, whereas the use of informal diversion was higher but more varied.
- After controlling for area-level factors, such as the type and nature of offending and the age and ethnic characteristics of those who offend, Bromley, Bexley, Hammersmith and Fulham, Merton, and Kingston Upon Thames had significantly higher diversion rates compared to the borough with the median rate of diversion (Newham).
- Lambeth, Haringey and Hackney had the three lowest rates of diversion. After controlling for individual-level factors, Harrow, Tower Hamlets and Greenwich had significantly lower rates of diversion (compared to Newham).
- The spread in the rate of diversion across boroughs is roughly halved from 45.1%pts to 21.5%pts after controlling for individual-level factors.

Where we refer to the rate of diversion, this is based on the proportion of diverted cases out of diverted and/or escalated cases. This rate excludes indeterminate outcomes.

Detailed data tables supporting the analysis can be found in <u>Appendix D</u>.

Findings

Overall trends

Overall, we found that there has been an increase in the use of diversions across boroughs from 2015 to 2022, with most boroughs exhibiting generally higher diversion rates in 2022 compared to 2015. Across this period, the average rate of diversion in most boroughs ranged between 40% and 50%.

Some boroughs demonstrated a notable increase in diversion rates over the study period. For example, Barking and Dagenham saw its rate of diversion rise from 39.2% in 2015 to 59.1% in 2022. Similarly, Hillingdon and Havering increased their diversion rates from 57.5% and 50.5%, respectively, in 2015 to 68.9% and 67.7%, respectively, in 2022. However, some boroughs did not show particularly strong increases in their rates of diversion. For instance, Haringey had a 39.0% rate of diversion in 2015, which only increased to 46.1% by 2022.

For some boroughs, diversion rates were volatile over time. Richmond upon Thames, for instance, recorded rates ranging from 42.5% to 74.4%, while Kensington and Chelsea exhibited variation in rates between 42.2% and 61.6%.

Importantly, the volume of crime does not appear to drive differences in the use of diversions across boroughs. High-volume boroughs often displayed similar diversion rates to those with lower volumes. For example, Bromley, which recorded a comparatively high volume of incidents (9,991), had a high diversion rate of 65.6%. In contrast, Lambeth, with a similar number of incident cases (10,104), exhibited a lower diversion rate of 42.2%.



Figure 24: Average rate of diversion across London boroughs

60.0% to 69.9%

70.0% to 79.9%
Figure 25: Overall percentage point change in the rates of diversion across London boroughs from 2015 to 2022.



Кеу	Percentage point change in rate of diversion
	-6.0% to 0.0%
	0.0% to 9.9%
	10.0% to 19.9%
	20.0% to 25.0%

Ethnicity

Population estimates of diversion

Using population estimates for CYP across boroughs, we compare the proportion of CYP from each ethnic group who come into contact with police (regardless of outcome) with the proportion of CYP from these ethnic groups in the London population.⁴⁷

Table 14: CYP population and average rates of diversion by ethnici
--

	White CYP	Black CYP	Asian CYP	Middle Eastern CYP
Average population in London (2015– 2022)	1,082,957 (45.3%)	591,636 (24.7%)	604,203 (25.3%)	112,395 (4.7%)
Proportion of CYP in the population with any kind of police contact	10.6%	21.0%	5.5%	7.2%
Proportion of CYP with diverted outcomes (in CRIS)	21.0%	15.7%	17.6%	22.3%
Proportion of CYP with escalated outcomes	17.8%	20.5%	17.0%	15.1%
Diversion rate (out of diversion and escalation)	54.1%	43.4%	50.9%	49.2%

Black CYP are more likely than any other ethnic group to come into contact with police (regardless of outcome), with over 2–4 times the representation of every other ethnic group. At the same time, Black CYP are the least likely to be diverted and most likely to receive an escalated outcome.

Key trends

We found large disparities in diversion rates between 2015 and 2022 for different ethnic groups across boroughs. In general, White and Asian CYP experience higher rates of diversion

⁴⁷ Estimates were based on ethnic group projection estimates from the Greater London Authority. See <u>https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ethnic-group-population-projections</u>

(vs being escalated) compared to Black CYP. Most boroughs divert White CYP at rates between 50% and 60%, while Black CYP are diverted at slightly lower rates, typically between 40% and 50%. The consistency of these differences across boroughs suggests that there is a systematic influence on how CYP from different ethnic backgrounds are treated.

For instance, in Kingston upon Thames – the borough with the highest rates of diversion for both groups – 70.7% of White CYP were diverted compared to 54.7% of Black CYP. At the other end of the spectrum, the lowest diversion rates for both groups were observed in Barnet, with White CYP diverted at a rate of 47.9% and Black CYP at 40.3%.

Asian CYP also experience higher rates of diversion compared to Black CYP, though these rates are more variable across boroughs. This is potentially due to the smaller number of Asian CYP in the sample in each borough. For example, diversion rates for Asian CYP range from 44.8% in Tower Hamlets to 84.1% in Sutton. Similarly, Middle Eastern CYP show relatively high but inconsistent rates of diversion. In Sutton, 100% of Middle Eastern CYP were diverted, while in Newham, the diversion rate for this group was only 42.9%. As with Asian CYP, this variation is likely due to the small numbers of Middle Eastern CYP in boroughs: there are eight Middle Eastern CYP in Sutton and 12 Middle Eastern CYP in Newham. When sample sizes are small, diversion rates tend to be more volatile, making it challenging to draw definitive conclusions about broader trends for this ethnic group.

Offence type

We observed a relatively consistent pattern across all boroughs regarding the types of offences that are more or less likely to result in a diverted outcome. Theft, drug offences, and arson and criminal damage offences are the most likely to result in diversion. In contrast, vehicle offences, burglary and robbery are among the least likely offences to lead to diversion.

Type of diversion

Most boroughs had the same level of formal diversion (10–15% diversion rates out of diverted or escalated cases). The highest rates were observed in Kingston upon Thames (15.9%), Richmond (15.2%) and Tower Hamlets (15.0%). Some boroughs, such as Sutton (8.9%) and Lambeth (9.2%), were a bit lower in the rates of formal diversion.

There was much more variation across boroughs in the use of informal diversion. Over half of boroughs used informal diversions in 30–40% of cases which were diverted or escalated. Bromley (56.7%), Sutton (55.6%), Bexley (55.4%) and Kingston upon Thames (55.2%) showed comparatively high rates of diversion using informal diversion. Hackney had the lowest rate (33.6%).

Rates of diversion: regression analysis findings

While it's interesting to know that boroughs vary in their use of diversion, we don't know how much of this can be explained by the pattern and profile of offending locally or whether there are differences in how police and justice services in those areas choose to use diversions. To explore this further, we tested to what extent differences in borough-level diversion rates could be explained by individual-level characteristics, such as age, ethnicity and the profile of offending locally, such as the frequency and seriousness of offending (see Research design for more details).

We find that observable individual-level characteristics explain some of the differences in diversion rates between boroughs. Prior to controlling for these characteristics, there was a range of 45.1% pts in the rates of diversion (from 69.8% in Bromley to 48.5% in Harrow). This shrinks to a range of 21.5% pts after adjusting for individual-level characteristics and offending profiles. In addition, the standard deviation falls from 8.60% pts to 5.53% pts, reflecting less variation once covariates are accounted for.

However, there are still boroughs that are notable outliers, with either significantly higher or lower rates of diversion. We use Newham as the reference borough in this analysis, as it has the median rate of diversion after accounting for covariates (48.7% in the unadjusted and adjusted data). Eight out of the other 32 boroughs have significantly different diversion rates (p < 0.05) compared to Newham after accounting for individual-level characteristics and offending profiles.

We found five boroughs had significantly higher diversion rates (p < 0.05) compared to Newham after adjusting for individual-level characteristics and offending profiles:

- Bromley: 60.6% diversion rate
- Bexley: 59.7% diversion rate
- Hammersmith and Fulham: 58.7% diversion rate
- Merton: 58.4% diversion rate
- Kingston upon Thames: 57.7% diversion rate

There are three boroughs which have significantly lower rates of diversion (p < 0.05) compared to Newham after adjusting for individual-level characteristics and offending profiles:

- Harrow: 39.0% diversion rate
- Tower Hamlets: 41.9% diversion rate
- Greenwich: 42.0% diversion rate

The gaps in diversion rates between these eight outlier boroughs and the median borough Newham are all meaningful, ranging from 6.7% pts to 11.9% pts.

Figure 26 below shows the distribution of (unadjusted) diversion rates for each borough (left), as well as the distribution of diversion rates after adjusting for other observable individual-level characteristics (right), using Newham as the reference group.⁴⁸





These findings suggest that, for most boroughs, the average diversion rates are not significantly different after accounting for the individual-level characteristics. Nonetheless, for some boroughs, broader factors apart from individual-level characteristics (e.g. age, ethnicity and number of previous arrests) contribute to the likelihood of being diverted. Such factors could include differences in public services (e.g. funding levels for youth services),

⁴⁸ Note that unadjusted diversion rates are different to the average rates of diversion presented above in Table 15. This is because our sample for this regression analysis only includes diversion from 2019 to 2022 in order to control for prior arrests in the 2015 to 2018 period. See <u>Sample</u> for further details.

policing (e.g. attitudes to diversion, police resourcing and institutional racism), demographics (e.g. population density, socioeconomic conditions and poverty) or type of crime (e.g. organised crime networks and patterns of crime beyond what is captured in our data).

RQ3: what is the relationship between diversion and reoffending?

Key findings

- CYP who were diverted were significantly less likely to be arrested in the following six months compared to similar CYP who were escalated. Diversion is associated with a reduction in average arrest rates by 3.67%pts over six months (p < 0.001) compared to average arrest rates of 8.21% for escalated CYP. This is after taking into account factors such as age, type of offence, crime severity and number of previous arrests (p < 0.01).
- Diversion was associated with a 5.10%pt reduction in the rate of arrest over 12 months compared to an average arrest rate of 11.94% for escalated CYP.
- There appears to be a stronger relationship between being diverted and a reduced likelihood of being arrested when looking at diversions involving violent offences. There was a 6.31%pt reduction in the likelihood of being arrested within six months (p < 0.01) compared to the 10.55% arrest rate for escalated CYPs and a 7.89%pt reduction within 12 months (p < 0.1) against a 13.66% arrest rate for escalated CYP.
- There also appears to be a stronger relationship between diversion and reduced arrest rates within six months for Black CYPs than for White CYP. Diversion is associated with a 6.15%pt reduction (p < 0.01) in arrest rates within six months for Black CYP (compared to an arrest rate of 8.78% for escalated Black CYP) and a 5.25%pt reduction (p < 0.01) for White CYP (compared to an arrest rate of 5.93% for escalated White CYP). However, this is small and unlikely to be statistically significant.
- Both formal and informal diversions had a negative relationship with the probability of arrest within six months for all offence types and for violent offences.
- Some specific types of diversion are strongly associated with lower arrest rates within six months. For all offence types, not in the public interest was most strongly associated with a lower probability of arrest. For violent offences, this was strongest for community resolution and not in the public interest.
- Triage had no relationship with the likelihood of arrest (within six months) for all offence types and for violent offences.

Findings

We conducted a regression analysis of arrests within six months (or 12 months in some specifications) of CYPs' initial offence, comparing diversion with escalation in this timeframe. Individual-level characteristics, such as age, type of offence, crime severity and number of previous arrests, were also used as covariates (see <u>Research design</u> for further details).

Note that the findings from the regression analyses cannot comment on whether the use of diversion causes a change in subsequent arrests. They are measuring the statistical relationship between diversion and arrest after accounting for relevant factors in the data.

Main analysis: all offence types

We find a strong, statistically significant negative relationship between being diverted and the average future likelihood of being arrested when comparing cases with a diversion to cases with an escalation. In our sample for this analysis, 4.99% of CYP were arrested within six months of coming into contact with police. This overall rate includes CYP who received either a diverted or escalated outcome between January 2019 and March 2022. Before controlling for any covariates, diverted CYP in our sample have a 2.47% likelihood of arrest within six months and an 8.21% likelihood of arrest within 12 months. Escalated CYP have an 8.21% and 11.74% likelihood of arrest within 6 and 12 months, respectively.

In our main analysis, receiving any form of diversion was associated with a 3.67%pts lower (p < 0.001) likelihood of being arrested within six months against a rate of 8.21% for escalated CYP. Looking at the likelihood of arrest within 12 months, this drops by 5.10%pts (p < 0.001) compared to 11.94% for escalated CYP.

Formal vs informal diversion

Informal diversion had a stronger negative relationship with the average likelihood of future arrest than formal diversion, though both types of diversion had a negative relationship with the probability of arrest. Informal diversion was associated with a 4.11%pt (p < 0.001) reduction in the average likelihood of arrest over six months compared to escalated CYP, who had an arrest rate of 8.21%. Formal diversion is associated with a 2.86%pt (p < 0.01) reduction in the average likelihood of arrest over 12 months compared to an average likelihood of arrest of 11.94% for escalated CYP.

	Model: arrest in six months	Model: arrest in 12 months	Model: arrest in six months (type of diversion)
Mean outcome for the escalated group (%)	8.21	11.94	8.21
Estimated effect of diversion (%pts)	-3.67***	-5.10***	
Estimated effect of formal diversion (%pts)			-2.86**

Table 15: Regression analysis results: relationship between diversion, type of diversion andarrest

Estimated effect of informal diversion (%pts)			-4.11***
Number of observations	22,177	16,715	21,477

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Specific type of diversion

When examining the relationship between specific methods of diversion and the likelihood of arrest, not in the public interest was most strongly associated with a lower probability of arrest in the following six months. After adjusting for covariates, these CYP had average arrest rates 5.38% pts lower (p < 0.001) at six months compared to an arrest rate of 8.21% for CYP who were escalated. Community resolution and youth caution also had lower average arrest rates within six months, with reductions of 4.69% pts (p < 0.001) and 2.67% pts (p < 0.01), respectively.

Conversely, we do not observe statistically significant relationships in arrest rates within six months for triage.⁴⁹ Directionally, this type of diversion aligns with the overall hypothesis of diversion having a negative relationship with the likelihood of being arrested in the future. Triage is the most common type of diversion and has a relatively large sample size within the regression model. Therefore, it is unlikely that the lack of significance was due to a lack of statistical power.

Table 16: Regression analysis results: relationship between specific types of diversion andarrest

	Model: arrest in six months (specific type of diversion)
Mean outcome for the escalated group (%)	8.21
Estimated effect of community resolution (%pts)	-4.69***
Estimated effect of triage (%pts)	-0.79
Estimated effect of not in the public interest (%pts)	-5.38***
Estimated effect of youth caution (%pts)	-2.67**
Estimated effect of youth conditional caution (%pts)	-8.21
Number of observations	19,521

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

⁴⁹ We do not comment on the results for the relationship between youth conditional caution and the average likelihood of arrest, as the sample for this regression was too small to draw any meaningful conclusions.

Ethnicity

When investigating the relationship between diversion and arrest for CYP of different ethnic backgrounds, we found a slightly stronger negative relationship for Black CYP compared to White CYP in percentage point terms. For Black CYP, diversion was associated with a 3.79%pt reduction (p < 0.001) in arrest rates within six months compared to 8.78% for escalated Black CYP. For White CYP, diversion was associated with a 3.07%pt reduction in arrest rates within six months (p < 0.001) compared to 5.93% for escalated White CYP.

We also examined the relationship between diversion and arrest for CYP from any ethnic minority background (including Black CYP). For this group, diversion was associated with a 3.87%pt reduction in arrest rates (p < 0.001) within six months compared to 8.01% for escalated ethnic minority CYP.

	Model: arrest in six months (White CYP only)	Model: arrest in six months (Black CYP only)	Model: arrest in six months (all ethnic minority CYP only)
Mean outcome for the escalated group (%)	5.93	8.78	8.01
Estimated effect of diversion (%pts)	-3.07***	-3.79***	-3.87***
Number of observations	8,032	8,032	10,946

Table 17: Regression analysis results: relationship between diversion and arrest by ethni

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Main analysis: violent offences

We found an even stronger negative relationship between being diverted and the likelihood of arrest for cases in which the initial offence was a violent offence. For CYP in this sample, 4.71% were arrested within six months of coming into contact with police.

CYP who were diverted for violent offences showed a 6.31%pt reduction (p < 0.001) in the average likelihood of being arrested within six months compared to 10.6% for escalated CYP. In addition, the average arrest rate reduced by 7.89%pts within 12 months (p < 0.01) for CYP diverted for a violent offence compared to 13.7% for escalated CYP.

Formal vs informal diversion

We found informal diversion had a stronger relationship with reduced arrest rates than formal diversion for violent offences, although both types of diversion had significant negative relationships with the rate of arrest (as observed across all offence types). Informal types of diversion for violent offences were associated with a reduction of 6.93%pts (p < 0.001) in the likelihood of arrest within six months, whereas formal types of diversion of violent offences were associated with a reduction of arrest within six months.

Table 18: Regression analysis results: relationship between diversion and arrest for violentoffences

	Model: arrest in six months	Model: arrest in 12 months	Model: arrest in six months (type of diversion)
Mean outcome for the escalated group (%)	10.55	13.66	10.55
Estimated effect of diversion (%pts)	-6.31***	-7.89**	
Estimated effect of formal diversion (%pts)			-4.79*
Estimated effect of informal diversion (%pts)			-6.93***
Number of observations	5,693	4,645	5,588

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Specific type of diversion

Community resolution, not in the public interest and youth caution had negative relationships with the likelihood of being arrested within six months for violent offences, which is similar to all offences.

However, for violent offences, this relationship was strongest for community resolution. In contrast, it was strongest for not in the public interest for all offence types.

Being diverted via community resolution and not in the public interest are correlated with significantly lower arrest rates within six months, with a reduction of 7.98%pts (p < 0.05) and 7.71%pts (p < 0.001), respectively, compared to 10.6% for escalated CYP. Youth caution is also associated with a lower likelihood of arrest rates within six months of 5.31%pts (p < 0.05).

As with diversions for any offence, both the triage and youth conditional caution methods of diversion were not significantly associated with a change in average arrest rates compared to escalated CYP.

Table 19: Regression analysis results: relationship between specific types of diversion a	and
arrest for violent offences	

	Model: arrest in six months (specific type of diversion)
Mean outcome for the escalated group (%)	10.55
Estimated effect of community resolution (%pts)	-7.89*
Estimated effect of triage (%pts)	-3.28
Estimated effect of not in the public interest diversion (%pts)	-7.71***
Estimated effect of youth caution (%pts)	-5.31*
Estimated effect of youth conditional caution (%pts)	-10.55
Number of observations	5,293

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Ethnicity

The pattern of the relationship between diversion and arrest by ethnicity is similar for violent and all offence types. Specifically, there is a stronger negative relationship for Black CYP than White CYP. Diversion is associated with a 6.15%pt reduction (p < 0.01) in arrest rates within six months compared to 11.8% of escalated Black CYPs and a 5.25%pt reduction (p < 0.01) compared to 7.6% of escalated White CYP. For all ethnic minority groups, diversion is associated with a 6.64%pt reduction (p < 0.001) in arrest rates compared to 11.2% for escalated ethnic minority CYP.

Table 20: Regression analysis results: relationship between diversion and arrest for violent
offences by ethnicity

	Model: arrest in six months (White CYP only)	Model: arrest in six months (Black CYP only)	Model: arrest in six months (all ethnic minority CYP only)
Mean outcome for the escalated group (%)	7.59	11.84	11.17
Estimated effect of diversion (%pts)	-5.25**	-6.15**	-6.64***
Number of observations	1,805	1,921	2,642

* $p < 0.05, \; ** \; p < 0.01, \; *** \; p < 0.001$

Results of exploratory knife offence analysis

Descriptives for the number of CYP involved in knife offences

Key findings

- Between 2015 and 2022, within the dataset, there were 10,432 unique CYP who were involved in a knife-related offence. As for all offences, the number of CYP involved in knife offences decreased over time, down 31.8% in 2022 compared to 2015.
- Out of unique CYP involved over this period, 417 (4%) had at least three knife-related offences, accounting for 7.5% of all knife-related offences. The proportion of children with three or more knife offences fell over the period, standing at 4% in 2022, the lowest rate since 2015.
- Older CYP (aged 15–17 years) accounted for around 70% of incident cases for any knife-related offence. The proportion of children with three or more knife offences peaked at age 15 (9.5%), dropping back to 5.4% by age 17.
- Most CYP involved in knife offences (including those with at least three kniferelated offences) were male.
- Black CYP accounted for around half (50.9%) of CYP involved in knife offences in the data.
- The volume of knife offences varied across London boroughs, with Lambeth, Croydon and Southwark having the highest average number of knife offence case incidents between 2015 and 2022.
- Most CYP (68.1%) involved in knife offences (2019–2022) had no previous arrests during 2015–2018.
- CYP with at least three knife offences were more involved in knife-enabled offences (49.2%) as opposed to knife possession compared to CYP with at least one knife offence (44.0%).

We outline descriptive analyses of the characteristics of CYP who are involved in knife offences.⁵⁰ We focus on comparing the characteristics of all CYP involved in knife offences to CYP who have repeatedly been involved in knife offences. Note that 'repeatedly' in this section refers to CYP with at least three knife-related offences.

In places where we have provided figures, the underlying data is also provided in tables in <u>Appendix G</u>.

⁵⁰ This total number includes incident cases with multiple disposal outcomes (i.e. diversion, escalation and/or indeterminate cases). We use the total number of incident cases in our dataset to contextualise the numbers of CYPs with knife offences.

Findings

Overall trends

Over this period, there were 11,386 incident cases of knife-related offences, which is 2.4% of the total number of identifiable incident cases across all offence types. There were 855 incident cases across the whole period for CYP who had committed three or more knife offences (7.5% of knife-related offence cases). Overall, 10,432 unique CYP were involved in knife-related offences, and 417 unique CYP (4% of these) had at least three knife-related offences.

Similar to the trend across all offences (see Overall trends in outcomes for CYP [all offences]), the overall volume of CYP involved in knife offences declined from 1,646 in 2015 to 1,122 in 2021 (a 31.9% decline in 2015–2021). However, the decline was not consistent during this period. The number of CYP involved in knife offences increased from 2015 and peaked in 2017 with 1,757 unique CYP. The number then declined steadily from 2017 to 2020 (to 1,081), suggesting that the fall in knife-related offences primarily happened before the pandemic.

The proportion of those cases committed by CYP involved in at least three knife-related incidents remained stable, with a small increase in the pre-pandemic period (2016–2019). The overall volume of CYP involved in repeat knife offences decreased at the end of this period, though the numbers are quite small. Note that observing repeat knife offences is constrained by the age of the CYP (i.e. 10–17 years) within the period. This means that some subsequent knife offences could have occurred outside the period, particularly for younger CYP who committed their first offence towards the end of the period.



Figure 27: Number of unique CYP involved in all knife offences and unique CYP with at least three knife offences between 2015 and 2022⁵¹

Age

Similar to all offences, the highest volume of knife offences occurred among older CYP. However, unlike all offences, there is a slight drop between ages 16 and 17, where the volume continues to increase for all offence types. CYP aged 15–17 years accounted for around 45% and 55% of incident cases (i.e. cases with any knife-related offences and those associated with repeatedly involved CYP, respectively).

The proportion of cases featuring 16- and 17-year-olds repeatedly involved in knife offences (7.8% and 5.4%, respectively) is lower than 14-year-old CYP (8.9%) and 15-year-old CYP (9.5%) involved in any knife-related offences. This is likely driven by the fact that CYP who commit multiple knife-related offences are more likely to have committed at least a portion of these offences when younger. Conversely, CYP who commit their first knife-related offence at 16 or 17 years old are unlikely to commit multiple knife-related offences before they turn 18.

⁵¹ Note this does not include data for the full year of 2022. See <u>Methodological considerations and limitations</u> for more details.



Figure 28: Number of incident cases for all knife offences and for CYP with at least three prior knife offences, across ages of CYP (2015–2022)

Sex

As with all offences, both groups of CYP (i.e. CYP involved in any knife-related offences and CYP repeatedly involved in knife offences) are predominantly male, although to a greater extent. However, repeatedly involved CYP are almost exclusively male (97.8% vs 88.7% for generally involved CYP). There is a small percentage of CYP (2.3%) for which data on sex is missing.

Figure 29: Sex of unique CYP involved in all knife offences and CYP with at least three knife offences between 2015 and 2022



Ethnicity

There are more Black CYP alleged or suspected of knife offences than any other ethnic group, accounting for around half (50.9%) of all CYP involved in knife offences and 66.4% of CYP repeatedly involved in knife offences. There is also an overrepresentation of Black CYP in comparison with the London CYP population, where Black CYP make up an estimated 24.7% share of the CYP population (see <u>Ethnicity</u> in RQ1 or more details). Black CYP make up a higher proportion of cases of CYP who come into contact with the police for knife-related offences than for all offences (44.3%).

The proportion of Black CYP with repeat offences (5.2%) is also notably higher compared to the proportion of White CYP with repeat offences (1.3%) and Asian CYP with repeat offences (1.1%).

There is also a substantive proportion of CYP with missing ethnicity data (15.5% for all knife offences and 23.5% for repeat knife offences); having actual ethnicity data for these CYP could change some of these statistics.



Figure 30: Ethnicity of unique CYP for all knife offences and CYP with at least three prior knife offences between 2015 and 2022

Location

There is a lot of variation in volumes of knife offences across boroughs from 2015 to 2022; the average volume (per year) ranges from 95 cases (Richmond upon Thames) to 779 cases (Lambeth).

There were a few boroughs with notably low volumes of knife offences and a few boroughs with notably high volumes. We provide a summary categorisation of the number of boroughs with different levels of knife offences:

- Low average volume of knife offences: <200 cases (five boroughs)
- Medium average volume of knife offences: 200–350 cases (15 boroughs)
- High average volume of knife offences: 351–700 cases (10 boroughs)
- Very high average volume of knife offences: >700 cases (two boroughs)

The three boroughs with the highest average volume of all knife offences were Lambeth (779 cases), Croydon (709 cases) and Southwark (698 cases). Lambeth also had among the highest number of cases with repeatedly involved CYP (83 cases). Lewisham and Hackney were also among the top three boroughs for repeatedly involved CYP, with 91 and 72 cases, respectively. Knife offences in these boroughs may partially be driven by CYP who are repeatedly involved in knife offences. It is not known whether repeatedly involved CYP travel to these boroughs or live in them.

Table 21: Top five London boroughs with the highest proportion of CYP with at least three knife-related offences

Borough	Number of CYP involved in knife- related offences	Number of CYP involved in at least three knife-related offences	% of CYP involved in at least three knife-related offences
Lewisham	569	91	16.0%
Hackney	546	72	13.2%
Lambeth	779	83	10.7%
Haringey	423	41	9.7%
Hammersmith and Fulham	2,764	25	9.1%

The three boroughs with the lowest volumes of knife-related offences were Sutton (180 cases), Kingston Upon Thames (113 cases) and Richmond Upon Thames (95 cases). These boroughs also had the lowest proportion of cases with CYP who were repeatedly involved in knife offences (out of those who were involved at all).

Figure 31: Number of knife-related incident cases between 2015 and 2022 across London boroughs





Figure 32: Number of knife-related incident cases for CYP with at least three knife offences between 2015 and 2022 across London boroughs



Key Volume of knife-related incident cases for CYP with at least three knife offences



Previous arrests

As with all offences, most CYP had no prior arrests in the 2015–2018 period. CYP with at least three knife offences had more previous arrests than CYP with one or two knife offences. For all knife-related offences, a minority of CYP (31.9%) had at least one previous arrest. In

comparison, over three-quarters (81.8%) of CYP with repeat knife offences had at least one previous arrest.

A substantial proportion of repeatedly involved CYP had six or more previous arrests (26.7%) compared to CYP involved in any knife offences (4.6%). It also appears that, as the number of previous arrests increases, the proportion of CYP with at least three offences increases, too – although the overall volumes here become very small.





Offence type

For both groups of CYP, there is a higher volume of knife-possession offences compared to knife-enabled offences. For CYP repeatedly involved in knife crime, there are similar proportions of knife possession and knife-enabled offences (50.8% vs 49.2%). For CYP involved in any knife crime, there is a slightly higher proportion of knife possession offences compared to knife-enabled offences (56.0% vs 44.0%).

Knife-enabled violence is the most common type of knife-enabled offence across both CYP who are generally involved and those repeatedly involved in knife offences. Knife-enabled homicide has the highest proportion of CYP with repeat offences (11.5%) compared to other types of offences. However, this still implies that the vast majority of knife-enabled homicide cases have not been committed by a repeat offender. Knife-enabled robbery also has a relatively high proportion of repeatedly involved CYP (10.5%).



Figure 34: Number of incident cases for knife possession and knife-enabled offences between 2015 and 2022

Figure 35: Number of incident cases for types of knife-enabled offences between 2015 and 2022



● % of knife crime cases with ≥3 knife offences

Severity of offence

Most incident cases of knife offences are considered lower harm in the CCHI data. This is also the case for incident cases involving CYP with repeat knife offences.

CYP with repeat offences are more highly represented in medium harm offences. For example, while only 6.3% of CYP committing lower harm offences are repeat knife offenders (out of all knife offences in the data), this increases to 9.3% of CYP committing medium harm offences. This appears to drop for high harm offences, but given the small sample size of repeat offenders in this group, the difference should be interpreted cautiously, as there is a high level of uncertainty about whether this reflects more than random chance.

Figure 36: Crime harm for all knife offences and incident cases with at least three knife offences



- Knife offences (≥3 prior offences)
- % of knife crime cases with ≥ 3 prior knife offences

Descriptives of all CYP diverted for knife offences

Key findings

- Escalation for knife offences was the most common outcome for CYP suspected of knife-related offences. In 2022, 53.3% were escalated compared to 15.4% diverted and 31.4% receiving an indeterminant outcome (e.g. no further outcome).
- Younger CYP (aged 10–13 years) received a higher proportion of diverted outcomes (compared to escalated outcomes) than older CYP. For example, 88.9% of 10-year-olds were diverted for knife offending compared to 4.1% of 17-year-olds.
- Male CYP have a lower rate of being diverted (compared to being escalated) than female CYP for knife-related offences (21.0% vs 46.6%).
- Black CYP make up a disproportionate volume of CYP involved in knife offences among those who are escalated (56.9%). Black CYP also had the lowest rate of diversion compared to escalation for knife offences (16.8%) across ethnic groups.
- Most CYP involved in knife offences had no prior arrests between 2015 and 2018, with a diversion rate of 36.3% (compared to being escalated). The rate of diversion dropped to 7.1% for CYP involved in knife offences who had one previous arrest.
- Knife possession offences have a higher rate of being diverted rather than escalated compared to the diversion rate of knife-enabled offences (25.9% vs 12.0%).
- Most boroughs had average rates of diversion (2015–2022) of 15–30% for knife offences. Sutton and Bexley had the highest rates of diversion compared to being escalated (50.7% and 43.8%, respectively). Tower Hamlets and Kensington and Chelsea had the lowest rates of diversion (3.7% and 9.7%, respectively).
- The rate of diversion (compared to being escalated) is much higher for lower harm knife offences (28.5%) compared to high harm ones (2.0%).

In places where we have provided figures, the underlying data is also provided in tables in <u>Appendix I</u>.

Findings

Overall trend

The yearly numbers of CYP involved in knife offences and diverted for knife offences remain low. All descriptive analyses (especially involving subgroups) should, therefore, be treated with caution due to the small sample size.

Proportion of CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes

Unlike for all offences, the most common response to knife-related offences is escalation (average 57.6% over 2015–2022). However, as with all offences, the percentage of CYP

escalated (compared to receiving diversionary and/or indeterminate outcomes with no escalation) declined between 2015 and 2022 – specifically, it declined by 10.5%pts (from 63.7% to 53.2%). There was a small spike in the proportion of CYP escalated for knife offences during 2020 (59.9%) compared to the year before (53.7% in 2019) and the year after (54.2% in 2021).

Diversions are about half as common for knife-related offences compared to all offences, averaging 17.1% across the period. Across the whole period, the proportion of diversions remained stable, from 13.9% in 2015 to 15.4% in 2022, which is similar to the trend for all offences. The proportion of CYP diverted for knife offences steadily increased from 2015 (13.9%) to 2019 (20.8%) but then decreased again to 15.4% by 2022.

Unlike all offences, fewer CYP received indeterminate outcomes (compared to diverted or escalated outcomes). Between 2015 and 2022, the proportion of CYP receiving exclusively indeterminate outcomes (neither diversion nor escalation) increased by 9%pts, with a particularly sharp increase during the pandemic period. During the pre-pandemic period, the proportion of CYP with indeterminate outcomes was relatively stable (ranging from 21.5% to 26.3%). However, during the pandemic period, there was an 8.3%pt increase in the proportion of CYP with indeterminate outcomes to 31.4% in 2022. This also aligns with the increase in the proportion of overall CYP with indeterminate outcomes across all offences.



Figure 37: Proportion of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes for knife offences between 2015 and 2022⁵²

Age

Similar to CYP diverted for all offences, we find that for knife offences, younger CYP receive a higher proportion of diverted outcomes (compared to escalated outcomes) than older CYP. As with all offence types, the rate of diversion decreases with age for knife offences. The rate of diversion for ages 10–13 is similar for knife offences (ranging from 51.2% to 88.9%) as for all offences (ranging from 71.4% to 88.4%). Conversely, there is a much lower rate of diversion for CYP aged 14–17 involved in knife offences (ranging from 4.1% to 32.1%) compared to similarly aged CYP diverted for all offences (ranging from 32.3% to 46.6%). The rates of diversion for CYP aged 16–17 who are involved in knife offences are particularly low (6.4% for age 16 and 4.1% for age 17).

⁵² Note this does not include data for the full year of 2022. See <u>Methodological considerations and limitations</u> for more details.



Figure 38: Number of incident cases across ages of CYP involved in knife offences

Sex

Similar to all offences, male CYP also had a lower rate of diversion (21.0%), compared to being escalated, than female CYP (46.6%). However, both male and female CYP involved in knife offences had much lower rates of diversion compared to their respective rates of diversion for any type of offence (male 21.5% vs 44.8% and female 47.5% vs 67.3%).

There is a small proportion of CYP (1.8%) whose sex is missing from our sample data. Of these CYP, a high proportion are diverted (64.0%).



Figure 39: Sex of CYP diverted or escalated for knife offences between 2015 and 2022

Ethnicity

Across all ethnicities, CYP involved in knife offences are more likely to receive escalated outcomes than diverted outcomes. This differs from CYP involved in any offence type, where diverted outcomes are more common for White CYP (compared to escalated outcomes) and are roughly equal for Asian and Middle Eastern CYP.

Volume of diversion and escalation by ethnic group

Black CYP are overrepresented for all offences and even more so for knife offences. Black CYP make up 38.8% of incident cases across all offences and 50.7% for knife-related offences, despite only making up 24.7% of London's CYP population.⁵³ Additionally, more than half of Black CYP (56.9%) are escalated for knife offences – a disproportionately higher rate than CYP from other ethnic groups.

In comparison, White CYP account for 21.1% of escalated CYP involved in knife offences while making up 35.9% of our overall sample. Table 22 below outlines the split of diverted and escalated CYP for knife offences across ethnic groups.

For a substantial minority of CYP involved in knife offences (15.5%), ethnicity was not reported in our data. Therefore, the true number of CYP involved in knife offences across different ethnic groups could be meaningfully different to the summary statistics presented in this section. All figures should, therefore, be considered with caution.

⁵³ Estimates of the London CYP population were based on ethnic group projection estimates from the Greater London Authority. See <u>https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ethnic-group-population-projections</u>

Table 22: Number of CYP involved in knife offences and the proportion of diverted andescalated CYP across ethnic groups

	White CYP	Black CYP	Asian CYP	Middle Eastern CYP	Unknown or missing
Number (and percentage) of CYP in combined data ⁵⁴	115,154 (35.9%)	124,451 (38.8%)	33,533 (10.5%)	8,068 (2.5%)	39,230 (12.2%)
Number (and percentage) of CYP with police contact for knife offences (i.e. diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcome)	2,493 (23.9%)	5,311 (50.9%)	884 (8.5%)	123 (1.2%)	1,621 (15.5%)
Percentage of escalated CYP for knife offences	21.1%	56.9%	8.5%	1.2%	15.5%
Percentage of diverted CYP for knife offences	35.6%	36.5%	12.2%	1.3%	14.4%

Rates of diversion for ethnic groups of CYP involved in knife offences

Black CYP had the lowest rate of diversion (compared to escalation) across ethnic groups, at 16.8%. White and Asian CYP had similarly high rates of diversion (34.6% and 35.0%, respectively). Middle Eastern CYP had a slightly lower rate of diversion compared to White and Asian CYP (25.0%).

Taken together, this indicates that Black CYP are more likely to come into contact with police for knife offences than CYP from other ethnic groups. They are then less likely to be diverted for knife offences and more likely to be escalated. However, the missing ethnicity data means that these figures should be interpreted with caution.

⁵⁴These figures are based on any diversionary, any escalatory and any indeterminate outcomes to provide overall figures of diversionary outcomes provided to ethnic minority CYPs. This includes CYPs who may have received more than one diversionary, escalatory or indeterminate outcome within a single incident case



Figure 40: Ethnicity of CYP diverted (vs escalated) for knife offences (2015–2022)

Previous arrests (2015–2018)

Similar to CYP involved in any offence, most CYP involved in knife offences (according to their first offence from 2019 onwards) had no prior arrests in the 2015–2018 period, regardless of whether they were diverted or escalated. More than a third of CYP involved in knife offences with no previous arrests were diverted (36.3%). This is lower than the rate of diversion for CYP involved in any offence who have no previous arrests between 2015 and 2018 (51.4%).

The rate of diversion (compared to being escalated) drops substantially for knife offences for CYP with any previous arrests, ranging from 7.1% for one previous arrest to 1.4% for four previous arrests. This is different to the rates of diversion for CYP with previous arrests involved in any type of offence, which range from 46.0% for one previous arrest to 41.4% for four previous arrests.

This could suggest that CYP suspected/alleged of a knife offence are considered less suitable for a diverted outcome than if they were suspected/alleged of a different type of crime. This might reflect a heightened perception of reoffending risk for CYP involved in knife offences, though the influence of other factors may also provide a plausible explanation for this trend.



Figure 41: Diverted or escalated CYP involved in knife offences based on previous arrests between 2015 and 2018

Type of offence

There is a higher volume of knife possession offences than knife-enabled offences. Knife possession offences also have a higher rate of diversion compared to escalation (25.9% vs 12.0%). The rate of diversion (compared to escalation) for knife possession offences increased slightly in 2015–2022, whereas it decreased slightly for knife-enabled crime.



Figure 42: Diverted and escalated CYP for knife possession and knife-enabled offences

When looking at specific types of knife-enabled crime, knife-enabled violent crime (not including homicide or robbery) had the highest rate of diversion (compared to escalation) at 14.6%.

Knife-enabled homicide had a very low rate of diversion (2.3%), with only seven incident cases being diverted. Of these cases, six had a diversionary outcome of not in the public interest and once received a caution. Of these (including the simple caution case), two were labelled with 'insufficient evidence to proceed'. Inspection of the data noted that two of these causes (including the case resulting in a caution) were also noted as having insufficient evidence to proceed. There were no diversions for this type of knife offence between 2015 and 2016.

Similarly, knife-enabled robbery had a low rate of diversion (3.1%), with 11 incident cases receiving a diversion. These cases involved six youth cautions, five triage outcomes and three youth conditional cautions. Three cases involved more than one offence and, therefore, more than one diversionary outcome. These cases were diverted between 2015 and 2017, with no diversions for this type of crime between 2018 and 2022.



Figure 43: Proportion of diverted cases for types of knife-enabled crime

Table 23: Number of diverted and escalated cases for types of knife-enabled crime between2015 and 2022

Number of enabled ho	cases (knife- micide)	Number of cases (knife- enabled violence)		Number of cases (knife- enabled robbery)		
Diverted	Escalated	Diverted	Escalated	Diverted	Escalated	
7	291	338	1,983	11	349	

Location⁵⁵

There is considerable variation across boroughs in the average rate of diversion (from 2015 to 2022) for knife offences. This ranges from 14.1% in Kensington and Chelsea and 14.8% in Lambeth to 49.4% in Bexley and 54.4% in Sutton. Most boroughs have rates of diversion roughly between 20% and 35%.

⁵⁵ The sample of cases for identifying rates of diversion across boroughs for knife offences is different to the descriptives presented in the rest of this section. This sample mirrors the sample used in RQ2, which also allows for a comparison between the rates of diversion (for all offences) across boroughs. We have included incident cases involving knife offences which resulted in either diversion or escalation (including cases which received both), as well as cases which received an indeterminate outcome and a diversion and/or an escalation. This allows us to calculate the rate of diversion based on the number of diversionary outcomes provided (regardless of whether an individual CYP has received a different outcome for other offences).

Relative to other boroughs, the rates of diversion in boroughs for all offences generally do not align with the rates of diversion for knife offences. For instance, only three out of the five boroughs with the highest average rates of diversion for all offences are also among the boroughs with the highest rates of diversion for knife offences (i.e. Sutton, Bexley and Bromley). When looking at the five boroughs with the lowest rates of diversion for all offences, only one (Lambeth) was among the five boroughs with the lowest rates of diversion for knife offences. This could suggest that the decision to provide diversion outcomes is different across boroughs when dealing with knife offences compared to other offences.

There were a small number of cases (1.1%) for which the location of the offence(s) was not identifiable.






Severity of offence

Most knife offences, including escalated cases (72.7%) and diverted cases (93.6%), have lower harm CCHI scores. Lower harm knife offences were also more likely to result in a diverted outcome compared to an escalated outcome, with a diversion rate of 28.5%. In contrast, the rate of diversion for medium harm offences was more than three times lower, at 8.4%. Very few knife offences classified as high harm were diverted (2.0%).





Descriptives of disposal outcomes for CYP involved in knife offences

Key findings

- Escalation is the most common outcome for knife-related offences, unlike for all offences, where indeterminate outcomes are the most common. Escalation is more prevalent among CYP with at least three knife offences compared to all CYP involved in knife offences.
- There are similar numbers of formal and informal diversions provided to diverted CYP who are involved in knife offences, which makes diversions more likely to be formal for knife-related offences than all offences.
- Youth cautions and youth conditional cautions are the most commonly used types of diversion for CYP with any involvement in knife offences.
- The number of CYP charged with knife offences notably reduced after 2017. The numbers of community resolution, youth caution and youth conditional caution diverted outcomes were relatively stable between 2015 and 2019, although they reduced slightly in 2020–2022.

Below, we outline disposal outcomes for any CYP involved in knife offences (at least one kniferelated offence) and for CYP who are repeatedly involved in knife offences (three or more knife-related offences).

We note that when examining the data for these specific groups of CYP, the numbers in each group become quite small. As a result, comparisons between groups should be treated with caution, as there is a high level of uncertainty about whether any differences are more than random chance, and they may not necessarily reflect real underlying differences between groups.

In places where we have provided figures, the underlying data is also provided in tables in <u>Appendix H</u>.

Disposal outcomes

Unlike for all types of offences, most incident cases for knife-related offences resulted in an escalated outcome (e.g. arrest, charge or summons). While an indeterminate outcome is most common for all offences, 59.5% of knife-related offences were escalated compared to 22.6% of all offences. A greater proportion of cases for repeatedly involved CYP also received an escalated outcome (76.1%) than for generally involved CYP (59.5%). Conversely, the proportion of cases receiving diverted outcomes was much higher for CYP generally involved in knife offences (16.4%) than for CYP repeatedly involved in knife offences (4.1%).

Compared to all types of offence, knife-related offences have a much lower proportion of indeterminate outcomes, i.e. neither diversion nor escalation. Nearly half (43.6%) of cases for

any offence resulted in an indeterminate outcome. Whereas only about a quarter of kniferelated offences (24.1%) and around a fifth (19.8%) of knife-related offences for CYP with at least three prior knife offences had indeterminate outcomes.

Table 24: Number of cases across different disposal outcomes for incident cases involving
all knife offences and at least three knife offences

Type of disposal outcome	Number of cases (all knife-related offences)	Number of cases (CYP with at least three knife-related offences)	Number of cases (any offence)
Diverted (including cases with escalated outcomes in addition to diverted outcomes)	1,867	35	61,444
Escalated (including cases with diverted outcomes in addition to escalated outcomes)	6,773	651	91,599
Indeterminate (neither diverted nor escalated)	2,746	169	118,383

Figure 46: Percentage of disposal outcomes for incident cases involving all knife offences, at least three knife offences and all offences



Types of diverted outcomes

There are roughly similar numbers of formal and informal diversions given to CYP involved in knife offences (1,114 formal and 1,004 informal). In addition, the proportion of cases associated with repeatedly involved CYP is very similar for formal diversions (1.9%) and informal diversions (1.8%).

Diversions are much less common for knife-related offences (compared to all offences). Informal diversions are given to CYP for knife-related offences in 8.8% of cases and formal diversions in 9.8% of cases (vs 19.6% and 4.8%, respectively, of cases for all offences). Within diversions, 52.6% of diversions for knife-related offences are formal, while 19.7% of diversions for all offences are formal. This means that diversions are much more likely to be formal for knife-related offences.

Figure 47: Diverted outcomes for incident cases involving any offence, all knife offences and at least three knife offences



Similarly, there were very small differences in the specific types of diversions applied to CYP repeatedly involved in knife offences (compared to CYP generally involved in knife offences). Youth cautions and youth conditional cautions were the most commonly used types of diversion for CYP generally involved in knife offences, whereas not in the public interest was most likely to be applied to CYP with repeated knife-related offences. No informal warnings were provided to either group of CYP involved in knife offences.

Knife offences make up a greater proportion of offences that receive youth conditional cautions (23.3%) and youth cautions (8.4%) than they do for other types of diversion.



Figure 48: Breakdown of diversion types comparing incident cases involving knife offences and all offences

Trends in the application of key outcomes for knife offences (community resolution, youth caution, youth conditional caution, charge and no further action outcomes) over time

When examining key outcomes over time, we find that the volume of CYP charged with a knife-related offence reduced substantially after 2017, aligning with the overall trend of a reduction in escalated outcomes. Nearly half of CYP (46.7%) involved in knife offences were charged in the period. Being charged was a very common escalated outcome – 82.5% of CYP with an escalated outcome were charged.

Fewer CYP received key diversion outcomes (i.e. community resolution, youth caution and youth conditional caution) compared to being charged. Reflecting trends in diversions for knife offences (see <u>Type of diverted outcomes</u> above), youth cautions were slightly more common than youth conditional cautions (12.9% of CYP vs 9.6% of CYP). These outcomes were much more common than community resolution, which was only provided to 1.1% of CYP. The overall number of CYP provided with community resolution, youth caution and youth conditional caution remained relatively steady over this period.

No further action outcomes account for nearly half (49.2%) of indeterminate outcomes provided to CYP involved in knife offences. However, only a relatively small proportion (11.5%) of CYP received a no further action outcome. Indeterminate outcomes were provided to nearly a quarter of CYP (23.5%) involved in knife offences.

Figure 49: Number of unique CYP with community resolution, youth caution, youth conditional caution, charge and no further action outcomes for knife offences across 2015–2022⁵⁶



⁵⁶ This figure shows the total number of CYPs involved in knife offences by year and the volumes for each outcome of interest. Note that the overall total is larger than the sum of the specific outcomes listed (charge, cautions, community resolutions etc.) because some CYPs had other types of outcomes not included in these categories.

Regression analysis of CYP diverted for knife offences

Key findings

- CYP who were diverted for knife-related offences were significantly less likely to be arrested in the following six months (compared to similar CYP who were escalated for knife-related offences). Diversion is associated with an average reduction in arrest rates of 9.36%pts compared to an arrest rate of 13.3% for escalated CYP. This is after taking into account factors such as age, type of offence, crime severity and number of previous arrests.
- Diversions are also associated with a reduction in arrest rates within 12 months by 7.71%pts, but this isn't statically insignificant. Escalated CYP had an arrest rate of 17.4% within 12 months.
- Both formal and informal diversions for knife-related offences were associated with a lower likelihood of arrest within six months. However, a significant relationship was only found for formal diversion, likely because this analysis had a larger sample size. Formal diversions were associated with a reduction in arrest rates of 9.05%pts (compared to an arrest rate of 13.3% for escalated CYP).

Main analysis

We find a strong, statistically significant negative relationship between being diverted for knife offences and future arrest within six months when comparing cases that were diverted to cases that were escalated. In our sample for this analysis, 6.42% of CYP were arrested within six months of coming into contact with police. This overall rate includes CYP who received either a diverted or escalated outcome between January 2019 and March 2022.

The arrest rate within six months for CYP who received any diversion for knife offences was an estimated 9.36%pts (p < 0.001) lower than 13.30% (also for knife offences) for escalated CYP. Arrest rates within 12 months are 7.71%pts lower on average compared to 17.38% for escalated CYP, but this relationship is not statistically significant at the 5% level (p = 0.057).

Interestingly, the relationship between being diverted and reduced likelihood of arrest within six months is much greater for knife-related offences than for all offences (see <u>Results for</u> <u>RQ3</u>): CYP diverted for any offence had a 3.67%pt lower likelihood of being arrested within six months. This suggests that diversion may be particularly helpful when applied to CYP involved in knife offences compared to all other offences. Yet, diversion rates are lower for knife offences. However, this result may also reflect a possible selection bias, where diversions are applied more selectively to CYP for knife offences compared to other offences. Alternatively, this result could also indicate that involvement in knife-related offences reflects a lower propensity for future offending compared to being involved in any type of offence.

Formal vs informal diversion

Both formal and informal diversion were associated with a lower likelihood of arrest within six months. Formal diversions were linked to a significant reduction in arrest likelihood (-9.05%pts, p < 0.05), while informal diversions were associated with a similar reduction (-9.69%pts, p = 0.064) but did not reach statistical significance due to the smaller sample size. These are compared to an average arrest likelihood of 13.30% for escalated CYP.

	Model: arrest in six months	Model: arrest in 12 months	Model: arrest in six months (type of diversion)
Mean outcome for the escalated group (%)	13.30	17.38	13.30
Estimated effect of diversion (%pts)	-9.36**	-7.71	
Estimated effect of formal diversion (%pts)			-9.05*
Estimated effect of informal diversion (%pts)			-9.69
Number of observations	1,123	923	1,067

Table 25: Regression analysis results: relationship between diversion and type of diversion	n
and arrest for knife offences	

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Ethnicity and type of offence

When disaggregating our sample to examine the relationships between ethnicity, offence type and the likelihood of arrest, the resulting sample sizes were too small to draw meaningful statistical conclusions. Therefore, we have not presented these results, as we are not able to make reliable conclusions. We provide results of the regression models for ethnicity and offence type in Appendix J.

Conclusions and implications

Summary findings

RQ1: what are the characteristics of CYP who are diverted, and how does this compare to CYP who are not diverted?

During our study period (2015–2022), there was an overall reduction in the number of CYP who came into contact with the police. Outcomes for CYP also shifted during this time: escalations decreased and became less common than diversions, driven by an increase in indeterminate outcomes. By 2022, about a quarter of CYP (25.7%) who came into contact with the police were diverted.

Younger CYP consistently received proportionally more diverted outcomes compared to older CYP, a pattern that is true for all offences and violent offences. In line with our hypothesis, we find that male CYP represent the majority of cases; however, they are less likely to be diverted (compared to escalated) than female CYP.

We also identify racial disparities between CYP receiving diverted outcomes. While overrepresented in police contact, Black CYP had the lowest diversion rate across all ethnic groups. In further regression analysis, Black CYP were statistically significantly less likely to be diverted than White CYP by nearly 9%pts, even after adjusting for a range of characteristics, including type of offence and previous arrests. While these findings show differences in rates of diversion between Black and White CYP, we need further evidence to determine the role of other possible factors (e.g. socioeconomic conditions and racial bias) in the decisions to divert CYP from different ethnic groups.

Most CYP in the sample had no previous arrests, and the likelihood of receiving diversion remained relatively stable for those with one to four previous arrests but decreased for those with five or more previous arrests.

CYP were commonly diverted for violence against the person offences and drug offences. This reflects the overall volume of these offences. The rate of diversion (compared to escalation) was highest for theft offences (65.7%). Diversion was similarly likely for CYP involved in drug offences, sexual offences and violence against the person offences. Robbery was the least likely type of offence to result in a diversion.

Informal diversions were more common than formal, with triage and not in the public interest types of diversion being used most frequently.

RQ2: is there variation across London boroughs in the use of different types of diversion and in who is diverted?

There is variation in diversion rates among different boroughs. Bromley, Bexley and Kingston Upon Thames demonstrated the highest average rates of youth diversion, while Lambeth, Haringey and Hackney had the lowest rates. A slightly different picture emerges after controlling for individual-level factors (e.g., age, ethnicity and type of offence). Bromley, Bexley, Hammersmith and Fulham, Merton, and Kingston Upon Thames all had significantly higher rates of diversion compared to the median rate of diversion, which hovered around 60% after adjustment. Meanwhile, Harrow, Tower Hamlets and Greenwich had significantly lower rates of diversion, hovering around 40% after adjustment. This geographical disparity raises important questions about the consistency of diversion approaches across London.

Despite geographical variations in overall diversion rates, there was reasonable consistency in which types of offences were likely to result in diverted outcomes across boroughs. Drug offences and arson and criminal damage offences consistently emerged as the most likely to lead to diversion, which could be reflective of standardised practices (e.g. the use of the CGM to apply outcomes) in considering how offence types relate to decisions to provide diverted outcomes to CYP.

As in RQ1, we also identify that White and Asian CYP generally experienced higher rates of diversion compared to Black CYP across most boroughs. Specifically, White CYP were typically diverted at rates between an average of 50% and 60%, while diversion rates for Black CYP were somewhat lower, usually ranging between an average of 40% and 50%. The consistency of these differences across boroughs suggests that there is a systematic influence on how CYP from different ethnic backgrounds are treated. Additional research would help clarify sources of racial differences in diversions across boroughs.

We also examined the use of formal vs informal diversions, identifying a relatively consistent pattern for formal diversions, which were used in approximately 10% of cases across most boroughs. In contrast, while informal diversions were more frequently employed overall, their use showed greater variation between boroughs, indicating that this type of diversion may follow less standardised practices.

RQ3: what is the relationship between diversion and reoffending?

In line with our hypothesis, our results find that diversions are associated with significantly lower rates of subsequent arrests compared to escalation through the CJS.

We find that CYP who were diverted were considerably less likely to be arrested in the following six months compared to CYP who were escalated, even after accounting for

factors such as age, type of offence, crime severity and prior arrest history. Specifically, diversion was associated with a 3.67% pt reduction in average arrest rates over six months and a 5.10% pt reduction over 12 months.

Compared to all offences, diversion for violent offences had a larger association with a reduced likelihood of arrest. Diversion was associated with a 6.31%pt reduction in arrest likelihood within six months and a 7.89%pt reduction over 12 months.

We find that diversions for Black CYP had a somewhat stronger relationship with reduced arrest rates than for White CYP, although this difference is not statistically significant. This may reflect diversionary approaches providing a greater protective factor for Black CYP, particularly since we find Black CYP were also more likely to be escalated. Therefore, being diverted could mitigate against the negative effects of being escalated, such as increased scrutiny from police or internalising a pro-criminal identity. Alternatively, this could also reflect a selection bias in the application of diversion for Black CYPs since a smaller proportion are diverted.

Both formal and informal diversion approaches are associated with reduced subsequent arrests across all offence types, with informal diversions having a stronger relationship with the average reduced likelihood of future arrest. This suggests informal diversions might be more beneficial in preventing arrests.

However, informal diversions were more likely to be applied in cases where an individual had committed a relatively low-level offence or did not have a history of offending. This finding could, therefore, reflect a selection bias for informally diverted cases. Youth who receive informal diversion might have a lower propensity for offending (and therefore being arrested) compared to those who get formal diversion. Our analysis accounts for some of these differences (e.g. arrest history) between CYP who are given informal or formal diversion. However, there may be other important differences between these groups that are not captured in our data or analysis.

When examining specific types of diversion, we find that not in the public interest showed the strongest association with reduced arrest probability within six months. For violent offences, community resolution and not in the public interest had the strongest associations with reduced likelihood of arrest within six months.

Some types of diversion, specifically triage and youth conditional caution, did not show a significant relationship with subsequent arrest likelihood, whether for all or just violent offences. Compared to other types of informal diversion (e.g. informal warning and community resolution), triage is more interventionist, as it involves YJS teams reaching out to CYP and providing support and interventions if the CYP engages. This could suggest that informal diversions, which are less interventionist and more 'light touch' (e.g. not involving other additional services such as YJS), might be a better approach for reducing future

arrests. However, there is also the possibility of selection bias here if individuals who are higher risk (in a way that is not captured by our control variables) are more likely to be referred to YJS teams for this more interventionist approach than other CYP given informal diversions.

While these findings are correlational, they suggest that diverting CYP, particularly CYP involved in violence, could be an effective strategy for reducing future contact with the CJS.

Exploratory knife offence analyses: CYP involved in knife offences

We find there has been a decline in the number of CYP involved in knife-related offences. Of the 10,213 individual CYP involved in knife-related offences during the 2015–2022 period, a small minority (2.4%) were involved in three or more. This trend is slightly different to national figures, which show the number of knife offences in England and Wales increased from 2015 to 2022 by roughly 15,000 offences (Allen & Wong, 2025). The volume of knife crime in London also increased during this period, though this includes knife crime with adult offenders as well. These differences could be a result of our approach to analysing the data or how data is collected in police records. For instance, our analysis focused on the number of individual CYP which could be identified in the data. Police-recorded crime records do not restrict the number of offences to only identifiable suspects or alleged perpetrators.

Males make up the majority of CYP involved in knife offences, with older teenagers (15–17 years) accounting for approximately 70% of all cases. Black CYP are disproportionately represented, comprising nearly half (49.8%) of all CYP involved in knife offences despite only representing 24.7% of the London youth population. The geographical distribution of knife offences also varies across London, with Lambeth, Croydon and Southwark experiencing the highest average volumes of knife offences.

CYP involved in knife offences are much more likely to be escalated than diverted, more so than for all offence types. However, there has been a small decrease in the proportion of CYP escalated for knife offences, while the proportion diverted remained relatively stable across the time period. Youth cautions and youth conditional cautions are the most frequently applied types of diversion. These types of diversion result in a criminal record, suggesting that knife offences are typically not considered suitable for more informal approaches to diversion.

Exploratory knife offence analyses: CYP diverted for knife offences

We find differences in the application of diversion for knife offences. Younger CYP (10–13 years) and female CYP are more likely to be diverted than their older and male

counterparts, with diversion rates for female CYP more than double that of male CYP (47.5% vs 21.5%).

Black CYP are also disproportionately represented in escalated cases (56.8%) and face the lowest diversion rates (17.2%) across ethnic groups, similar to the trend of diversion for Black CYP across all types of offences.

Prior arrests also appear to play a role in the likelihood of diversion. CYP with no prior offences have a rate of diversion at 36.3%, but this drops to 7.1% after just one previous arrest. Knife possession offences are more likely to be diverted than knife-enabled crimes (27.0% vs 12.0%), and lower harm offences see substantially higher diversion rates than very high harm ones (28.7% vs 2.0%).

Most London boroughs maintain diversion rates between 15% and 30%. However, there are notable outliers – Sutton's high diversion rate of 50.7% to Tower Hamlets' low of 3.7% – suggesting variation in applying diversion for knife offences across London.

Exploratory knife offence analyses: regression analysis of CYP diverted for knife offences

CYP diverted for knife offences were significantly less likely to be arrested within six months compared to similar CYP who were escalated. Diversion is associated with a 9.36%pt reduction in the likelihood of arrest after controlling for key factors, including age, offence type, crime severity and previous arrests. When looking at the likelihood of arrest within 12 months, there was a similar pattern. Diversion was associated with a 7.71%pt reduction in arrests. However, this is not statistically significant (p = 0.057), likely due to sample size limitations.

When examining types of diversion, both formal and informal approaches were associated with lower six-month arrest rates. However, only formal diversion showed statistical significance, demonstrating a 9.05%pt reduction. This likely reflects the larger sample size rather than necessarily indicating greater effectiveness over informal approaches.

Overall, these findings suggest that diverting CYP involved in knife offences may be an effective approach to preventing CYP from reoffending.

Implications

Ethnicity of CYP diverted

Two compounding disparities emerge for Black CYP: i) they faced disproportionately higher rates of police contact than CYP from other ethnic groups, and ii) once involved with the police, they received comparatively fewer diverted outcomes than their peers. Even after

controlling for factors such as type of offence and prior arrests, Black CYP were less likely to be diverted than White CYP, with a gap of 8.88%pts. These findings are based on historical data (2015–2022), which points to systemic inequities requiring attention, although current diversionary practices may differ. For instance, addressing ethnic disproportionality is already shaping the MPS's strategic and operational aims, as noted in its recent Race Action Plan (Metropolitan Police Service, 2024). Nevertheless, this highlights the importance of understanding and addressing how CYP from ethnic minority backgrounds, particularly Black CYP, are treated when coming into contact with the CJS.

Offence types and diversion

While the CGM provides guidelines for practitioners about which offences may be more or less suitable for diversion, our findings suggest that decisions to provide a diversion could be related to different factors, including:

- Levels of interpersonal harm (e.g. higher diversion rates for theft offences, arson and criminal damage offences)
- Potential for desistance and/or rehabilitation (e.g. higher diversion rates for drug and theft offences)
- Potentially escalating offending behaviour (e.g. low diversion rates for robbery and possession of weapons)
- Intentional planning or targeting (e.g. low diversion rates for burglary and vehicle offences)

Variation in the use of diversion

The generally increasing rate of diversion across boroughs suggests a broader shift towards using diversionary approaches, as opposed to escalation, in dealing with CYP who come into contact with police.

Nonetheless, the geographic distribution between boroughs with lower rates of diversion and those with higher rates of diversion may indicate areas in which diversionary practices could be better encouraged or bolstered (particularly for BCUs covering boroughs which have consistently had lower rates of diversion). Additionally, BCUs covering boroughs with higher rates of diversion could also be examined to potentially identify policies and processes which may be effective at providing diverted outcomes to CYP.

Increased use of indeterminate outcomes

While the use of diversions slightly decreased between 2015 and 2022, the use of indeterminate outcomes greatly increased, mainly displacing escalations, which fell more than other outcomes. The increased use of indeterminate outcomes was primarily driven by victim unwilling to prosecute, which increased from 48% in 2015 to 63% of CYP with

indeterminate outcomes in 2022. The second most common indeterminate outcome was insufficient evidence, accounting for 38% of CYP with indeterminate outcomes in 2022. Meanwhile, no further action fell from 13% of CYP with indeterminate outcomes in 2015 to 4% in 2022. Since the main indeterminate outcomes during this period imply that the investigation could not continue, this may, in part, be due to limited police capacity or resources to pursue an investigation or provide support to victims or a shift in the prioritisation of police time. While no further action may be used in a similar way to diversions in practice, it did not play a role in the increase in indeterminate outcomes. Further research should seek to understand the role of indeterminate outcomes within the context of diversion, both in terms of how capacity affects policing outcomes and whether this has a relationship with diversion.

Relationship between diversion and arrest

Our findings indicate some key implications for policymakers and practitioners in the youth justice space:

- The association between diversion and reduced arrest provides evidence supporting policies and programmes that promote and prioritise diverting CYP from the CJS, although the correlational nature of the analysis means that we cannot draw conclusions about the causal impact of diversion.
- Policymakers and practitioners should consider maintaining flexibility in diverting CYP, even in cases which involve violent offences. While there are clear legal frameworks that require escalation for certain offences (e.g. indictable-only offences), summary or either-way offences should be considered eligible for diversion.
- The relationship between specific types of diversion and the likelihood of reoffending is also worth exploring. Both informal and formal diversions are likely to remain key parts of the diversionary process. However, there may be a benefit in more 'light touch' approaches to diversion, given these showed strong relationships with reducing the likelihood of arrest. The association of these types of diversion with reduced arrest rates, compared to more involved types of diversion (e.g. triage, youth caution and youth conditional caution), may also be indicative of the effect of 'up-tariffing'. This refers to the practice of involving or escalating more CYP in the CJS (e.g. by providing them with a more formal diversion rather than an informal diversion) than is necessary, which could expose CYP to potentially detrimental effects of being involved with the CJS.

The findings from our research provide promising evidence for diversion as an effective method to mitigate future involvement in the CJS. However, our analysis only examined the relationship between diversion and future arrest. It does not provide evidence of whether diversions cause less contact with the CJS or offending. Our analysis controlled for a range of factors that could influence the relationship between diversion and future arrest, which

provides some support for diversion as an approach to reducing crime. Nonetheless, future research would benefit from investigating whether diversion has a casual relationship with reduced offending and how much of an impact this has within the UK.

References

Bateman, T. (2020). The state of youth justice 2020. An overview of trends and developments. National Association for Youth Justice. Retrieved from https://uobrep.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10547/624525/Stateofyouthjustice2 https://uobrep.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10547/624525/Stateofyouthjustice2 https://uobrep.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10547/624525/Stateofyouthjustice2

Centre for Justice Innovation (2021). Youth justice – Frequently asked questions: Getting the terminology right. Retrieved from:

https://justiceinnovation.org/sites/default/files/media/document/2021/youth_justice_faq_second_edition.pdf

Centre for Justice Innovation (2022). *Effective point-of-arrest diversion for children and young people*. Suffolk: Clinks. <u>https://www.clinks.org/sites/default/files/2022-</u><u>12/clinks el diversion for children and young people 0.pdf</u>

Crest (2022). Making the judicial system work better: how to improve out-of-court disposals and diversion scheme. Retrieved from: <u>https://64e09bbc-abdd-42c6-90a8-58992ce46e59.usrfiles.com/ugd/64e09b</u> 7df3289b60fe45aaa442e5320d67cd98.pdf

College of Policing (2024). Possible justice outcomes following investigation. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.college.police.uk/app/prosecution-and-case-management/possible-justice-outcomes-following-investigation</u>

Ely, C., Fadda-Archibald, F., Jolaoso, B., Kilgallon, A., Robin-D'Cruz, C., Waters, R., and Whitehead, S. (2019). *Understanding Youth Diversion in London: Evidence and practice briefing.* London: Centre for Justice Innovation.

https://justiceinnovation.org/publications/understanding-youth-diversion-london-evidence-and-practice-briefing

Gaffney, H., Farrington, D. P., & White, H. (2021). *Pre-Court Diversion. Toolkit Technical Report*. London: Youth Endowment Fund. https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Pre-Court-Diversion-technical-report-.pdf

Haines, A., Goldson, B., Haycox, A., Houten, R., McGuire, J., Nathan, T., Perkins, E., Richards, E., and Whittington, R. (2012) Evaluation of the Youth Justice Liaison and Diversion (YJLD) Pilot Scheme. University of Liverpool. Retrieved from: <u>https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/621343/1/dh_133007.pdf</u>

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2019). *Annual report: Inspection of youth offending services (2018-2019)* https://yjlc.uk/resources/legal-updates/youth-offending-services-inspected

HM Government (2008). *Youth Crime Action Plan 2008*. London: Ministry of Justice. <u>https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/8334/2/youth-crime-action-plan-</u>08 viewBinary Redacted.pdf

HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (2018). Out-of-court disposal work in youth offending teams. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/cjji/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/03/Out-of-court-disposal-work-in-youth-offending-teams-reportb.pdf</u>

House of Commons Library (2023). Knife crime statistics: England and Wales. Retrieved from: <u>https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN04304/SN04304.pdf</u>

Keenan, C., Strange, L., Neyroud, P., and Corr, M. (2024). An evidence review on youth diversion programmes. Youth Endowment Fund, National Children's Bureau. Retrieved from: <u>https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/NCB-YEF-Diversion-Evidence-Review-for-Publication.pdf</u>

Labour Party (2024). Change. Labour Party manifesto. Retrieved from: <u>https://labour.org.uk/change/take-back-our-streets/</u>

Leiber, M. J., & Mack, K. Y. (2003). The individual and joint effects of race, gender, and family status on juvenile justice decision-making. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(1), 34–70. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427802239253</u>

Metropolitan Police (n.d.). Monthly crime data. Knife crime dashboard. Retrieved from: <u>https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/metropolitan.police.service/viz/MonthlyCrimeData</u> <u>NewCats/Coversheet</u>

Metropolitan Police (n.d.). About the MPS Research Ethics Committee (MetREC). Retrieved from: <u>https://www.met.police.uk/police-forces/metropolitan-police/areas/about-us/about-the-met/met-research-ethics-committee-metrec/</u>

Metropolitan Police Service (2024) London race action plan. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.met.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/media/downloads/met/about-us/london-race-action-plan-2024.pdf</u>

Ministry of Justice (2013). Code of Practice for Youth Conditional Cautions. Retrieved from: <u>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment</u><u>data/file/243443/9780108512179.pdf</u>

Ministry of Justice (2023). Knife and offensive weapon sentencing statistics: January to March 2023. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/knife-and-offensive-weapon-sentencing-statistics-january-to-march-2023

National Police Chief's Council (2022). Community resolutions (CR) guidance 2022. Retrieved from: <u>https://library.college.police.uk/docs/NPCC/Community-resolution-guidance-</u>2022.pdf

National Police Chief's Council (2025). Child Gravity Matrix: Children under 18 v2.3. Retrieved from:

https://www.npcc.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/media/downloads/publications/publications-

log/criminal-justice/2023/child-gravity-matrix-v2.2---september-2023.pdf

Ofori, A., Jolaoso, B., Robin-D'Cruz, C., and Whitehead, S. (2021). *Equal diversion? Racial disproportionality in youth diversion*. London: Centre for Justice Innovation. https://justiceinnovation.org/publications/equal-diversion-racial-disproportionality-youth-diversion

ONS (2024). Crime in England and Wales: Year ending March 2024. Retrieved from <u>https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/crimeinenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2024#knife-or-sharp-instrument-offences</u>

ONS (2024). Population estimates for England and Wales: Mid-2023. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/populationestimatesforenglandandwales/mid2023</u>

Petrosino A., Turpin-Petrosino C., and Guckenberg, S. (2010). Formal system processing of juveniles: Effects on delinquency. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 6, 1–88, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.4073/csr.2010.1

Popham C. (2024). Is knife crime at record highs? Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from: https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/is-knife-crime-at-record-highs/

Sherman, L., Neyroud, P.W., and Neyroud, E. (2016). The Cambridge Crime Harm Index: Measuring total harm from Crime Based on Sentencing Guidelines, Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, *(10)*3, 171–183, <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw003</u>

Sturge G. (2024). Court statistics for England and Wales. Retrieved from: <u>https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-8372/CBP-8372.pdf</u>

Sutherland, A., Disley, E., Cattell, J., and Bauchowitz, S. (2017). An analysis of trends in first time entrants to the youth justice system. Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/analysis-of-trends-in-first-time-entrants-to-the-youth-justice-system</u>

Trust for London (2024). Poverty rates by London borough. Retrieved from: <u>https://trustforlondon.org.uk/data/poverty-borough/</u>

Uhrig, N. (2016). Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System in England and Wales. Ministry of Justice: Crown Copyright. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a75928440f0b6360e475224/bamedisproportionality-in-the-cjs.pdf

Wilson, H.A., and Hoge, R. D. (2013). The effect of youth diversion programs on recidivism: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal justice and behavior*, 40(5), 497–518, https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-12174-002

Wilson, D.B., Brennan, I., and Olaghere, A. (2018). Police-initiated diversion for youth to prevent future delinquent behavior: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 14(1), 1–88, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.4073/csr.2018.5

Youth Endowment Fund (2022a). Children, Violence, and Vulnerability. Retrieved from: <u>https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/YEF-Children-violence-and-vulnerability-2022.pdf</u>

Youth Endowment Fund (2022b.) YEF Outcomes Framework. Retrieved from: <u>https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/YEF-Outcomes-</u> <u>Framework-August-2022.pdf</u>

Youth Endowment Fund (2024). YEF Toolkit: Pre-court diversion. Retrieved from: <u>https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/toolkit/pre-court-diversion/</u>

Youth Justice Board (2013). Youth Cautions Guidance for Police and Youth Offending Teams. Retrieved from:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_ data/file/354050/yjb-youth-cautions-police-YOTs.pdf

Youth Justice Board (2021). Definitions for prevention and diversion. Retrieved from: <u>https://yjresourcehub.uk/images/YJB/Definitions for Prevention and Diversion YJB 2021</u>.pdf

Youth Justice Board (2023). Prevention and Diversion Project – final report. Retrieved from: <u>https://yjresourcehub.uk/images/YJB/Prevention and Diversion Project Final Report YJB</u> <u>Feb 2023.pdf</u>

Youth Justice Board (2024a). Case management guidance. How to use out-of-court disposals. retrieved from: <u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/case-management-guidance/how-to-use-out-of-court-disposals</u>

Youth Justice Board (2024b). Youth justice statistics: 2022 to 2023. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-justice-statistics-2022-to-2023

Youth Justice Legal Centre. (2024) Diversion, Legal Terms A-Z. Retrieved from: <u>https://yilc.uk/resources/legal-terms-z/diversion</u>

Annexures

Annex A: Originally proposed research elements excluded due to feasibility

This research project initially included additional lines of research that we did not pursue fully due to feasibility. This Annex describes the rationale for why we could not proceed with these elements. While these questions represented valuable lines of inquiry, practical constraints such as data availability, timeframes, and limitations on resources meant these research questions were not possible to fully investigate.

These additional areas of research sought to explore both implementation-focused aspects of the project as well as analysis of the relationship between diversion and arrest/offending. Specifically, the research questions we could not fully pursue included:

- 1. Which factors predict a CYP not admitting to an offence?
- 2. Which types of diversion are most effective at reducing re-offending?
- 3. Can police data and YJS data be linked to improve understanding and monitoring of diversion?

We describe the rationale for why we were unable to fully investigate these lines of research to provide transparency in our research process and to highlight potentially valuable areas for future research with additional budget and time.

1. What factors predict a CYP not admitting to an offence?

Context

CYP are required to admit guilt as a precondition for most OOCDs (e.g. community resolution, youth caution, youth conditional caution).⁵⁷ The Lammy review highlighted that individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds were found to be more likely than White individuals to plead not guilty at court due to a lack of trust with the CJS.⁵⁸ Additional research with practitioners in the youth justice field has also highlighted that receiving poor legal advice and mistrust of the CJS were seen as contributing to CYP from ethnic minority backgrounds being less likely to admit to an offence or provide 'no comment' at police interviews.⁵⁹ Therefore

⁵⁷ YJB (2022). Case management guidance: How to use out-of-court disposals. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/guidance/case-management-guidance/how-to-use-out-of-court-disposals

⁵⁸ Lammy, D. (2017). The Lammy Review: An Independent Review into the Treatment of, and Outcomes for, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Individuals in the Criminal Justice System. London.

⁵⁹ Ofori,A., Jolaoso, B., Robin-D'Cruz, C., & Whitehead, S. (2021). Equal diversion? Racial disproportionality in youth diversion. London: Centre for Justice Innovation.

ethnic disproportionality in CYP not admitting to an offence, could potentially affect which CYP are diverted from the CJS.

Rationale

Whether individuals admit guilt is not captured systematically within a specific data field in the MPS's systems. It may be noted by officers within free-text fields in interview reports. To extract this free-text data would have required manually reviewing a large number of interviews or designing an algorithm capable of extracting this data, both of which were beyond the scope of this research project.

2. Which types of diversion are most effective at reducing re-offending?

Context

There is mixed evidence on which types of diversion have a greater effect on reducing reoffending. One meta-analysis reported that diversions which involve providing some kind of support service or intervention had a greater impact on reducing re-offending compared to types of diversion that don't involve additional services.⁶⁰ However, another meta-analysis found no significant differences between diversion activities with additional support services and those that did not.⁶¹ Therefore, this research question sought to understand the effect different types of diversion have on the likelihood of future arrest.

In order to answer this question, we needed to determine if a suitably robust research method was feasible. Unfortunately, this was not the case as we describe in the rationale below.

Rationale

We examined the feasibility of five different options for a potential quasi-experimental design (QED) analysis to estimate the effect that different types of diversion have on future arrest. However, we did not find any of these approaches either (i) feasible or (ii) able to provide a robust estimate of the impact of diversion on future arrest. Therefore, we have not used a QED analysis to answer this research question.

We outline below the different methods we considered (and discarded) for the QED analysis. Note that the figures in this section are based on earlier analysis methods during the initial stages of the project, so they do not align with the main body of the report.

⁶⁰ Petrosino et al. (2010)

⁶¹ Wilson & Hoge (2013)

Option #1: Matching (within- and between-borough comparison)

This design would compare a group of CYP who are diverted and a group of CYP who are not, after re-weighting the latter group so its observable characteristics are more similar to the former group. Specifically, we would have used entropy balancing as our matching method, and our matching variables would have included sex, ethnicity, age, number of previous arrests, type of offence, year and season (spring, summer, autumn or winter).

As we are not able to observe whether someone admitted to an offence, we cannot differentiate between those who are never offered diversion, and those who are offered it but refuse (e.g. because they do not admit to the offence). Instead we can only match those who are diverted to those who are not.

Assumptions for estimates to be unbiased: The main assumption for estimates to be unbiased is conditional independence. This means that we observe all factors that are correlated with both treatment status (i.e. diversion) and the outcome (arrest within 6 months of initial offence date). For example, if the comparison group has a higher underlying offence rate than the treatment group (in the absence of any diversion) and this is not perfectly accounted for by observable variables (e.g. number of previous arrests), we will overstate the effectiveness of diversion.

This assumption is unlikely to hold for this dataset. In particular, CYP must admit to the offence to be diverted. If this is correlated with reoffending (in a way that is not proxied by criminal history or our other matching variables), our estimates from matching will be biased. For example, if CYP who admit to an offence are doing so because they want to make a change in their lives away from crime, our estimates will overstate the effectiveness of diversion. This approach is therefore likely to have low internal validity. Overall, the results of this approach would not indicate a causal relationship between diversion and reoffending, and so it would provide minimal additional value compared to the regression analyses in the main body of the report.

Option #2: Matching (between-borough comparison)

This design would compare CYP in boroughs with high diversion rates to CYP in boroughs with low diversion rates. We would be comparing all CYP in relevant boroughs, including those who are not diverted. Matching would be used to compare individuals with similar observable variables (aside from borough).

However, the differences in the average diversion rates between boroughs are likely too small for estimation to be precise (as indicated in Table 26 below).

Table 26: Comparison of diversion rates in the top and bottom 3 boroughs based on CRIS data

Diversion rates in bottom 3 boroughs	Diversion rates in top 3 boroughs
Barnet: 23.9%	Kingston upon Thames: 43.7%
Enfield: 24.4%	Bromley: 42.7%
Haringey: 24.4%	Kensington and Chelsea: 38.3%

When focusing on certain offences with the greatest range in diversion rates across all boroughs (Theft and Possession of Weapons), the spread of diversion rates becomes greater (as indicated in the Table 10 below).

Table 27: Diversion rates by offence type (CRIS data)

Offence type	Diversion rates based on CRIS data
Robbery	5.3%
Vehicle Offences	12.5%
Burglary	13.0%
Sexual Offences	13.1%
Violence Against the Person	19.6%
Public Order Offences	20.4%
Other Accepted Crime	24.4%
Arson and Criminal Damage	26.7%
Possession of Weapons	29.8%
Theft	33.8%
Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society	35.4%
Drug Offences	59.3%

Conversely, using the boroughs with the highest/lowest diversion rates results in small sample sizes.⁶² Including more boroughs raises the sample size, but reduces the difference in treatment intensity between the boroughs being compared.

⁶² For Theft, the best option is probably to compare Kingston upon Thames / Bromley (which have diversion rates above 50%, specifically 65% and 70% respectively) to Hackney (which has the only diversion rate below

Assumptions for estimates to be unbiased: This approach assumes that CYP in the treatment/comparison boroughs have similar underlying likelihood of reoffending conditional on observable characteristics.

We consider this approach to have medium-low internal validity, and it also has less statistical power compared to the first option above. The main advantage of this method (compared to the within- and between-borough matching above) is that it is less susceptible to bias arising from self-selection into treatment. Instead, it assumes that CYP in the treatment/comparison boroughs have similar underlying likelihood of reoffending conditional on observable characteristics.

Option #3: Instrumental variables design

This design would use variation in the propensity to offer diversion to a CYP (instead of escalation) among police officers to estimate the impact of being diverted on reoffending. Specifically, our understanding is that community resolution and no further action diversion types are offered by the arresting officer.⁶³ If allocation of CYP to arresting officers is at random (e.g. based on which officers are patrolling on the specific day, and the schedule for patrols changes over time), then the arresting officer is a valid instrument for diversion - it affects treatment status without affecting reoffending outcomes. This design is known as a "judge leniency" design.

Assumptions for estimates to be unbiased: The first key assumption for impact estimates to be unbiased is instrument exogeneity. This means the officer responsible for diverting / charging CYP only affects their probability of reoffending through this choice. The second key assumption is instrument relevance: there is variation in diversion rates between officers (conditional on borough and the observable variables used in the first stage).

The instrument exogeneity assumption cannot be proven, but it seems likely that it would approximately hold. If there is meaningful variation in diversion rates, this approach would have high internal validity. However, we cannot use this design with the current datasets because it does not identify police officers (via name or some other unique identifier). As a result, we do not think this approach is feasible.

^{25%,} specifically 23%) . The sample sizes for the treatment and comparison groups here would be 1,988 and 318 respectively.

For Possession of Weapons, one option is to compare Bromley / Bexley / Sutton (which have diversion rates above 50%, specifically 50%, 56% and 63% respectively) to Lambeth / Kensington and Chelsea (which have diversion rates below 25%, specifically 21% and 23% respectively). The sample sizes for the treatment and comparison groups here would be 543 and 651 respectively.

⁶³ We understand that the other types of diversion are likely to be offered by a single officer embedded in the YJS team for that BCU. In that case, the variation in the propensity to offer diversion is across different BCUs and is less likely to be as if random, so this approach would be more likely to produce biased estimates.

Options #4 and #5: Difference-in-differences (between-borough comparison) & pre-post (within-borough comparison)

Both these designs rely on there being a sharp and sustained increase or decrease in the diversion rate in a given borough (or set of boroughs). To identify sharp, sustained changes in the diversion rate, we grouped the data by borough, and by year/quarter. We then looked for borough/year/quarter combinations where the diversion rate is at least 10pp different from either of the previous two quarters. Only 4 boroughs satisfy this condition at any point, with the maximum quarter-to-quarter jump being 16pp.

We also considered offence types with the highest diversion rates across all boroughs (Theft, Drug Offences and- Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society). 13 boroughs had one quarter where the diversion rate was at least 15pp different from the previous four quarters. The best candidates were Hackney, Haringey, Hillingdon (excluding the last quarter in the data) and Waltham Forest. However, sample sizes are too small in these cases for precise estimation.

Assumptions for estimates to be unbiased: difference-in-differences approach

The main assumption is (conditional) parallel trends: conditional on observable characteristics, the underlying trends in arrest rates (i.e. percentage-point changes over time) are the same in intervention and comparison boroughs. This assumption is unlikely to hold (e.g. intervention boroughs may increase efforts to divert children because they are anticipating an increase in crime), but is likely to be violated to a lesser degree than the matching assumptions. As a result, this approach has medium internal validity. However, this approach is expected to have lower statistical power compared to cross-sectional analysis (e.g. matching).

Assumptions for estimates to be unbiased: pre-post approach

The main assumption for estimates to be unbiased is that there are no systematic/underlying changes in reoffending rates between the pre- and post-intervention periods (e.g. no change in underlying crime rates). The likelihood of this assumption holding is very low, so this approach has low internal validity.

As there are very few examples of sharp, sustained changes in diversion rates in the data, we do not consider either of the difference-in-differences or pre-post approaches to be feasible.

3. Can police data and YJS data be linked to improve understanding and monitoring of diversion?

Context

Data between MPS and YJS teams is currently not systematically linked to monitor the process and impact diversion has on arrest/offending for CYP. There is also variation in the types of diversionary support provided by YJS teams across London (Ely et al., 2019). Linking

data between the MPS and YJS teams would provide insight into which types of offences or CYP benefit from being diverted to YJS teams. This would also enable investigating the effectiveness of different diversionary support activities provided by YJS teams, in addition to diversionary outcomes provided by the MPS.

This research question sought to explore the feasibility of linking MPS data with data from YJS teams.

Rationale

We encountered administrative challenges in obtaining both internal MPS data and data from YJS teams. In consultation with YEF, we prioritised obtaining internal data from the MPS, which was key to progressing the overall project. This reduced the timescales and resources available for the project to pursue obtaining data from YJS teams, given this process required additional resources to liaise with multiple stakeholders to obtain data from multiple YJS teams.

We were able to obtain YJS data with the depth required to link to MPS data from one borough (Croydon). While we were able to successfully link this data, a breakdown by type of diversion was unavailable and given we only had data from one borough it didn't warrant further analysis.

Below we describe:

- Accessing YJS data: Challenges with accessing a high enough volume of YJS data with the information needed, which made further analysis unfeasible
- Linking YJS data: Successfully linking YJS data from one borough

Accessing YJS data

There were challenges in agreeing data sharing arrangements and being provided with data, which delayed obtaining data from additional YJS teams for this project.

We initially proposed taking a two-staged approach to determine the feasibility of merging data from YJS teams with the MPS's data:

- 1. Obtain data from two YJS teams to initially assess the feasibility of merging
- 2. If initial YJS data could be merged with MPS data, we proposed obtaining a second tranche of data from YJS offices across all London boroughs, to supplement our main analyses for this research project. We proposed leveraging relationships with stakeholders in the London Office of Technology and Innovation (LOTI) and the Information Governance for London working group (IGfL), to engage with the YJS team at a pan-London level, rather than approaching individual YJS teams in each borough.

However, we were not able to proceed past the first stage of this approach. There were two key administrative challenges in obtaining this data from both the MPS and YJS teams; i) data extraction and iii) data sharing arrangements.

Data extraction: There were delays to being provided with data from the MPS. The key challenges to being provided with this data appeared to stem from operational demands on data teams within the MPS. This took priority over the data being requested for this research project. However, without data from the MPS, we could not determine the feasibility of linking this data with YJS teams. Data was requested from five different systems in the MPS in June of 2023, but wasn't able to be provided until December 2023. At this point, data was provided for only two datasets (CRIS and Stops). Data from the NSPIS system was provided in April 2024.

Data sharing arrangements: This project leveraged existing data sharing agreements between the MPS and YJS teams in London. This was anticipated to help reduce the complexity of having to establish new data sharing agreements between the MPS and YJS teams. We worked with the IGfL to identify the suitability of leveraging this existing data sharing agreement, as having an appropriate basis to obtain and analyse data for this project. The IGfL advised that the scope of the research project fell within the remit of this existing data sharing agreement, where data would be processed for law enforcement purposes under Part 3 of the *Data Protection Act 2018*. This was because the aim of the project focused on whether youth diversion is effective at preventing and reducing re-offending, which aligns with the purposes of processing data within the data sharing agreement. The IGfL also advised that a DPIA has already been completed for the sharing of personal data between local YJS teams and the MPS, and this would be sufficient for this research project.

Nonetheless, these arrangements were still checked for its appropriateness to be used for this project, which required liaising with the Information Governance for London group (IGfL). However, when reaching out to stakeholders in the MPS and YJS teams for data, these data sharing arrangements were then considered again for their appropriateness. These discussions also impacted the timelines for this project, in obtaining relevant YJS data.

We obtained data from two YJS teams (Croydon YJS and Hackney YJS). However, data with identifiable information was only provided from Croydon YJS. Hackney YJS did not provide any identifying information (i.e. only aggregated information was provided). This was due to perceived uncertainty around the data sharing arrangements between the MPS and YJS teams, to provide this information. Without identifying details in the data from Hackney YJS, this information could not be linked to MPS data. Therefore we only sought to determine the feasibility of linking MPS data, with data from the Croydon YJS team.

Data from Croydon YJS teams

The data requested from Croydon YJS covered the period 01 Jan 2015 to 30th September 2022.

This dataset includes demographic information (e.g. name, address, ethnicity), as well as diversion-related information (e.g. diversion intervention offered to CYP, start and end date of programme offered). Croydon YJS database (Core+) only has a single option for recording diversionary interventions or activities ("Diversion Programme"). Specific kinds of diversionary interventions provided by the YJS team are not captured in a clearly extractable manner.

Linking YJS data with MPS data

Prior to merging Croydon YJS data, we cleaned the data following the same procedure for MPS data (see <u>Data cleaning</u> section above for further details). This resulted in a dataset of 1,383 incident cases, covering 260 unique CYP. ⁶⁴

For each individual in the YJS data, we then examined whether they appear in the combined data. We matched YJS data with the combined dataset for CRIS and Stops, by using a unique identifier, of the CYP's forename, surname and date of birth based on the YJS data.

Out of 1,383 incident cases in the YJS data, 84% could be linked to the combined MPS data. This covers 1,052 unique CYP being linked to the combined MPS data. Of these, we find that 80% (840) were classified as being diverted in the combined MPS dataset.

We can't conclusively say why the remaining 20% of unique CYP in the YJS data could not be linked to MPS data. It is likely these CYP could have been referred to YJS through other pathways (e.g. Early Help Services, Pupil Reduction Units) without these CYP having come into contact with police.

However, whilst there is a high proportion of CYP who are able to be linked to CRIS and Stops data, it is unclear which offences are directly linked to a specific diversionary intervention within Croydon YJS data. Therefore, we assessed there was no additional value in using this data to supplement the combined MPS data for our analysis.

⁶⁴ Using the same definition of incident cases for MPS data (i.e. unique combination of forename, surname and date of birth).

Annex B: Scope of explanatory analysis of diversions for knife crime offences

We outline below the scope of additional exploratory analyses related to knife crime offences. The scope of this additional analysis was based on our main research aims, except focusing on knife offences. Table 29 provides an overview of the additional analysis.

Table 28: Summary of elements to be addressed by exploratory analysis of diversions for knife crime

Research theme	Description of analysis	Specific elements to be addressed by analysis
Descriptive summary of the number of CYP involved in knife crime	 Descriptive analysis of the number of CYP found carrying a knife / suspected of committing a knife-enabled crime at least once, compared to CYP found carrying a knife / suspected of committing a knife-enabled crime at least three times Descriptive analysis of CYP found carrying a knife / suspected of committing a knife	 Breakdown of the number of CYP by: Calendar year Age Sex Ethnicity Location Number of previous arrests Offence type Severity of offence
Descriptive summary of diversions for CYP involved in knife crime	 Descriptive analysis of CYP who are diverted for a knife-related offence 	Breakdown of the number of CYP by: Calendar year Age Sex Ethnicity Location Number of previous arrests Offence type

		 Severity of offence
Relationship between diversion and arrest for CYP involved in knife crime	 Regression analysis exploring the relationship between diversion on arrest rates for knife crime offences 	 Arrest rates for all diverted CYP (compared to escalated CYP) Arrest rates for specific types of diversion Arrest rates for white CYP and other ethnic minority CYP

Appendices

Appendix A: Values from CRIS, Stops and NSIPIS data mapped to diversionary, escalatory and indeterminate disposal outcome variable

Table 29: Mapping of values across CRIS, Stops and NSPIS data for diverted (including typesof diversion) outcomes

Concept	Data source	Values
Diverted outcome (overall)	Stops	 9 CANNABIS OR KHAT WARNING 13 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION 14 CAUTION (SIMPLE OR CONDITIONAL) 3 VERBAL WARNING 2 ADVISED
	CRIS	 ARRESTED AND CAUTIONED CAUTION-ADULT COMMUNITY RESOLUTION ADULT CAUTIONED AWAY FROM POLICE STATION COMMUNITY RESOLUTION COMMUNITY RESOLUTION WITH RESTORATIVE JUSTICE L2 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION NON YOUTH TRIAGE COMMUNITY RESOLUTION SCHOOLS COMMUNITY RESOLUTION WITH RESTORATIVE JUSTICE L1 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION YOUTH TRIAGE COMMUNITY RESOLUTION YOUTH TRIAGE COMMUNITY RESOLUTION YOUTH TRIAGE CONDITIONAL CAUTION DRUG WARNING FORMAL WARNING NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST - SEE DETS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILD RESTORATIVE JUSTICE LEVEL ONE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE LEVEL TWO RESTORATIVE JUSTICE SCHOOLS YOUTH CAUTIONS YOUTH CAUTIONAL CAUTION YOUTH CONDITIONAL CAUTION YOUTH CONDITIONAL CAUTION YOUTH TRIAGE

	CRIS	 Adult Caution Youth Caution Youth Triage
	NSPIS	 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION CONDITIONAL CAUTION REPRIMAND SIMPLE CAUTION
Informal diverted outcomes	Stops	 9 CANNABIS OR KHAT WARNING 13 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION 3 VERBAL WARNING 2 ADVISED
	CRIS	 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION ADULT COMMUNITY RESOLUTION COMMUNITY RESOLUTION WITH RESTORATIVE JUSTICE L2 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION NON YOUTH TRIAGE COMMUNITY RESOLUTION SCHOOLS COMMUNITY RESOLUTION WITH RESTORATIVE JUSTICE L1 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION YOUTH TRIAGE DRUG WARNING NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST - SEE DETS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILD RESTORATIVE JUSTICE LEVEL ONE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE LEVEL TWO RESTORATIVE JUSTICE SCHOOLS YOUTH TRIAGE
	CRIS	Youth triage
	NSPIS	COMMUNITY RESOLUTION
Community Resolution	Stops	13 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION
	CRIS	 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION ADULT COMMUNITY RESOLUTION COMMUNITY RESOLUTION WITH RESTORATIVE JUSTICE L2COMMUNITY RESOLUTION NON YOUTH TRIAGE COMMUNITY RESOLUTION SCHOOLS COMMUNITY RESOLUTION WITH RESTORATIVE JUSTICE L1 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION YOUTH TRIAGE

		 RESTORATIVE JUSTICE LEVEL ONE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE SCHOOLS
	NSPIS	COMMUNITY RESOLUTION
Triage	Stops	n/a
	CRIS	 COMMUNITY RESOLUTION YOUTH TRIAGE YOUTH TRIAGE
	CRIS	Youth Triage
	NSPIS	n/a
Not in the	Stops	n/a
interest	CRIS	 NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST - SEE DETS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILD
	NSPIS	n/a
Warning (informal)	Stops	 9 CANNABIS OR KHAT WARNING 3 VERBAL WARNING 2 ADVISED
	CRIS	DRUG WARNING
	NSPIS	n/a
Formal diverted	Stops	• 14 CAUTION (SIMPLE OR CONDITIONAL)
	CRIS	 ARRESTED AND CAUTIONED CAUTION-ADULT CAUTIONED AWAY FROM POLICE STATION YOUTH CAUTION YOUTH CAUTIONS YOUTH CONDITIONAL CAUTION CONDITIONAL CAUTION FORMAL WARNING RESTORATIVE JUSTICE LEVEL TWO
	CRIS	Adult Caution

		Youth Caution
	NSPIS	 CONDITIONAL CAUTION REPRIMAND SIMPLE CAUTION
Youth Caution	Stops	n/a
Caution	CRIS	 FORMAL WARNING ARRESTED AND CAUTIONED CAUTION-ADULT CAUTIONED AWAY FROM POLICE STATION YOUTH CAUTION YOUTH CAUTIONS
	CRIS	Adult CautionYouth Caution
	NSPIS	REPRIMANDSIMPLE CAUTION
Youth Conditional Caution	Stops	n/a
	CRIS	 YOUTH CONDITIONAL CAUTION CONDITIONAL CAUTION RESTORATIVE JUSTICE LEVEL TWO
	NSPIS	CONDITIONAL CAUTION

Table 30: Mapping of values across CRIS, Stops and NSPIS data for escalated outcomes

Concept	Data source	Values
Escalated criminal justice outcomes	Stops	 4 ARRESTED 6 DISPERSAL OF GROUPS (ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR LOCALITY) 7 DIRECTED TO LEAVE, ALCOHOL RELATED CRIME OR DISORDER LOCALITY 8 ALCOHOL CONFISCATION 11 PENALTY NOTICE (PND/FPN) 12 POSTAL CHARGE REQUISITION / SUMMONS

	CRIS	 ARRESTED AND CHARGED CHARGE/FURTHER CHARGE CPS DECLINE PROSECUTION CPS DECLINE TO CHARGE CRIME RELATED INCIDENT FIRST INSTANCE OF HARASSMENT FIXED PENALTY NOTICE FIXED PENALTY NOTICE ISSUED INTERVIEWED UNDER CAUTION - NFA POSTAL CHARGE REQUISITION SUMMONS/FURTHER SUMMONS SUMMONSED TIC
	CRIS	 Charged Fixed Penalty Notice Postal Charge Requisition Summonsed Taken into Consideration
	NSPIS	 BAILED TO COURT ON WARRANT BAILED TO POLICE STATION CHARGED AND BAILED TO COURT CHARGED AND DETAINED FOR COURT DETAINED FOR COURT ON WARRANT FIXED PENALTY NOTICE ISSUE PROCESSED ON BEHALF OF ANOTHER FORCE RELEASED UNDER INVESTIGATION REPORTED FOR SUMMONS TO COURT (POSTAL REQUISITIONS) TO COURT BREACH OF BAIL TO COURT FOR BREACH OF INJUNCTION TO PRISON
Charge	Stops	• 12 POSTAL CHARGE REQUISITION / SUMMONS
	CRIS	 ARRESTED AND CHARGED CHARGE/FURTHER CHARGE
CRIS	•	Charged
------	-----	---
NSP	S •	BAILED TO COURT ON WARRANT CHARGED AND BAILED TO COURT CHARGED AND DETAINED FOR COURT

Table 31: Mapping of values across CRIS, Stops and NSPIS data for indeterminate outcomes

Concept	Data Source	Values
Indetermin ate outcomes	Stops	1 NO FURTHER ACTION5 OTHER
	CRIS	 FALSE ALLEGATION INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO PROCEED NO FURTHER ACTION [TRUE N/A] SUSPECT DECEASED SUSPECT HAS LEFT THE UK THIRD PARTY REPORT - AWAITS VICTIM THIRD PARTY REPORT - VICTIM UNWILLING TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER FORCE SOCIAL SERVICES INVESTIGATION STATUTORY BODY INVESTIGATION VICTIM UNWILLING TO PROSECUTE
	NSPIS	 MHA DIVERSION NO FURTHER ACTION PROCESSED ON BEHALF OF ANOTHER FORCE CROSS REFERENCED DEATH (IN CUSTODY)
No Further Actions	Stops	• 1 NO FURTHER ACTION
	CRIS	NO FURTHER ACTION [TRUE N/A]
	NSPIS	NO FURTHER ACTION

Appendix B: Values from CRIS, Stops and NSIPIS data mapped to definition of violent offences

We define offences in CRIS as violent offences (where they contain Home Office offence codes) for the offences listed in the table below.

Data source	Values
CRIS	 05601 - Arson endangering life 05700 - Unlawfully and maliciously causing or conspiring to cause explosion likely to endanger life or property 05912 - Possessing or making an explosive substance, a noxious or dangerous thing, a machine, engine or instrument with intent to commit an offence under the Offences against the Person Act 1861 05915 - Possessing or making an explosive substance, a noxious or dangerous thing, a machine, engine or instrument with intent to commit an offence under the Offences against the Person Act 1861 05915 - Possessing or making an explosive substance, a noxious or dangerous thing, a machine, engine or instrument with intent to commit an offence under the Offences against the Person Act 1861 07600 - Aid / abet the suicide or attempted suicide of another 07601 - Intentionally doing an act capable of encouraging or assisting the suicide or attempted suicide of another 00803 - Setting spring guns etc. to injure trespassers 00861 - Threaten with an offensive weapon in a public place 00862 - Threaten with an offensive weapon on school premises 00863 - Threaten with a blade or sharply pointed article on school premises 00864 - Threaten with an offensive weapon on school premises 00864 - Threaten a person with an offensive weapon / article / substance in a private place 06500 - Violent Disorder 06606 - Threats of attack on United Nations workers 06609 - Racially aggravated fear or provocation of violence 06661 - Affray 06664 - Possessing radioactive material with intent using it in commission or preparation for terrorism 03401 - Robbery 03402 - Assault with intent to rob 10423 - Assault on a constable 10425 - Assault on a constable 10425 - Assault on a constable

Table 32: Values in CRIS used to identify violent offences

 10430 - Offences against similar provisions in Local Acts
 10431 - Resisting or obstructing a constable in execution of duty - offences
under the Vagrancy Act 1824
 10433 - Resisting or obstructing a constable in execution of duty - offences
under the Police Act 1996
 10435 - Resisting or wilfully obstructing a designated person or his assistant
in exercise of such power
• 10436 - Assaulting a member of a joint investigation team carrying out his
functions as a member of that team
 10437 - Obstructing a person in the exercise of any rights conferred by a
warrant under S.66 - power to enter and seize documents (Serious
Organised Crime and Police Act 2005)
 10438 - Resisting or wilfully obstructing a member of a joint investigation
team carrying out his functions as a member of that team
 10439 - Assaulting or obstructing a Customs or Revenue officer
 10440 - Resisting or obstructing constables in execution of duty - Summary
offences under similar provisions in Local Acts
 10441 - Obstruct a person serving / enforcing a closure notice / order
 10501 - Common assault and battery
 10502 - Assaults punishable under special enactments and not falling under
other headings
 10503 - Assaulting, resisting or obstructing a person assisting a constable
 10504 - Assaulting a prisoner custody officer or custody officer
 10505 - Resisting or wilfully obstructing a prisoner custody officer
 10506 - Assaulting a court security officer
 10507 - Resisting or wilfully obstructing a court security officer
 10508 - Assaulting a designated or accredited person, or person assisting
him or her, in the execution of his or her duty
 10509 - Resisting or wilfully obstructing a designated or accredited person,
or person assisting, in the execution of his or her duty
 10510 - Assaulting a traffic officer
• 10511 - Resisting or wilfully obstructing a traffic officer in the execution of
his duties
 10512 - Assaulting a designated immigration officer exercising S.2 detention
powers
• 10513 - Assaulting an immigration officer
• 10514 - Assault an NCA officer or a member of an NCA-led team acting or
assisting in the exercise of an operational power
 10515 - Resist or Wiltuily obstruct an NCA officer or a member of an NCA- load team estimater experience in the expension of a member of an NCA-
ieau team acting or assisting in the exercise of an operational power
 10516 - Assault a supreme court security officer 10517 - Decist or wilfully obstruct a supreme security officer
 10517 - Resist or winning obstruct a supreme court security officer 10510 Make off when required to wait with a secure college system to afficer
 TOTA - Make on when required to wait with a secure college custody officer

•	10520 - Resist / wilfully obstruct a custody officer performing custodial
	duties at a contracted-out secure college
•	10521 - Assault a custody officer performing custodial duties at a
	contracted-out secure college
•	10522 - Resist / wilfully obstruct custody officer performing contracted-out
	functions at directly managed secure college
•	10523 - Assault custody officer performing contracted-out functions at
	directly managed secure college
•	10524 - Obstruct police / customs officer executing a drug-cutting agent
	search and seizure warrant
•	10525 - Assault/resist or wilfully obstruct appropriate person acting in
	exercise of relevant power
•	19442 - Assaulting a detainee custody officer
•	02802 - Burglary in a dwelling with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm -
	indictable only
•	02900 - Aggravated burglary in a dwelling
•	03002 - Burglary in a building other than a dwelling with intent to
	steal/inflict grievous bodily harm/commit damage - triable either way
•	03100 - Aggravated burglary in a building other than a dwelling
•	03702 - Aggravated taking of a vehicle: where the vehicle was driven
	dangerously, where injury to any person or damage to any property was
	caused, or damage was caused to the vehicle
•	00101 - Murder of persons aged 1 year or over
•	00102 - Murder of infants under 1 year of age
•	00200 - Attempted murder
•	00301 - Making threats to kill
•	00302 - Conspiracy or soliciting, etc., to commit murder
•	00304 - Intentionally encouraging or assisting commission of murder
•	00401 - Manslaughter
•	00402 - Infanticide
•	00403 - Child destruction
•	00404 - Causing death by dangerous driving (MOT)
•	00405 - Manslaughter due to diminished responsibility
•	00406 - Causing death by careless driving when under the influence of drink
	or drugs (MOT)
•	00407 - Causing or allowing the death of a child or vulnerable person
•	00408 - Causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving (MOT)
•	00409 - Causing death by driving: unlicensed or uninsured drivers (MOT)
•	00410 - Applicable organisation by way of management or organisation of its
	activities causing death by gross breach of duty of care
•	00411 - Causing or allowing child or vulnerable adult to suffer serious
	physical harm
•	00412 - Causing serious injury by dangerous driving (MOT)

 00413 - Cause death by driving without due care / consideration while over prescribed limit - specified controlled drug 00417 - Cause death by driving whilst disqualified 00418 - Cause serious injury by driving whilst disqualified 00501 - Wounding etc. with intent to do grievous bodily harm etc. or to resist apprehension 00502 - Shooting at naval or revenue vessels 00504 - Attempting to choke, suffocate etc. with intent to commit an
 indictable offence (garrotting) 00505 - Using chloroform, etc., to commit or assist in committing an
indictable offence
 00506 - Burning, maiming, etc. by explosion
 00507 - Causing, explosions or casting corrosive fluids with intent to do grievous bodily harm
 00508 - Impeding the saving of life from shipwreck
 00509 - Placing, etc. explosives in or near ships or buildings with intent to do bodily harm, etc.
 00510 - Endangering life or causing harm by administering poison
 00511 - Causing danger by causing anything to be on a road or interfering with a vehicle or traffic equipment (MOT)
 00513 - Possession etc. of explosives with intent to endanger life
• 00514 - Possession of firearms etc., with intent to endanger life (Group I)
• 00515 - Possession of firearms etc. with intent to endanger life (Group II)
 00516 - Possession of firearms etc. with intent to endanger life (Group III) 00517 - Using etc. firearms or imitation firearms with intent to resist arrest etc. (Group I)
 00518 - Using etc. firearms or imitation firearms with intent to resist arrest etc. (Group II)
 00519 - Using etc. firearms or imitation firearms with intent to resist arrest etc. (Group III)
• 00520 - Use etc. of chemical weapons
00521 - Use of premises or equipment for producing chemical weapons
 00522 - Use, threat of use, production or possession of a nuclear weapon 00523 - Weapons related acts overseas
00524 - Use of noxious substances or things to cause harm or intimidate
 00525 - Performing an aviation function or ancillary function when ability to carry out function is impaired because of drink or drugs
 00526 - Endangering safety at aerodromes
• 00527 - Torture
• 00601 - Endangering railway passenger: By placing, etc., anything on railway,
taking up rails, changing points and signals etc.
 00602 - Endangering railway passengers: By throwing anything at railway carriages, etc.

 00603 - Endangering railway passenger: By unlawful acts, or by omission or perfect
 00604 - Endangering railway passenger: Destroying damaging etc. a Channel
Tunnel train or the tunnel system, or committing acts of violence likely to
endanger safety of operation
 00714 - Destroying ships or fixed platforms endangering their safety
 00801 - Wound / inflict grievous bodily harm without intent
 00802 - Administering poison with intent to injure or annov
 00804 - Causing bodily harm by furious driving
 00805 - Assaults on person preserving wreck
 00806 - Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm
 00809 - Obstructing, assaulting or arresting upon civil process clergymen
performing service
 00820 - Assault with intent to resist apprehension or assault a person
assisting a constable
• 00821 - Owner or person in charge allowing dog to be dangerously out of
control in any place in England and Wales (whether or not in a public place)
injuring any person or assistance dog
00822 - Owner or person in charge allowing dog to enter a non-public place
and injure any person
00829 - Breach of the conditions of an injunction against harassment
 00830 - Other harassment - putting people in fear of violence
• 00831 - Breach of Restraining Order (Protection from Harassment Act 1997)
 00833 - Racially aggravated wounding or inflicting grievous bodily harm
(inflicting bodily injury with or without weapon)
 00834 - Racially aggravated actual bodily harm (assaults occasioning ABH)
 00835 - Racially aggravated common assault
 00836 - Racially aggravated intentional harassment, alarm or distress
 00837 - Racially aggravated offence of harassment
 00838 - Racially aggravated putting people in fear of violence
 00840 - Religiously aggravated malicious wounding or grievous bodily harm
 00841 - Religiously aggravated assault/assault occasioning actual bodily
harm (ABH)
 00842 - Religiously aggravated common assault
 00843 - Religiously aggravated causing intentional harassment alarm or
distress
00844 - Religiously aggravated offence of harassment
U0845 - Religiously aggravated putting people in fear of violence
 UU846 - Racially or religiously aggravated malicious wounding or grievous
poally narm (GBH)
 UU847 - Racially or religiously aggravated actual bodily harm (ABH) OOR48 - Decially or religiously aggregated actual bodily harm (ABH)
 00848 - Racially or religiously aggrevated common assault 00840 - Recipilly or religiously aggrevated intentional becomment of any or
 UD649 - Racially or religiously aggravated intentional narassment, alarm or distrass
uistress

 00850 - Racially or religiously aggravated offence of harassment 00851 - Racially or religiously aggravated putting people in fear of violence (used only if it is not known whether the offence is racially or religiously
aggravated or if it is both racially and religiously motivated)
 00852 - Offences under the Female Genital Mutilation Act 2003
 00856 - Racially or religiously aggravated stalking without violence
 00857 - Racially or religiously aggravated common assault or beating
 00858 - Racially or religiously aggravated stalking with fear of violence
 00859 - Racially or religiously aggravated wounding or grievous bodily harm
 00860 - Racially or religiously aggravated assault occasioning actual bodily
harm
 00865 - Stalking involving fear of violence
 00866 - Stalking involving serious alarm/distress
 00867 - Engage in controlling / coercive behaviour in an intimate / family relationship
 00868 - Fail to protect girl from risk of genital mutilation
 00869 - Care worker ill-treat/wilfully neglect an individual
 00870 - Care provider breach duty of care resulting in ill-treatment / neglect
of individual
 00871 - Disclose private sexual photographs and films with intent to cause
distress
 00872 - Sending letters etc. with intent to cause distress or anxiety
 00873 - Assault or assault by beating of an emergency worker
 00874 - Breach of stalking order / interim stalking order
 01102 - Neglecting to provide for apprentice or servant
 01103 - Cruelty to or neglect of children
 01200 - Abandon / expose a child under the age of two years whereby life /
health endangered
 01301 - Abduction of a child by parent
 01302 - Abduction of a child by other persons
• 03601 - Kidnapping
• 03602 - Hijacking
 03603 - False imprisonment
 03604 - Detaining and threatening to kill or injure a hostage
03605 - Forced marriage
 03701 - Aggravated taking of a vehicle: where, owing to the driving of the
vehicle, an accident occurs causing the death of any person (MOT)
 00877 - Intentional strangulation or suffocation
 00419 - Cause serious injury by careless / inconsiderate driving
 06821 - Offences relating to carrying out, aiding or abetting the carrying out
of a virginity test
 06822 - Offences relating to carrying out of a hymenoplasty, aiding and
abbeting the carrying out of a hymenoplasty

 01605 - Male member of staff of hospital committing buggery or gross indecency with male patient (historic)
 01606 - Man committing buggery or act of gross indecency with mentally disordered male patient who is subject to his care (historie)
disordered male patient who is subject to his care (historic)
 01611 - Assault with intent to commit buggery 01612 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male with a male under the age
• 01012 - Buggery of attempted buggery by a male with a male under the age of 16 (historic)
 01613 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 21 or over with a male aged under 16 (historic)
• 01614 - Buggery by a male aged 18 to 20 with a male aged 16 or 17 (historic)
 01615 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged under 16 with a male aged under 16 (historic)
 01616 - Buggery - other than in private - male victim
 01617 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male with a female under 16 (historic)
• 01618 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 21 or over with a
female aged 16 or 17 (historic)
 01619 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 18 - 20 with a female aged under 16 (historic)
 01620 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 16 or 17 with a
female aged 16 or over (historic)
 01621 - Buggery - other than in private - female victim
 01622 - Buggery or attempted buggery of an animal (historic)
 01623 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 18-20 with a male aged under 16
 01624 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 18-20 with a female aged under 16 (historic)
 01625 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 16 to 17 with a male aged under 16 (historic)
 01626 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 21 or over with a male aged under 16
 01627 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 21 or over with a female aged under 16
 01628 - Buggery or attempted buggery by a male aged 16 to 17 with a female aged under 16 (historic)
 01711 - Indecent assault or attempted indecent assault on a male aged under 16 (bistoric)
 01712 - Indecent assault on a male aged 16 or over (historic)
 01712 - Indecent assault on a male aged 10 or over - penetration 01713 - Sexual assault on a male aged 13 or over - penetration
 01714 - Sexual assault on a male child aged under 13 - nenetration
 01715 - Sexual assault on a male aged 13 or over - no penetration
 01716 - Sexual assault on a male child aged under 13 - touching
 01803 - Gross indecency by a male aged 21 or over with a male aged under
18 (historic)

• 01804 - Gross indecency by a male aged 18 - 20 with a male aged under 16
(historic)
 01805 - Gross indecency by a male aged under 18 with another male
(historic)
 01806 - Gross indecency by a male aged 18 or over with another male aged
16 or over (historic)
01807 - Gross indecency between man aged 16 or 17 and boy under 16
 01808 - Gross indecency between man aged 18 - 20 and boy under 16 (historic)
 01809 - Gross indecency between men in public place (historic)
• 01810 - Gross indecency by a male aged under 16 with another male
(historic)
• 01811 - Gross indecency between man aged over 21 years and boy under 16
years
01902 - Sexual intercourse with woman / girl mental defective (historic)
01904 - Man having unlawful sexual intercourse with mentally disordered
female patient in his care (historic)
 01907 - Rape of a female aged 13 to 15
 01908 - Rape of a female aged 16 or over
 01909 - Rape of a male aged 13 to 15
 01910 - Rape of a male aged 16 or over
 01911 - Attempted rape of a female aged 13 to 15
 01912 - Attempted rape of a female aged 16 or over
 01913 - Attempted rape of a male aged 13 to 15
 01914 - Attempted rape of a male aged 16 or over
 01916 - Rape of a female child aged under 13 by a male
 01917 - Rape of a male child aged under 13 by a male
 01918 - Attempted rape of a female child aged under 13 by a male
 01919 - Attempted rape of a male child aged under 13 by a male
 02001 - Indecent assault or attempted indecent assault on a female aged
under 16 (historic offence)
 02002 - Indecent assault or attempted indecent assault on a female aged 16
or over (historic offence)
 02003 - Sexual assault on a female aged 13 or over - penetration
 02004 - Sexual assault on a female child aged under 13 - penetration
02005 - Sexual assault on a female aged 13 or over - no penetration
02006 - Sexual assault on a female child aged under 13 - touching
 U2100 - Unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl under 13 years of age (historic)
 02101 - Unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl under 13
 02102 - Causing or inciting a female child aged under 13 to engage in sexual
activity - penetration
 02103 - Causing or inciting a female child aged under 13 to engage in sexual
activity - no penetration

• 02104 - Causing or inciting a male child aged under 13 to engage in sexual
 activity - penetration 02105 - Causing or inciting a male child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity - no penetration
 02106 - Sexual activity with a female child aged under 13 - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02107 - Sexual activity with a male child aged under 13 - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02108 - Causing or inciting a female child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02109 - Causing or inciting a male child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02110 - Engaging in sexual activity in the presence of a child aged under 13 -
 Offender aged 18 or over 02111 - Causing a child aged under 13 to watch a sexual act - offender aged
 18 or over 02112 - Sexual activity with a female child aged under 13 - offender aged under 18
 02113 - Sexual activity with a male child aged under 13 - offender aged under 18
 02114 - Causing or inciting a female child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity - offender under 18
 02115 - Causing or inciting a male child under 13 to engage in sexual activity offender under 18
 02116 - Engaging in sexual activity in the presence of a child aged under 13 - offender under 18
 02117 - Causing a child under 13 to watch a sexual act - offender under 18 02118 - Sexual activity with a female child aged under 13 - offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
 02119 - Sexual activity with a male child aged under 13 - offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
 02120 - Causing or inciting a female child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
 02121 - Causing or inciting a male child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
 02122 - Sexual activity with a female child aged under 13 - offender aged under 18 - no penetration
 02123 - Sexual activity with a male child aged under 13 - offender aged under 18 - no penetration
 02124 - Causing or inciting a female child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged under 18 - no penetration
 02125 - Causing or inciting a male child aged under 13 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged under 18 - no penetration
 02200 - Unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl aged under 16 (historic)

 02201 - Unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl aged under 16 (historic) 02202 - Causing a female person to engage in sexual activity without consent - penetration
 02203 - Causing a male person to engage in sexual activity without consent - penetration
 02204 - Causing a female person to engage in sexual activity without consent - no penetration
 02205 - Causing a male person to engage in sexual activity without consent - no penetration
 02206 - Sexual activity with a female child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02207 - Sexual activity with a male child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02208 - Causing or inciting a female child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02209 - Causing or inciting a male child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02210 - Engaging in sexual activity in the presence of a child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged 18 or over
 02211 - Causing a child aged 13 to 15 to watch a sexual act - offender aged 18 or over
 02212 - Sexual activity with a female child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged under 18 - penetration
 02213 - Sexual activity with a male child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged under 18 - penetration
 02214 - Causing or inciting a female child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged under 18 - penetration
 02215 - Causing or inciting a male child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged under 18 - penetration
 02216 - Engaging in sexual activity in the presence of a child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged under 18 22217 - Consistent with the presence of a child aged 13 to 15 -
 U2217 - Causing a child aged 13 to 15 to watch a sexual act - offender aged under 18 U2218 - Sexual activity with a female child aged 12 to 15 offender aged 18
 02218 - Sexual activity with a remain child aged 13 to 15 - Other aged 18 or over - no penetration 02210 - Sexual activity with a male shild aged 12 to 15 - offender aged 18 or
 02219 - Sexual activity with a male child aged 13 to 15 - Oriender aged 18 or over - no penetration 02220 - Causing or inciting a female child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual
 O2220 - Causing of inciting a female child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - no penetration O2221 - Causing or inciting a male child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual
 activity - offender aged 18 or over - no penetration 02222 - Sexual activity with a female child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged
under 18 - no penetration

• 02223 - Sexual activity with a male child aged 13 to 15 - offender aged under
18 - no penetration
 02224 - Causing or inciting a female child aged 13 to 15 to engage in sexual
O2225 Causing or insisting a male shild aged 12 to 15 to angage in sexual
 O2225 - Causing of incluing a male clinic aged 15 to 15 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged under 18 - no penetration
 02201 - Incest with a female shild aged under 12 (male offender) (historic)
 02301 - Incest with a female child aged over 13 (male offender) (historic) 02302 - Incest with a female child aged over 13 (male offender) (historic)
 02302 - Intest with a female child aged over 13 (male offender) (firstoffe) 02304 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged 13 to 17 -
offender aged 18 or over - nenetration
 02305 - Sexual activity with a male child family member aged 13 to 17 -
offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02306 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged 13 to 17 -
offender aged under 18 - no penetration
 02307 - Sexual activity with a male child family member aged 13 to 17 -
offender aged under 18 - no penetration
 02308 - Inciting a female child family member aged 13 to 17 to engage in
sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
• 02309 - Inciting a male child family member aged 13 to 17 to engage in
sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
02310 - Inciting a female child family member to engage in sexual activity -
offender aged under 18 or over at time of offence and victim aged 13 to 17
 02311 - Inciting a male child family member to engage in sexual activity -
offender aged under 18 or over at time of offence and victim aged 13 to 17
• 02312 - Sex with an adult relative aged 18 or over - offender aged 16 or over
- penetration
• 02313 - Sex with an adult relative aged 18 or over - offender aged 16 or over
- consenting to penetration
 02314 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged under 13 - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02315 - Sexual activity with a male child family member aged under 13 -
offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02316 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged under 13 -
offender aged under 18 - no penetration
• 02317 - Sexual activity with a male child family member - offender not 18 or
over at time of offence and victim under 13
 02318 - Inciting a female child family member aged under 13 to engage in
sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over - penetration
 02319 - Inciting a male child family member to engage in sexual activity -
offender aged 18 or over at time of offence and victim under 13 -
penetration
 02320 - Inciting a temale child family member aged under 13 to engage in
sexual activity - offender aged under 18 - no penetration

• 02321 - Inciting a male child family member to engage in sexual activity -
offender not 18 or over at time of offence and victim under 13
• 02322 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged 13 to 17 -
offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
• 02323 - Sexual activity with a male child family member aged 13 to 17 -
offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
• 02324 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged under 13 -
offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
• 02325 - Sexual activity with a male child family member aged under 13 -
offender aged 18 or over - no penetration
 02326 - Inciting a female child family member aged 13 to 17 to engage in
sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over at time of offence - no penetration
 02327 - Inciting a male child family member aged 13 to 17 to engage in
sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over at time of offence - no penetration
 02328 - Inciting a female child family member aged under 13 to engage in
sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over at time of offence - no penetration
 02329 - Inciting a male child family member to engage in sexual activity -
offender aged 18 or over at time of offence and victim under 13 - no
penetration
 02330 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged under 13 -
offender aged under 18 - penetration
• 02331 - Sexual activity with a male child family member under 13 - offender
under 18 - penetration of anus, vagina or mouth by penis or other part of
body
• 02332 - Sexual activity with a female child family member aged 13 to 17 -
offender aged under 18 - penetration
• 02333 - Sexual activity with a male child family member 13 to 17 - offender
under 18 - penetration of anus, vagina or mouth by penis or other part of
body
• 02334 - Inciting a female child family member under 13 to engage in sexual
activity - offender under 18 - penetration of anus, vagina or mouth by penis
or other part of body
 02335 - Inciting a male child family member under 13 to engage in sexual
activity - offender under 18 - penetration of anus, vagina or mouth by penis
or other part of body
 02336 - Inciting a female child family member aged 13 to 17 to engage in
sexual activity - offender under 18 - penetration
 02337 - Inciting a male child family member aged 13 to 17 to engage in
sexual activity - offender under 18 - penetration
 02401 - Procure woman to have sex by threats / intimidation, by false
pretences or to become a common prostitute; administer drug to a woman
to obtain intercourse (historic)
 02414 - Man over 21 years party to / procure gross indecency by men (one
under 16) (historic)

• 02415 - Man aged 18 to 20 party to / procure gross indecency by men (one
 under 16) (historic) 02416 - Man aged 16 or 17 party to / procure gross indecency by men (one under 16) (historic)
under 16) (historic) • 02502 Abduction of woman by force to have intercourses (marry (historia))
 02502 - Abduct unmarried girl under sixteen years of age (historic)
 02503 - Abduct unmarried girl under 18 from parent / guardian (historic) 02504 - Abduct unmarried girl under 18 from parent / guardian (historic)
 02504 - Abduct uninamed girl under 18 nom parent / guardian (historic) 02505 - Abduction of mentally disordered female (historic)
 02200 - Abduction of mentally disordered female (historic) 02700 - Soliciting / importuning by map in public place (historic)
 02700 Soliciting / importanting by main in public place (instance) 07001 - Sexual activity with a male person with a mental disorder impeding
choice - penetration
 07002 - Sexual activity with a female person with a mental disorder
impeding choice - penetration
 07003 - Sexual activity with a male person with a mental disorder impeding
choice - no penetration
 07004 - Sexual activity with a female person with a mental disorder
impeding choice - no penetration
07005 - Causing or inciting a male person with a mental disorder impeding
choice to engage in sexual activity - penetration
07006 - Causing or inciting a female person with a mental disorder impeding
choice to engage in sexual activity - penetration
 07007 - Causing or inciting a male person with a mental disorder impeding
choice to engage in sexual activity - no penetration
07008 - Causing or inciting a female person with a mental disorder impeding
choice to engage in sexual activity - no penetration
 07009 - Engaging in sexual activity in the presence of a person with a mental disorder impeding choice
 07010 - Causing a person with a mental disorder impeding choice to watch a sexual act
 07011 - Inducement, threat or decention to procure sexual activity with a
person with a mental disorder - penetration
 07012 - Inducement, threat or deception to procure sexual activity with a
person with a mental disorder - no penetration
• 07013 - Causing a person with a mental disorder to engage in sexual activity
by inducement, threat or deception - penetration
07014 - Causing a person with a mental disorder to engage in sexual activity
by inducement, threat or deception - no penetration
• 07015 - Engaging in sexual activity in the presence, procured by inducement,
threat or deception, of a person with a mental disorder
 07016 - Causing a person with a mental disorder to watch a sexual act by
inducement, threat or deception
 07017 - Care workers: Sexual activity with a male person with a mental
disorder - penetration

07018 - Care workers: Sexual activity with a female person with a mental
disorder - penetration
 07019 - Care workers: Sexual activity with a male person with a mental disorder, no ponetration
 07020 - Care workers: Sexual activity with a female person with a mental
disorder - no penetration
• 07021 - Care workers: causing or inciting sexual activity (person with a
mental disorder) - penetration
 07022 - Care workers, causing of inciting sexual activity (person with a mental disorder) - no penetration
 07023 - Care workers: sexual activity in the presence of a person with a
mental disorder
• 07024 - Care workers: causing a person with a mental disorder impeding
choice to watch a sexual act
 07108 - Causing or inciting child prostitution or pornography - child aged 13 to 17
 07109 - Controlling a child prostitute or a child involved in pornography -
child aged 13 to 17
• 07111 - Causing or inciting child prostitution or pornography - child under 13
 07112 - Controlling a child prostitute or a child involved in pornography - child under 13
• 07301 - Abuse of position of trust: sexual intercourse with person aged
under 18 - Offender aged 18 of over (historic)
person aged under 18 - offender aged 18 or over (historic)
 07307 - Abuse of a position of trust: sexual activity with a female child aged
13 to 17 - offender aged 18 or over
• 07308 - Abuse of a position of trust: sexual activity with a male child aged 13
to 17 - offender aged 18 or over
 07309 - Abuse of a position of trust: causing or inciting a female child aged 13 to 17 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over
 07310 - Abuse of a position of trust: causing or inciting a male child aged 13
to 17 to engage in sexual activity - offender aged 18 or over
 07311 - Abuse of a position of trust: sexual activity in the presence of a child aged 13 to 17 - offender aged 18 or over
 07312 - Abuse of a position of trust: causing a child aged 13 to 17 to watch a sexual act - offender aged 18 or over
 07313 - Abuse of a position of trust: sexual activity with a female child aged
under 13 - offender aged 18 or over
• 07314 - Abuse of a position of trust: sexual activity with a male child aged
under 13 - offender aged 18 or over
• 07315 - Abuse of a position of trust: causing or inciting a female child to
engage in sexual activity (offender aged 18 or over and victim aged under
13)

 07316 - Abuse of a position of trust: causing or inciting a male child to engage in sexual activity (offender aged 18 or over and victim aged under 13) 07317 - Abuse of a position of trust: sexual activity in the presence of a child
(offender aged 18 or over and victim aged under 13)
 07318 - Abuse of a position of trust: causing a child to watch a sexual act (offender aged 18 or over and victim aged under 13)
 07401 - Gross indecency with a male child aged under 16 (historic)
 07402 - Gross indecency with a female child aged under 16 (historic)
 08801 - Meeting a female child aged under 16 following sexual grooming etc offender aged 18 or over
 08802 - Meeting a male child aged under 16 following sexual grooming etc offender aged 18 or over
 08805 - Administer substance with intent to stupefy or overpower to engage in sexual activity
 08811 - Sexual penetration of a corpse
 02801 - Burglary in a dwelling with intent to rape - indictable only
 03001 - Burglary in a building other than a dwelling with intent to rape - indictable only

We also define violent offences in Stops as violent offences, based on the values listed as reasons for an outcome, following a stop (excluding NFA outcomes). This is outlined in the table below.

Table 31: Values in Stops used to identify violent offences

Data source	Values
Stops	 V Violence (inc Common Assault, ABH and GBH) V Violence (inc Common Assault, ABH, GBH)

We also define the offences in NSPIS as violent offences, using values listed in table below.

Table 32: Values in NISPIS used to identify violent offences

Data source	Values
NSPIS	 Administer poison with intent to endanger life / inflict grievous bodily harm Arson with intent to endanger life

 Assault a constable in the execution of his / her duty Assault a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm Assault by beating
 Assault by beating Assault by beating of an omorgonou worker
 Assault by beating of an emergency worker Assault designated / accredited person - Police Peform Act 2002
 Assault designated / accredited person / inspector
 Assault designated / accredited person / hispector Assault person assisting constable in execution of duty.
 Assault person assisting designated / accredited person - Police Reform Act
2002
 Assault prisoner custody officer - contracted out prison
 Assault with intent to commit robbery
Assault with intent to resist arrest
 Attempt arson with intent to endanger life
 Attempt burglary dwelling with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm
 Attempt burglary other than dwelling - intent to inflict grievous bodily harm Attempt common assault
 Attempt common assault of an emergency worker
 Attempt kidnap - common law
 Attempt murder - potential victim under one year old
 Attempt murder - victim aged 1 year or over
Attempt robbery
 Attempt to assault a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm
 Attempt to cause grievous bodily harm with intent to do grievous bodily harm
 Attempt to choke / suffocate / strangle in order to commit or enable /
assist commission of an indictable offence
Attempt to solicit to commit murder
 Burglary dwelling - with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm
Burglary dwelling inflict grievous bodily harm
 Burglary other than dwelling - inflict grievous bodily harm
 Burglary other than dwelling - with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm
 Cause administer poison / noxious thing with intent to injure / aggrieve / annoy
 Cause bodily harm by wanton / furious driving
Cause bodily harm by wilful misconduct
Choke / suffocate / strangle to render unconscious / incapable of resistance
with intent to commit indictable offence
Common assault
Common assault of an emergency worker
Conspire to assault a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm
Conspire to cause grievous bodily harm with intent
Conspire to commit robbery
Conspire to kidnap

 Conspire to murder - potential victim one year of age or older Conspire to murder - potential victim under one year old Conspire to possess a firearm with intent to endanger life / enable another to do so Conspire to possess an imitation firearm with intent to commit an indictable offence Corporate Manslaughter Damage / destroy property with intent to endanger life Manslaughter Murder - victim one year of age or older Murder - victim under one year old
 Prace / lay a corrosive fluid with intent to burn / maim / distigure / disable / de grieveus hediby here;
ao grievous boaily narm
 Possess a lifearm with intent to endenger life / angle another to do co.
 Possess a meaning with intent to endanger life / enable another to do so Possess air weanon with intent to endanger life / enable another to do so
 Public official / person acting in official capacity intentionally inflicts severe
pain / suffering on another
 Racially / religiously aggravated assault occasioning actual bodily harm
Racially / religiously aggravated common assault
 Racially / religiously aggravated common assault / beating
 Racially / religiously aggravated harassment - violent
 Racially / religiously aggravated wounding / grievous bodily harm
 Racially aggravated assault / actual bodily harm
 Racially aggravated assault by beating
 Racially aggravated common assault
 Racially aggravated harassment - violent
 Religiously aggravated assault by beating
Robbery
 Section 18 - attempt wounding with intent
 Section 18 - cause grievous bodily harm with intent to resist / prevent arrest
 Section 18 - grievous bodily harm with intent
 Section 18 - wounding with intent
 Section 18 - wounding with intent to resist / prevent arrest
• Threaten a person with a blade / sharply pointed article in a public place
• Threaten a person with a blade / sharply pointed article in a public place
• Threaten a person with a blade / sharply pointed article on school premises
Threaten a person with an offensive weapon / bladed article / corrosive
substance in a private place
 Threaten a person with an offensive weapon in a public place
 Threaten a person with an offensive weapon in a public place
 Threaten a person with an offensive weapon on school premises

Threaten a witness / juror
 Threaten to destroy / damage own property - endanger life
 Threaten violence to secure entry to premises
Threats to kill
• Throw / cast a destructive substance with intent to burn / maim / disfigure
/ disable / do grievous bodily harm
• Throw / cast corrosive fluid with intent to burn / maim / disfigure / disable /
do grievous bodily harm
 Violent behaviour at a police station
Violent disorder
 Wound / inflict grievous bodily harm without intent

Appendix C: Analysis outputs for Research Question 1

Year	Diverted	Escalated	Indetermin ate	CYP per year	Proportio n of diverted CYP	Proporti on of escalate d CYP	Proportion of indetermi nate CYP
2015	8,754	10,326	10,980	30,060	29.1%	34.4%	36.5%
2016	8,537	10,072	12,976	31,585	27.0%	31.9%	41.1%
2017	7,635	9,345	13,870	30,850	24.7%	30.3%	45.0%
2018	6,919	7,879	12,265	27,063	25.6%	29.1%	45.3%
2019	7,189	8,468	13,158	28,815	24.9%	29.4%	45.7%
2020	6,002	7,874	11,738	25,614	23.4%	30.7%	45.8%
2021	6,233	6,056	12,681	24,970	25.0%	24.3%	50.8%
2022	5,715	4,914	11,579	22,208	25.7%	22.1%	52.1%

Table 55. Number of unique CTP 2015-2022 and proportion diverted and escalated	Table 33: Number of unio	ue CYP 2015-2022 and r	proportion diverted and escalated
--	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------------

Table 34: Number of unique CYP with key indeterminate outcomes by year (CRIS only)

Year	No Further Action	Insufficient evidence	Victim unwilling to prosecute	Other indeterminate outcomes*
2015	1,457	6,032	5,292	356
2016	1,336	6,454	6,898	432
2017	977	6,436	7,940	428
2018	660	5,165	7,525	408

2019	647	5,487	8,146	460
2020	533	4,899	7,213	428
2021	488	4,766	8,172	588
2022	447	4,347	7,298	779

*These refer to indeterminate cases which do not have either No further action, Insufficient evidence, or Victim unwilling to prosecute outcomes. Details of specific indeterminate outcomes are provided in Table 32 (see <u>Appendix A</u>).

Note. Unique CYP can have multiple indeterminate outcomes in a single incident (e.g., where a case involves multiple offences), or across multiple cases in the same year.

Age	Diverted	Escalated	Proportion of diverted cases
10	676	89	88.4%
11	1,756	334	84.0%
12	3,875	1,555	71.4%
13	7,025	5,064	58.1%
14	9,588	11,004	46.6%
15	11,687	18,802	38.3%
16	12,907	25,620	33.5%
17	13,930	29,131	32.3%

Table 35: Number of incident cases across age of CYP

Table 36: Sex of CYP diverted or escalated between 2015-2022

Outcome	Male	Female	Unknown/Missing
Diverted	36,945	13,223	2,208
Escalated	45,538	6,413	653

Proportion diverted	of	cases	44.8%	67.3%	77.2%

Table 37: Ethnicity of CYP diverted or escalated between 2015-2022

	White	Black	Asian	Middle Eastern	Unknown/ Missing
Diverted	21,068	16,995	4,983	1,000	8,330
Escalated	17,473	23,492	4,865	1,044	5,730
Proportion of CYP diverted	54.7%	42.0%	50.6%	48.9%	59.2%

Table 38: Diverted or escalated CYP based on previous arrests

Previous arrests	Diverted	Escalated	Proportion of diverted cases
0	21,470	20,297	51.4%
1	1,457	1,712	46.0%
2	457	544	45.7%
3	193	272	41.5%
4	99	140	41.4%
5	62	100	38.3%
6	32	76	29.6%
7	35	51	40.7%
8	18	33	35.3%
9	8	30	21.1%
10	8	16	33.3%
11	10	9	52.6%

12	8	7	53.3%
13	2	12	14.3%
14	3	5	37.5%
15	2	6	25.0%
16	1	2	33.3%
17	2	3	40.0%
18	1	4	20.0%
19	2	5	28.6%
20	2	3	40.0%
21	0	3	0.0%
22	0	2	0.0%
23	1	1	50.0%
24	2	1	66.7%
25	0	1	0.0%
26	1	1	50.0%
27	1	0	100.0%
29	0	1	0.0%
36	0	0	0.0%

Table 39: Proportion of diverted outcomes by offence type in CRIS

Offence Type	Diverted	Escalated	Proportion of diverted cases
Theft	9,057	4,731	65.7%
Arson and Criminal Damage	4,341	2,742	61.3%

Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society	3,093	2,313	57.2%
Drug Offences	13,728	11,226	55.0%
Sexual Offences	1,504	1,420	51.4%
Violence Against the Person	15,971	15,257	51.1%
Public Order Offences	2,523	3,428	42.4%
Other Accepted Crime	687	1,031	40.0%
Possession of Weapons	2,668	7,347	26.6%
Burglary	824	3,308	19.9%
Vehicle Offences	960	4,660	17.1%
Robbery	1,010	11,747	7.9%

Table 40: Stop outcome reasons for diverted and escalated case

Stop Reason	Diverted	Escalated	Proportion of diverted cases
Fireworks	123	148	45.4%
Psychoactive Substances	20	31	39.2%
Articles To Cause Criminal Damage	131	209	38.5%
Drugs	5,821	12,314	32.1%
Other Power	38	90	29.7%
Other Object	16	58	21.6%
Sub-total	8,943	32,565	21.5%
Anticipated Violence	75	363	17.1%
Stolen Property	1,386	7,407	15.8%

Going Equipped	419	2,999	12.3%
Weapons, Points & Blades	1,192	10,938	9.8%
Firearms	36	345	9.4%
Terrorism	0	23	0.0%

Table 41: Types of diversionary outcomes

Types of diversion	Cases	Proportion of outcomes
Formal Diversion	13,014	8.5%
Informal Diversion	53,091	34.7%
Triage	23,857	31.7%
Not in Public Interest	19,500	25.9%
Community Resolution	14,809	19.7%
Youth Caution	12,073	16.0%
Youth Conditional Caution	3,258	4.3%
Warning	1,832	2.4%

Table 42: Crime harm across diversionary outcomes

Crime harm categories	Diverted	Escalated	Proportion of diverted cases
High harm	220	1,062	17.2%
Medium harm	2,610	4,297	37.8%
Lower harm	39,909	43,098	48.1%

Table 43: Number of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes for violent offences between 2015-2022

Year	Diverted (violent)	Escalated (violent)	Indeterminate (violent)	Total CYP (violent)
2015	2,900	3,462	5,708	12,070
2016	2,915	3,438	7,017	13,370
2017	2,596	2,937	7,348	12,881
2018	2,309	2,401	6,991	11,701
2019	2,005	2,307	7,542	11,854
2020	1,594	1,966	7,067	10,627
2021	1,694	1,572	8,260	11,526
2022	1,594	1,261	7,241	10,096

Table 44: Percentage of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes forviolent offences between 2015-2022

Year	% of diverted CYP (violent)	% of escalated CYP (violent)	% of indeterminate CYP (violent)
2015	24.0%	28.7%	47.3%
2016	21.8%	25.7%	52.5%
2017	20.2%	22.8%	57.0%
2018	19.7%	20.5%	59.7%
2019	16.9%	19.5%	63.6%
2020	15.0%	18.5%	66.5%
2021	14.7%	13.6%	71.7%
2022	15.8%	12.5%	71.7%

Table 45: Number of unique CYP with diverted outcomes for violent offences, compared to all CYP (diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes) between 2015-2022

Year	Diverted CYP (violent offences)	Total CYP (violent offences)	% of total CYP diverted (violent offences)
2015	2,900	30,060	9.6%
2016	2,915	31,585	9.2%
2017	2,596	30,850	8.4%
2018	2,309	27,063	8.5%
2019	2,005	28,815	7.0%
2020	1,594	25,614	6.2%
2021	1,694	24,970	6.8%
2022	1,594	22,208	7.2%

Table 46: Number of incident cases across age of CYP for violent offences

Age	Diverted (violent offences)	Diverted (non-violent offences)	Proportion of CYP diverted (vs. escalated) for violent offences
10	348	328	88.1%
11	874	882	85.4%
12	1,741	2,134	74.2%
13	2,914	4,111	63.7%
14	3,544	6,044	52.1%
15	3,523	8,164	41.4%
16	2,997	9,910	33.8%
17	2,431	11,499	28.6%

Table 47: Sex of CYP diverted for violent offences (compared to all non-violent offences),between 2015-2022

Outcome	Male	Female	Unknown/Missing

Diverted (violent offences)	10,512	5,478	877
Diverted (non-violent offences)	28,184	8,298	1,428
Proportion of CYP diverted (vs escalated) for violent offence	43.9%	62.8%	71.5%

Table 48: Ethnicity of CYP diverted (vs. escalated) for violent offences compared to being diverted for non-violent offences (2015-2022)

	White	Black	Asian	Middle Eastern	Unknown/ Missing
Diverted	6,234	5,554	1,472	280	3,327
Escalated	15,750	12,226	3,629	730	5,575
Proportion of CYP diverted	54.3%	42.4%	51.9%	55.1%	55.6%

Table 49: Regression analysis results - relationship between the likelihood of being diverted and ethnicity (White CYP and Black CYP)

	Model: Receiving a diversion
Mean diversion rate for White CYP (%)	59.53
Difference in diversion rate for Black CYP - not adjusting for covariates (pp)	-16.01
Difference in diversion rate for Black CYP - after adjusting for covariates (pp)	-8.80***
Number of observations	17,318

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 50: Full logit regression results - relationship between the likelihood of being diverted and ethnicity (White CYP and Black CYP)

Model variable	Model: Receiving a diversion
----------------	------------------------------

Intercept	1.058 (0.422) [0.012]
Black CYP	-0.357 (0.045) [0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat1	-0.219 (0.100) [0.029]
n_previous_reports_cat2	-0.231 (0.190) [0.224]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	-0.198 (0.231) [0.392]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	-1.020 (0.497) [0.040]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	-0.430 (0.213) [0.044]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	0.098 (0.436) [0.822]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	-1.352 (0.699) [0.053]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	-0.268 (0.992) [0.787]
sex_mergedMale	-0.415 (0.055) [0.000]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missing	0.143 (0.170) [0.399]
as.factor(age_merged)11	0.540

	(0.395) [0.172]
as.factor(age_merged)12	-0.467 (0.353) [0.185]
as.factor(age_merged)13	-0.844 (0.344) [0.014]
as.factor(age_merged)14	-1.142 (0.342) [0.001]
as.factor(age_merged)15	-1.334 (0.341) [0.000]
as.factor(age_merged)16	-1.552 (0.341) [0.000]
as.factor(age_merged)17	-1.631 (0.343) [0.000]
year_season2019Q2	-0.140 (0.093) [0.130]
year_season2019Q3	-0.107 (0.095) [0.261]
year_season2019Q4	-0.187 (0.096) [0.052]
year_season2020Q1	-0.249 (0.096) [0.010]
year_season2020Q2	-0.224 (0.109) [0.039]
year_season2020Q3	-0.244 (0.107)

	[0.023]
year_season2020Q4	-0.013 (0.100) [0.898]
year_season2021Q1	-0.095 (0.109) [0.384]
year_season2021Q2	-0.083 (0.106) [0.431]
year_season2021Q3	0.210 (0.109) [0.055]
year_season2021Q4	0.385 (0.105) [0.000]
year_season2022Q1	0.324 (0.105) [0.002]
accused_suspectN/A - Stops only	0.642 (0.228) [0.005]
accused_suspectSuspects	2.731 (0.058) [0.000]
log_CCHI_score	-0.125 (0.020) [0.000]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.142 (0.131) [0.279]
BCU fixed effects?	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y
N observations	17,318

Notes: In each cell, the first row is the estimated coefficient from the logit model, the second row (in regular brackets) contains the standard error and the third row (in square brackets) contains the p-value.

Previous arrests	Diverted (violent offences)	Escalated (violent offences)	Proportion of CYP diverted (violent offences)	
0	4,620	6,264	57.6%	
1	855	275	24.3%	
2	377	100	21.0%	
3	226	28	11.0%	
4	125	20	13.8%	
5	72	9	11.1%	
6	50	8	13.8%	
7	38	8	17.4%	
8	25	5	16.7%	
9	21	5	19.2%	
10	14	1	6.7%	
11	9	3	25.0%	
12	5	0	0.0%	
13	13	2	13.3%	
14	4	1	20.0%	
15	4	1	20.0%	

 Table 51: Diverted CYP for violent offences based on previous arrests, between 2015-2022

16	4	0	0.0%
17	4	1	20.0%
18	3	0	0.0%
19	3	0	0.0%
20	1	0	0.0%
21	4	0	0.0%
22	1	0	0.0%
27	1	0	0.0%
28	1	0	0.0%
31	1	0	0.0%
37	1	0	0.0%

Table 52: Diverted CYP for non-violent offences based on previous arrests, between 2015-2022

Previous arrests	Diverted (non-violent offences)	Escalated (non- violent offences)	Proportion of CYP diverted (non- violent offences)	
0	15,640	15,995	49.4%	
1	1,300	1,799	41.9%	
2	424	657	39.2%	
3	187	270	40.9%	
4	96	160	37.5%	
5	61	109	35.9%	
6	26	60	30.2%	
7	31	52	37.3%	

8	15	37	28.8%	
9	6	24	20.0%	
10	8	20	28.6%	
11	7	6	53.8%	
12	8	6	57.1%	
13	4	9	30.8%	
14	4	6	40.0%	
15	1	4	20.0%	
16	1	3	25.0%	
17	2	2	50.0%	
18	1	3	25.0%	
19	2	5	28.6%	
20	2	3	40.0%	
21	0	1	0.0%	
22	0	1	0.0%	
23	1	2	33.3%	
24	2	2	50.0%	
25	0	1	0.0%	
26	1	1	50.0%	
27	1	0	100.0%	
29	0	1	0.0%	
36	0	1	0.0%	

Table 53: Diversions for violent offences (compared to non-violent offences) acrossdifferent offence types

Offence Type	Diverted (violent offences)	Diverted (non- violent offences)	Escalated (violent offences)	Escalated (non- violent offences)	Proportion of CYP diverted for violent offences	Proportion of CYP diverted for non- violent offences
Violence Against the Person	15,651	504	14,593	1,175	51.7%	30.0%
Sexual Offences	409	82	1,322	78	51.6%	51.3%
Vehicle Offences	892	855	1,086	3,990	45.1%	17.6%
Possession of weapons	21	2,584	69	6,908	23.3%	27.2%
Public order offences	119	1,610	3,803	2,254	3.0%	41.7%
Robbery	44	916	87	8,208	33.6%	10.0%
Drug Offences	84	13,691	320	10,975	20.8%	55.5%
Misc. crimes against society	100	3,065	626	2,257	13.8%	57.6%
Arson and criminal damage	19	4,259	100	2,564	16.0%	62.4%
Burglary	8	817	20	3,241	28.6%	20.1%
Theft	12	8,980	64	4,499	15.8%	66.6%
Other accepted crime	3	641	37	934	7.5%	40.7%

Table 54: Proportion of diverted outcomes across violent and non-violent incident cases
Diversion type	Number of incident cases (violent offences)	Number of incident cases (non-violent offences)	Proportion of diversions (violent offences)
Formal Diversion	3,374	9,640	17.4%
Informal Diversion	15,987	37,104	82.6%
Triage	6,117	17,740	14.9%
Not in Public Interest	8,201	11,299	20.0%
Community Resolution	2,758	12,051	6.7%
Youth Caution	3,227	8,846	7.9%
Youth Conditional Caution	866	2,392	2.1%
Warning	2	1,830	0.0%

Table 55: Proportion of diverted cases for violent offences compared to non-violent offences across levels of crime harm

Crime harm category	Diverted (violent offences)	Diverted (non- violent offences)	Escalated (violent offences)	Escalated (non- violent offences)	% of CYP diverted for violent offence	% of CYP diverted for non- violent offences
High harm	208	12	1059	3	16.4%	80.0%
Medium harm	531	2,079	2,310	1,987	18.7%	51.1%
Lower harm	17,426	22,483	14,784	28,314	54.1%	44.3%

Appendix D: Analysis outputs for Research Question 2

Table 56: Rates of diversionary outcomes across London boroughs

Borough	Total incident cases	Diverted incident cases	Diverted or escalated incident cases	Average rate of diversion (%)
Barking And Dagenham	8,224	1,814	4,086	44.4
Barnet	7,006	1,507	3,349	45.0
Bexley	7,349	2,452	3,757	65.3
Brent	8,406	2,269	4,747	47.8
Bromley	9,991	3,908	5,959	65.6
Camden	6,786	1,861	3,827	48.6
City Of Westminster	9,499	2,815	5,435	51.8
Croydon	13,537	3,381	6,865	49.2
Ealing	7,507	1,995	4,001	49.9
Enfield	8,628	1,945	4,540	42.8
Greenwich	9,894	2,532	4,656	54.4
Hackney	7,669	1,682	4,065	41.4
Hammersmith And Fulham	6,695	2,010	3,815	52.7
Haringey	8,065	1,790	4,208	42.5
Harrow	4,617	1,064	2,354	45.2
Havering	8,074	2,265	4,034	56.1
Hillingdon	8,200	2,132	3,959	53.9
Hounslow	7,949	1,903	3,842	49.5
Islington	6,676	1,735	4,076	42.6
Kensington And Chelsea	4,023	1,307	2,534	51.6
Kingston Upon Thames	4,426	1,699	2,634	64.5

Lambeth	10,104	2,405	5,700	42.2
Lewisham	9,504	2,149	5,081	42.3
Merton	5,058	1,256	2,612	48.1
Newham	10,934	2,532	5,863	43.2
Redbridge	7,710	1,856	3,843	48.3
Richmond Upon Thames	4,146	1,073	1,965	54.6
Southwark	10,535	2,841	6,090	46.7
Sutton	5,766	1,950	3,187	61.2
Tower Hamlets	9,142	2,360	5,356	44.1
Waltham Forest	7,930	2,075	4,247	48.9
Wandsworth	7,051	1,670	3,492	47.8
Other	2,391	655	1,119	58.5
Unknown/Missing	1,165	176	976	18.0

 Table 57: Rates of diversionary outcomes across London boroughs by year (2015-2022)

Borough	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Barking And Dagenham	39.2%	41.8%	41.8%	43.5%	45.9%	42.7%	53.3%	59.1%
Barnet	50.7%	50.0%	42.1%	43.8%	37.6%	35.4%	58.1%	47.6%
Bexley	56.9%	65.4%	66.0%	67.0%	68.2%	57.5%	75.4%	68.4%
Brent	49.1%	43.6%	42.3%	46.0%	51.9%	44.9%	54.6%	60.8%
Bromley	59.5%	63.6%	58.0%	70.5%	73.7%	62.9%	68.0%	76.2%
Camden	42.6%	42.2%	47.5%	52.8%	51.4%	48.8%	51.4%	61.4%
City Of Westminst er	59.1%	46.9%	52.7%	50.8%	52.5%	48.4%	52.1%	53.7%
Croydon	45.7%	44.7%	42.0%	49.5%	54.3%	51.6%	55.8%	62.0%
Ealing	47.9%	47.0%	52.6%	57.5%	48.4%	46.4%	54.5%	44.9%
Enfield	34.4%	43.5%	45.9%	38.8%	41.8%	48.6%	49.4%	47.1%
Greenwich	54.0%	55.5%	49.9%	55.4%	53.0%	53.0%	59.0%	57.8%
Hackney	33.0%	40.4%	42.3%	51.0%	39.5%	39.7%	44.0%	46.1%
Hammers mith And Fulham	51.9%	51.5%	49.7%	49.8%	53.9%	52.0%	59.2%	65.5%
Haringey	39.0%	42.9%	42.5%	44.6%	38.3%	43.5%	46.8%	46.1%

Harrow	40.7%	44.5%	41.6%	42.2%	45.4%	39.6%	54.4%	63.8%
Havering	57.5%	52.8%	54.5%	48.8%	49.0%	61.6%	63.0%	68.9%
Hillingdon	50.5%	46.4%	49.9%	55.5%	54.2%	59.8%	55.9%	67.7%
Hounslow	45.2%	45.8%	51.3%	54.4%	48.4%	50.5%	51.7%	53.4%
Islington	37.3%	43.4%	40.4%	44.1%	45.0%	37.3%	48.8%	54.3%
Kensington And Chelsea	42.2%	43.9%	46.9%	59.9%	61.6%	55.6%	59.0%	51.4%
Kingston Upon Thames	67.7%	67.7%	64.4%	51.7%	63.6%	59.4%	75.8%	63.7%
Lambeth	39.4%	38.2%	37.6%	43.6%	50.6%	44.0%	45.3%	46.9%
Lewisham	33.9%	36.3%	43.2%	44.8%	45.4%	45.7%	51.4%	57.5%
Merton	34.7%	40.5%	56.1%	40.9%	55.1%	58.2%	56.7%	49.5%
Newham	39.6%	42.3%	40.0%	38.1%	45.4%	36.0%	53.1%	59.0%
Redbridge	44.8%	42.9%	35.2%	45.8%	54.1%	48.2%	56.9%	64.4%
Richmond Upon Thames	49.8%	50.7%	49.2%	42.5%	55.6%	61.4%	74.4%	68.0%
Southwark	44.7%	46.2%	49.6%	39.0%	44.2%	47.3%	57.5%	52.8%
Sutton	61.0%	56.5%	62.3%	62.0%	68.9%	54.6%	60.3%	64.3%

Tower Hamlets	43.3%	37.5%	40.4%	43.1%	47.0%	46.3%	46.4%	56.3%
Waltham Forest	52.0%	42.6%	49.4%	48.9%	44.9%	44.2%	51.9%	62.8%
Wandswor th	41.3%	43.8%	48.5%	47.9%	50.3%	51.4%	53.9%	53.6%
Other	49.4%	54.1%	56.4%	65.4%	58.6%	53.2%	66.0%	60.1%
Unknown/ Missing	13.3%	12.5%	16.2%	25.4%	18.6%	13.1%	22.6%	25.8%

Table	58:	Regression	analysis	results	- relationship	between	rate	of	diversion	across
borou	ghs (using Newh	am as ref	erence k	oorough)					

Borough	Unadjusted rate of diversion (%)	Adjusted rate of diversion (%)	Estimated coefficient from logit model	Estimated effect (percentage points)	p-value
Hackney	47.3	48.7	-0.002	-0.039	0.991
Wandsworth	51.4	47.9	-0.032	-0.791	0.826
Waltham Forest	50.3	47.3	-0.055	-1.375	0.670
Ealing	52.7	47.2	-0.060	-1.494	0.661
Richmond Upon Thames	57.4	46.2	-0.100	-2.504	0.554
Croydon	54.4	46.1	-0.104	-2.601	0.368
Hounslow	54.0	45.1	-0.147	-3.662	0.288
Enfield	50.6	45.0	-0.148	-3.678	0.248
Islington	49.9	45.0	-0.150	-3.739	0.309
Redbridge	56.3	44.9	-0.152	-3.794	0.248
Haringey	44.0	44.6	-0.164	-4.088	0.216

Barking and Dagenham	53.7	44.5	-0.171	-4.258	0.210
Barnet	49.9	43.8	-0.199	-4.941	0.142
Greenwich	51.0	42.0	-0.272	-6.722	0.033
Tower Hamlets	46.8	41.9	-0.277	-6.864	0.023
Harrow	48.5	39.0	-0.394	-9.677	0.015
Newham	48.7	48.7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lewisham	50.1	49.6	0.036	0.898	0.787
Unknown/Missin g	29.8	50.0	0.053	1.317	0.877
Camden	54.8	50.3	0.064	1.590	0.639
Brent	57.2	50.6	0.076	1.909	0.551
Kensington And Chelsea	55.3	51.0	0.090	2.251	0.558
City of Westminster	50.7	51.1	0.093	2.335	0.443
Hillingdon	62.4	51.5	0.110	2.753	0.394
Southwark	50.6	52.1	0.134	3.346	0.273
Lambeth	47.6	52.1	0.135	3.381	0.276
Havering	65.6	54.3	0.224	5.582	0.095
Other	74.9	55.8	0.283	7.057	0.183
Sutton	68.3	55.8	0.286	7.125	0.066
Kingston Upon Thames	64.2	57.7	0.363	9.018	0.016
Merton	60.9	58.4	0.392	9.722	0.013
Hammersmith and Fulham	62.0	58.7	0.404	10.015	0.006

Bexley	64.3	59.7	0.444	10.974	0.001
Bromley	69.8	60.6	0.481	11.862	0.000

Table 59: Full logit regression results - relationship between rate of diversion acrossboroughs (using Newham as reference borough)

Model variable	Model: Receiving a diversion
Intercept	1.226 (0.325) [0.000]
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK	-0.360 (0.044) [0.000]
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN	-0.021 (0.066) [0.755]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN	-0.052 (0.119) [0.666]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown/Missing	-0.307 (0.060) [0.000]
BCU_mergedBARKING AND DAGENHAM	-0.171 (0.137) [0.210]
BCU_mergedBARNET	-0.199 (0.136) [0.142]
BCU_mergedBEXLEY	0.444 (0.137) [0.001]
BCU_mergedBRENT	0.076 (0.128) [0.551]
BCU_mergedBROMLEY	0.481 (0.122)

	[0.000]
BCU_mergedCAMDEN	0.064 (0.136) [0.639]
BCU_mergedCITY OF WESTMINSTER	0.093 (0.122) [0.443]
BCU_mergedCROYDON	-0.104 (0.116) [0.368]
BCU_mergedEALING	-0.060 (0.137) [0.661]
BCU_mergedENFIELD	-0.148 (0.128) [0.248]
BCU_mergedGREENWICH	-0.272 (0.127) [0.033]
BCU_mergedHACKNEY	-0.002 (0.134) [0.991]
BCU_mergedHAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM	0.404 (0.146) [0.006]
BCU_mergedHARINGEY	-0.164 (0.133) [0.216]
BCU_mergedHARROW	-0.394 (0.162) [0.015]
BCU_mergedHAVERING	0.224 (0.134) [0.095]
BCU_mergedHILLINGDON	0.110 (0.129) [0.394]

BCU_mergedHOUNSLOW	-0.147 (0.139) [0.288]
BCU_mergedISLINGTON	-0.150 (0.148) [0.309]
BCU_mergedKENSINGTON AND CHELSEA	0.090 (0.154) [0.558]
BCU_mergedKINGSTON UPON THAMES	0.363 (0.150) [0.016]
BCU_mergedLAMBETH	0.135 (0.124) [0.276]
BCU_mergedLEWISHAM	0.036 (0.133) [0.787]
BCU_mergedMERTON	0.392 (0.158) [0.013]
BCU_mergedOTHER	0.283 (0.213) [0.183]
BCU_mergedREDBRIDGE	-0.152 (0.132) [0.248]
BCU_mergedRICHMOND UPON THAMES	-0.100 (0.170) [0.554]
BCU_mergedSOUTHWARK	0.134 (0.122) [0.273]
BCU_mergedSUTTON	0.286 (0.156) [0.066]
BCU_mergedTOWER HAMLETS	-0.277

	(0.122) [0.023]
BCU_mergedUnknown/Missing	0.053 (0.341) [0.877]
BCU_mergedWALTHAM FOREST	-0.055 (0.129) [0.670]
BCU_mergedWANDSWORTH	-0.032 (0.144) [0.826]
n_previous_reports_cat1	-0.249 (0.087) [0.004]
n_previous_reports_cat2	-0.365 (0.163) [0.025]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	-0.322 (0.197) [0.103]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	-0.555 (0.382) [0.147]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	-0.578 (0.187) [0.002]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	-0.114 (0.368) [0.757]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	-1.401 (0.546) [0.010]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	-0.615 (0.787) [0.435]
sex_mergedMale	-0.406 (0.048)

	[0.000]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missing	-0.065 (0.117) [0.576]
as.factor(age_merged)11	0.332 (0.294) [0.259]
as.factor(age_merged)12	-0.434 (0.264) [0.100]
as.factor(age_merged)13	-0.754 (0.256) [0.003]
as.factor(age_merged)14	-1.019 (0.254) [0.000]
as.factor(age_merged)15	-1.225 (0.253) [0.000]
as.factor(age_merged)16	-1.475 (0.253) [0.000]
as.factor(age_merged)17	-1.549 (0.255) [0.000]
year_season2019Q2	-0.127 (0.078) [0.105]
year_season2019Q3	-0.115 (0.082) [0.160]
year_season2019Q4	-0.135 (0.082) [0.101]
year_season2020Q1	-0.200 (0.082) [0.014]

year_season2020Q2	-0.217 (0.093) [0.020]
year_season2020Q3	-0.247 (0.091) [0.007]
year_season2020Q4	-0.018 (0.086) [0.836]
year_season2021Q1	-0.069 (0.093) [0.455]
year_season2021Q2	-0.132 (0.089) [0.137]
year_season2021Q3	0.168 (0.093) [0.072]
year_season2021Q4	0.378 (0.089) [0.000]
year_season2022Q1	0.340 (0.088) [0.000]
accused_suspectN/A - Stops only	0.605 (0.199) [0.002]
accused_suspectSuspects	2.673 (0.050) [0.000]
log_CCHI_score	-0.141 (0.017) [0.000]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.104 (0.111) [0.348]
Offence type dummies?	Y

N observations	23,900
----------------	--------

Notes: In each cell, the first row is the estimated coefficient from the logit model, the second row (in regular brackets) contains the standard error and the third row (in square brackets) contains the p-value.

Table 60: Number of CY	odiverted across	boroughs by	ethnicity	(2015-2022)
------------------------	------------------	-------------	-----------	-------------

Borough	White CYP	Black CYP	Asian CYP	Middle Eastern CYP	Unknown/ Missing
Barking And Dagenham	855	522	142	5	290
Barnet	605	390	130	50	332
Bexley	1,668	411	41	2	330
Brent	512	991	257	144	365
Bromley	2,350	934	86	9	529
Camden	817	466	189	34	355
City Of Westminster	1,029	891	193	217	485
Croydon	1,125	1,524	148	39	545
Ealing	576	650	300	74	395
Enfield	772	685	57	16	415
Greenwich	1,257	773	86	7	409
Hackney	407	893	88	10	284
Hammersmith And Fulham	690	727	88	91	414
Haringey	575	842	43	10	320
Harrow	299	326	180	57	202
Havering	1,372	402	91	6	394
Hillingdon	1,035	440	258	27	372

Hounslow	906	364	262	37	334
Islington	716	612	104	28	275
Kensington And Chelsea	518	387	68	93	241
Kingston Upon Thames	1,024	246	148	26	255
Lambeth	493	1,476	63	15	358
Lewisham	651	1,150	49	13	286
Merton	577	378	79	11	211
Newham	648	906	555	12	411
Redbridge	495	483	517	12	349
Richmond Upon Thames	692	126	68	15	172
Southwark	863	1,479	85	23	391
Sutton	1,264	326	90	8	262
Tower Hamlets	559	376	1,086	9	330
Waltham Forest	634	737	328	13	363
Wandsworth	544	725	97	12	292
Other	331	139	72	15	98
Unknown/Missin g	59	64	10	0	43

Table 61: Rate of diversion for CYP across boroughs by ethnicity

Borough		White CYP	Black CYP	Asian CYP	Middle Eastern CYP	Unknown/ Missing
Barking A Dagenham	And	48.4%	40.3%	48.6%	71.4%	39.9%
Barnet		47.9%	36.6%	63.7%	62.5%	45.1%

Bexley	67.3%	58.3%	62.1%	50.0%	65.7%
Brent	58.3%	41.4%	65.1%	66.1%	42.2%
Bromley	70.5%	56.4%	81.9%	69.2%	61.9%
Camden	55.0%	40.5%	62.0%	64.2%	42.7%
City Of Westminster	62.6%	49.9%	62.7%	52.5%	37.8%
Croydon	58.5%	44.8%	50.7%	60.9%	46.0%
Ealing	53.4%	43.8%	61.3%	50.0%	49.3%
Enfield	50.6%	35.3%	52.3%	57.1%	44.2%
Greenwich	56.9%	49.3%	72.9%	70.0%	54.4%
Hackney	52.0%	37.8%	53.3%	71.4%	38.4%
Hammersmith And Fulham	62.2%	48.3%	76.5%	61.9%	44.0%
Haringey	53.5%	36.8%	45.7%	45.5%	43.9%
Harrow	50.9%	37.0%	59.2%	50.4%	43.3%
Havering	59.2%	46.5%	59.5%	54.5%	57.3%
Hillingdon	54.6%	48.1%	66.5%	67.5%	51.6%
Hounslow	54.6%	36.8%	61.8%	63.8%	46.8%
Islington	48.7%	38.8%	62.7%	65.1%	33.5%
Kensington And Chelsea	63.7%	44.2%	63.0%	63.3%	40.8%
Kingston Upon Thames	70.7%	54.7%	73.3%	70.3%	51.4%
Lambeth	56.7%	38.2%	60.0%	50.0%	43.1%
Lewisham	50.5%	38.1%	55.7%	59.1%	42.9%
Merton	50.4%	43.2%	61.7%	64.7%	47.1%

Newham	52.1%	36.8%	47.9%	42.9%	42.5%
Redbridge	53.9%	38.9%	55.7%	60.0%	47.5%
Richmond Upon Thames	58.3%	44.4%	63.6%	68.2%	47.0%
Southwark	54.2%	42.6%	61.2%	53.5%	46.2%
Sutton	63.3%	51.6%	84.1%	100.0%	59.0%
Tower Hamlets	47.9%	39.7%	44.8%	64.3%	41.1%
Waltham Forest	61.4%	40.2%	58.0%	48.1%	46.1%
Wandsworth	57.7%	41.5%	69.3%	52.2%	45.6%
Other	72.3%	39.5%	67.3%	75.0%	53.8%
Unknown/Missin g	20.6%	16.5%	32.3%	0.0%	16.1%

Borough	Violen ce Agains t the Person	Sexual Offence s	Robber y	Burgla ry	Vehicle Offenc es	Theft	Arson and Criminal Damage	Drug Offence s	Possession of Weapons	Public Order Offences	Miscellane ous Crimes Against Society	Other Accepted Crime
Barking And Dagenha m	47.0%	53.1%	10.6%	13.5%	23.2%	60.6%	52.8%	66.1%	38.5%	34.1%	57.7%	23.5%
Barnet	50.7%	48.1%	5.2%	21.1%	23.0%	64.0%	56.8%	59.4%	38.5%	41.3%	66.9%	60.5%
Bexley	68.3%	59.0%	15.2%	21.4%	26.0%	80.5%	67.9%	82.7%	57.5%	63.4%	62.6%	55.2%
Brent	52.1%	63.8%	10.0%	20.4%	22.1%	73.8%	57.3%	57.5%	31.8%	38.6%	57.7%	46.2%
Bromley	66.0%	49.1%	8.4%	31.5%	19.3%	87.3%	71.7%	79.7%	44.3%	47.8%	57.2%	56.6%
Camden	52.0%	45.2%	12.9%	32.3%	18.7%	45.9%	65.5%	64.5%	35.1%	41.2%	48.0%	40.0%
City Of Westmin ster	49.1%	45.8%	9.2%	15.2%	15.7%	64.0%	60.6%	71.2%	38.1%	41.3%	46.3%	78.0%
Croydon	46.6%	50.8%	9.2%	23.2%	19.6%	71.9%	58.2%	70.3%	37.3%	34.5%	61.9%	44.4%
Ealing	56.0%	59.6%	10.7%	32.4%	21.5%	69.2%	61.5%	61.6%	39.2%	45.7%	61.5%	32.3%

Table 62: Average rate of diversion across boroughs for offence types

Enfield	50.6%	52.6%	7.9%	18.9%	22.7%	69.1%	49.8%	58.1%	37.4%	34.7%	62.0%	65.2%
Greenwic h	56.2%	54.5%	12.7%	26.3%	18.0%	76.0%	71.8%	63.9%	44.4%	51.6%	62.3%	48.0%
Hackney	47.1%	43.8%	9.2%	20.6%	28.6%	46.5%	64.2%	55.2%	24.2%	47.8%	57.4%	47.7%
Hammer smith And Fulham	51.5%	38.0%	18.3%	30.8%	14.3%	78.3%	70.2%	62.7%	28.5%	44.3%	50.3%	43.9%
Haringey	46.8%	57.1%	9.3%	18.6%	27.4%	69.3%	58.2%	54.8%	29.0%	51.4%	50.8%	55.0%
Harrow	47.9%	39.1%	8.2%	10.4%	22.9%	71.6%	54.1%	54.8%	28.4%	35.2%	55.2%	60.0%
Havering	59.5%	55.7%	8.7%	16.2%	27.9%	76.1%	63.1%	75.1%	36.3%	58.2%	79.7%	44.2%
Hillingdo n	55.5%	61.8%	10.7%	30.4%	21.2%	73.0%	62.6%	61.7%	42.3%	53.8%	73.2%	21.0%
Hounslo w	48.7%	45.7%	7.9%	20.6%	16.6%	71.4%	67.4%	61.3%	37.6%	45.9%	47.7%	37.9%
Islington	51.2%	39.0%	6.5%	23.7%	14.3%	42.5%	66.8%	64.5%	26.6%	32.1%	25.5%	22.0%
Kensingt on And Chelsea	48.1%	46.9%	10.5%	17.5%	18.4%	54.9%	73.6%	76.3%	20.0%	43.4%	61.3%	65.4%

Kingston Upon Thames	49.8%	50.0%	13.8%	30.0%	19.3%	80.3%	72.8%	78.2%	44.0%	63.0%	42.9%	55.2%
Lambeth	44.5%	47.2%	7.3%	30.8%	25.6%	66.9%	69.6%	57.7%	18.8%	37.6%	54.5%	48.7%
Lewisha m	45.0%	58.3%	8.4%	17.2%	17.0%	66.4%	58.7%	55.9%	29.0%	43.4%	54.7%	53.8%
Merton	54.3%	45.5%	9.6%	16.4%	22.6%	54.3%	69.4%	73.6%	34.8%	49.0%	48.4%	40.8%
Newham	51.2%	51.6%	8.1%	29.0%	24.7%	61.9%	55.4%	55.6%	31.1%	39.7%	53.0%	22.7%
Redbridg e	52.3%	60.4%	7.4%	8.2%	20.9%	68.9%	63.0%	59.0%	47.5%	44.5%	69.6%	57.8%
Richmon d Upon Thames	49.3%	62.2%	7.8%	40.0%	15.4%	60.1%	59.8%	83.6%	34.9%	51.4%	64.9%	56.5%
Southwar k	54.6%	47.5%	10.1%	26.6%	22.2%	62.0%	67.2%	63.0%	29.5%	45.0%	55.5%	30.8%
Sutton	65.0%	63.0%	14.3%	30.8%	26.5%	75.6%	68.8%	74.9%	61.3%	55.5%	66.0%	63.6%
Tower Hamlets	53.8%	43.0%	10.2%	19.3%	21.5%	51.7%	58.8%	54.0%	33.2%	43.1%	48.2%	31.7%
Waltham Forest	49.2%	57.3%	8.2%	20.6%	30.6%	68.6%	62.2%	61.9%	39.5%	42.8%	62.7%	32.9%

Wandsw orth	53.1%	41.2%	10.8%	32.6%	16.4%	70.2%	63.7%	63.9%	28.5%	50.0%	54.1%	38.6%
Other	33.8%	50.0%	7.7%	2.9%	13.4%	9.7%	37.9%	28.7%	17.9%	30.4%	30.8%	18.8%
Unknown /Missing	58.9%	53.5%	3.7%	33.3%	12.5%	65.1%	75.0%	30.1%	18.9%	45.7%	84.1%	37.5%

Table 63: Rate of diversion across boroughs by type of diversion

Borough	Formal diversion	Informal diversion
Barking And Dagenham	11.4%	37.0%
Barnet	13.3%	35.1%
Bexley	14.8%	55.4%
Brent	10.6%	40.0%
Bromley	13.7%	56.7%
Camden	13.2%	39.3%
City Of Westminster	14.2%	42.3%
Croydon	12.8%	40.8%
Ealing	10.1%	44.0%
Enfield	12.4%	34.7%
Greenwich	12.3%	45.7%
Hackney	12.3%	33.6%
Hammersmith And Fulham	12.4%	45.3%
Haringey	10.7%	35.4%
Harrow	14.4%	34.9%
Havering	11.9%	49.9%
Hillingdon	11.9%	46.2%
Hounslow	12.5%	40.4%
Islington	10.4%	35.4%
Kensington And Chelsea	13.3%	42.9%
Kingston Upon Thames	15.9%	55.2%

Lambeth	9.2%	36.4%
Lewisham	11.9%	34.8%
Merton	11.5%	41.0%
Newham	12.0%	35.6%
Redbridge	10.5%	41.8%
Richmond Upon Thames	15.2%	43.7%
Southwark	10.6%	39.6%
Sutton	8.9%	55.6%
Tower Hamlets	15.0%	34.9%
Waltham Forest	13.8%	39.7%
Wandsworth	11.9%	39.5%
Other	6.3%	53.8%
Unknown/Missing	4.8%	16.0%

Table 64: Rate of diversion across boroughs by specific type of diversion

Borough	Community Resolution	Triage	Not in the Public Interest	Youth Caution	Youth Conditional Caution	Warning (informal)
Barking And Dagenham	7.9%	20.5%	12.7%	10.3%	3.7%	0.1%
Barnet	6.1%	16.0%	16.5%	12.2%	5.3%	0.2%
Bexley	12.1%	31.5%	19.2%	14.1%	3.0%	0.1%
Brent	12.0%	18.7%	12.7%	10.0%	3.5%	0.1%
Bromley	25.3%	32.3%	12.8%	12.7%	2.9%	0.1%
Camden	8.4%	21.9%	13.8%	12.3%	3.8%	0.1%
City Of Westminster	11.8%	25.1%	13.2%	13.5%	3.3%	0.2%

Croydon	6.1%	24.6%	14.2%	12.3%	2.5%	0.1%
Ealing	5.2%	22.1%	20.2%	9.3%	2.8%	0.3%
Enfield	7.8%	17.5%	13.9%	11.7%	3.3%	0.2%
Greenwich	9.7%	20.0%	21.0%	11.5%	3.9%	0.2%
Hackney	5.8%	16.3%	14.9%	11.7%	2.0%	0.0%
Hammersmit h And Fulham	15.1%	25.6%	14.9%	11.7%	2.8%	0.1%
Haringey	5.7%	18.6%	14.4%	9.9%	2.9%	0.1%
Harrow	8.3%	20.7%	11.4%	13.5%	4.2%	0.2%
Havering	8.4%	25.0%	22.9%	10.7%	3.1%	0.1%
Hillingdon	6.7%	23.2%	20.6%	11.1%	2.7%	0.2%
Hounslow	5.4%	21.2%	17.3%	11.8%	3.4%	0.1%
Islington	12.4%	18.2%	9.9%	9.9%	2.2%	0.3%
Kensington And Chelsea	11.4%	26.7%	11.9%	12.4%	3.7%	0.2%
Kingston Upon Thames	19.6%	36.6%	10.8%	15.1%	1.6%	0.3%
Lambeth	9.8%	19.0%	12.2%	8.6%	2.6%	0.2%
Lewisham	4.5%	16.3%	16.5%	10.6%	3.8%	0.1%
Merton	6.7%	23.4%	15.3%	10.9%	1.5%	0.0%
Newham	8.7%	20.6%	11.2%	10.9%	3.5%	0.0%
Redbridge	6.5%	22.5%	16.6%	9.6%	3.3%	0.1%
Richmond Upon Thames	5.3%	26.3%	15.6%	14.6%	2.4%	0.2%

Southwark	13.3%	17.3%	15.8%	9.8%	3.5%	0.2%
Sutton	17.5%	31.6%	13.9%	8.6%	1.6%	0.1%
Tower Hamlets	5.2%	20.1%	12.8%	13.1%	5.8%	0.2%
Waltham Forest	9.2%	24.5%	12.1%	13.0%	4.3%	0.1%
Wandsworth	6.2%	19.4%	17.6%	11.4%	2.2%	0.2%
Other	2.0%	8.0%	8.5%	4.6%	0.8%	0.0%
Unknown/M issing	8.4%	8.0%	40.3%	6.1%	1.8%	0.1%

Appendix E: Analysis outputs for Research Question 3

	Model: Arrest in 6 months	Model: Arrest in 12 months	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	8.21	11.94	8.21
Estimated effect of diversion (pp)	-3.67***	-5.10***	
Estimated effect of formal diversion (pp)			-2.86**
Estimated effect of informal diversion (pp)			-4.11***
Number of observations	22,177	16,715	21,477

Table 65: Regression analysis results - relationship between diversion and arrest

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 66: Full logit regression results - relationship between diversion and arrest

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months	Model: Arrest in 12 months	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Intercept	-4.968 (1.070) [0.000]	-4.969 (0.795) [0.000]	-4.925 (1.072) [0.000]
Treatment	-0.632 (0.093) [0.000]	-0.612 (0.087) [0.000]	
Treatment (formal diversion)			-0.459 (0.159) [0.004]

Treatment (informal diversion)			-0.739 (0.108) [0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat1	0.989	1.101	0.984
	(0.109	(0.102	(0.111)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.915	1.193	0.857
	(0.178)	(0.169	(0.181)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	1.462	1.797	1.385
	(0.191)	(0.195)	(0.196)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	1.731	2.075	1.576
	(0.306)	(0.330)	(0.313)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	0.262	0.133	0.292
	(0.172)	(0.177)	(0.174)
	[0.128]	[0.452]	[0.092]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	0.111	0.144	0.135
	(0.321)	(0.341)	(0.326)
	[0.730]	[0.674]	[0.678]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	0.695	0.271	0.826
	(0.372)	(0.411)	(0.376)
	[0.061]	[0.509]	[0.028]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	0.698	0.357	0.856
	(0.534)	(0.585)	(0.539)
	[0.192]	[0.542]	[0.112]
sex_mergedMale	0.701	0.779	0.669
	(0.115)	(0.108)	(0.116)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missi ng	-0.292 (0.329) [0.376]	-0.616 (0.341) [0.071]	-0.286 (0.330) [0.386]
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK	0.346	0.474	0.344
	(0.084)	(0.082)	(0.086)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]

ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN	-0.181	-0.010	-0.168
	(0.144)	(0.134)	(0.145)
	[0.208]	[0.941]	[0.247]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN	0.009 (0.246) [0.972]	0.075 (0.249) [0.762]	0.044 (0.247) [0.858]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown /Missing	1.017 (0.102) [0.000]	1.121 (0.097) [0.000]	1.011 (0.104) [0.000]
as.factor(age_merged)11	0.485	0.362	0.466
	(1.098)	(0.799)	(1.099)
	[0.659]	[0.650]	[0.671]
as.factor(age_merged)12	1.209	1.161	1.192
	(1.025)	(0.733)	(1.026)
	[0.238]	[0.113]	[0.245]
as.factor(age_merged)13	1.883	1.542	1.844
	(1.008)	(0.721)	(1.009)
	[0.062]	[0.032]	[0.067]
as.factor(age_merged)14	1.866	1.560	1.773
	(1.006)	(0.719)	(1.007)
	[0.064]	[0.030]	[0.078]
as.factor(age_merged)15	1.823	1.525	1.778
	(1.005)	(0.718)	(1.006)
	[0.070]	[0.034]	[0.077]
as.factor(age_merged)16	1.791	1.446	1.751
	(1.005)	(0.718)	(1.006)
	[0.075]	[0.044]	[0.082]
as.factor(age_merged)17	1.771	2.187	1.710
	(1.007)	(0.903)	(1.007)
	[0.079]	[0.015]	[0.090]
year_season2019Q2	-0.272	-0.246	-0.284
	(0.121)	(0.110)	(0.122)
	[0.025]	[0.025]	[0.020]
year_season2019Q3	-0.183	-0.219	-0.183
	(0.128)	(0.117)	(0.129)
	[0.154]	[0.062]	[0.156]

year_season2019Q4	-0.332	-0.416	-0.349
	(0.135)	(0.124)	(0.137)
	[0.014]	[0.001]	[0.011]
year_season2020Q1	-0.321	-0.409	-0.348
	(0.136)	(0.125)	(0.138)
	[0.018]	[0.001]	[0.011]
year_season2020Q2	-0.430	-0.446	-0.461
	(0.168)	(0.156)	(0.171)
	[0.010]	[0.004]	[0.007]
year_season2020Q3	-0.524	-0.570	-0.526
	(0.171)	(0.153)	(0.172)
	[0.002]	[0.000]	[0.002]
year_season2020Q4	-0.450	-0.511	-0.465
	(0.159)	(0.145)	(0.161)
	[0.005]	[0.000]	[0.004]
year_season2021Q1	-0.384	-0.309	-0.405
	(0.172)	(0.148)	(0.174)
	[0.026]	[0.037]	[0.020]
year_season2021Q2	-0.515	-0.492	-0.588
	(0.182)	(0.154)	(0.187)
	[0.005]	[0.001]	[0.002]
year_season2021Q3	-0.421	-0.337	-0.508
	(0.176)	(0.153)	(0.183)
	[0.017]	[0.027]	[0.005]
year_season2021Q4	-0.312 (0.162) [0.053]		-0.304 (0.163) [0.063]
year_season2022Q1	-0.250 (0.157) [0.111]		-0.253 (0.159) [0.110]
accused_suspectN/A - Stops only	-0.906 (0.290) [0.002]	-0.304 (0.276) [0.272]	-0.799 (0.293) [0.006]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.532	-0.266	-0.445
	(0.094)	(0.088)	(0.101)
	[0.000]	[0.002]	[0.000]

log_CCHI_score	-0.043 (0.033) [0.196]	-0.034 (0.032) [0.291]	-0.046 (0.034) [0.171]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.079 (0.207) [0.703]	-0.183 (0.198) [0.354]	-0.096 (0.211) [0.647]
BCU fixed effects?	Υ	γ	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y	Y	Y
Number of observations	22,177	16,715	21,477

Notes: In each cell, the first row is the estimated coefficient from the logit model, the second row (in regular brackets) contains the standard error and the third row (in square brackets) contains the p-value.

Table 67: Regression	analysis results	- relationship	between	arrest	and	specific	type	of
diversions								

	Model: Arrest in 6 months (specific type of diversion)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	8.21
Estimated effect of community resolution (pp)	-4.69***
Estimated effect of triage (pp)	-0.79
Estimated effect of not in the public interest diversion (pp)	-5.38***
Estimated effect of youth caution (pp)	-2.67**
Estimated effect of youth conditional (pp)	-8.21
Number of observations	19,521

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 68: Full logit regression results - relationship between arrest and specific type of diversions

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Intercept	-4.785 (1.077) [0.000]
Treatment (community resolutions)	-0.890 (0.198) [0.000]
Treatment (not in the public interest)	-1.122 (0.155) [0.000]
Treatment (triage)	-0.110 (0.150) [0.462]
Treatment (youth caution)	-0.423 (0.187) [0.024]
Treatment (youth conditional caution)	-10.55 (187.779) [0.955]
n_previous_reports_cat1	1.008 (0.113) [0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.855 (0.186) [0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	1.443 (0.201) [0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	1.493 (0.324) [0.000]

n_previous_arrests_cat1	0.306 (0.176) [0.082]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	0.102 (0.331) [0.757]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	0.887 (0.385) [0.021]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	0.994 (0.547) [0.069]
sex_mergedMale	0.652 (0.121) [0.000]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missing	-0.172 (0.334) [0.606]
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK	0.344 (0.089) [0.000]
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN	-0.107 (0.149) [0.470]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN	0.056 (0.254) [0.826]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown/Missing	1.057 (0.107) [0.000]
as.factor(age_merged)11	-1.090 (1.419) [0.442]
as.factor(age_merged)12	0.944 (1.033) [0.361]

as.factor(age_merged)13	1.649 (1.013) [0.104]
as.factor(age_merged)14	1.546 (1.011) [0.126]
as.factor(age_merged)15	1.585 (1.010) [0.117]
as.factor(age_merged)16	1.578 (1.010) [0.118]
as.factor(age_merged)17	1.551 (1.012) [0.125]
year_season2019Q2	-0.256 (0.127) [0.043]
year_season2019Q3	-0.145 (0.133) [0.276]
year_season2019Q4	-0.266 (0.139) [0.056]
year_season2020Q1	-0.300 (0.142) [0.034]
year_season2020Q2	-0.464 (0.178) [0.009]
year_season2020Q3	-0.446 (0.175) [0.011]
year_season2020Q4	-0.372 (0.163) [0.022]

year_season2021Q1	-0.356 (0.179) [0.047]
year_season2021Q2	-0.483 (0.192) [0.012]
year_season2021Q3	-0.423 (0.191) [0.027]
year_season2021Q4	-0.193 (0.171) [0.258]
year_season2022Q1	-0.220 (0.171) [0.197]
accused_suspectN/A - Stops only	-0.837 (0.296) [0.005]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.463 (0.103) [0.000]
log_CCHI_score	-0.032 (0.034) [0.351]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.084 (0.219) [0.700]
BCU fixed effects?	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y
Number of observations	19,521

Notes: In each cell, the first row is the estimated coefficient from the logit model, the second row (in regular brackets) contains the standard error and the third row (in square brackets) contains the p-value.

	Model: Arrest in 6 months (White CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (Black CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (All ethnic minority CYP only)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	5.93	8.78	8.01
Estimated effect of diversion (pp)	-3.07***	-3.79***	-3.87***
Number of observations	8,032	8,032	10,946

 Table 69: Regression analysis results - relationship between diversion, arrest and ethnicity

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 70: Full logit regression results - relationship between diversion, arrest and ethnicity

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months (White CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (Black CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (All ethnic minority CYP only)
Intercept	-3.689	-16.092	-15.654
	(1.219)	(320.862)	(278.803)
	[0.002]	[0.960]	[0.955]
Treatment	-0.750	-0.605	-0.701
	(0.178)	(0.147)	(0.132)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat1	0.756	1.031	1.085
	(0.238)	(0.162)	(0.147)
	[0.001]	[0.000]	[0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.659	0.875	0.835
	(0.392)	(0.280)	(0.256)
	[0.093]	[0.002]	[0.001]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	1.995	1.503	1.511
	(0.353)	(0.294)	(0.281)
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	2.961	1.584	1.370
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------
	(0.690)	(0.498)	(0.460)
	[0.000]	[0.001]	[0.003]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	0.782	0.243	0.189
	(0.349)	(0.259)	(0.243)
	[0.025]	[0.348]	[0.437]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	-1.329	0.702	0.687
	(1.166)	(0.439)	(0.417)
	[0.254]	[0.110]	[0.100]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	1.308	1.167	1.178
	(1.086)	(0.545)	(0.516)
	[0.229]	[0.032]	[0.023]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	-0.882	0.271	0.480
	(1.186)	(0.774)	(0.748)
	[0.457]	[0.726]	[0.521]
sex_mergedMale	0.467	0.870	0.844
	(0.186)	(0.202)	(0.186)
	[0.012]	[0.000]	[0.000]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missi ng	-0.343 (0.740) [0.643]	0.630 (0.469) [0.179]	0.372 (0.457) [0.416]
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK			
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN			-0.606 (0.145) [0.000]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN			-0.333 (0.248) [0.180]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown /Missing			
as.factor(age_merged)11	0.356	11.420	11.106
	(1.138)	(320.863)	(278.805)
	[0.755]	[0.972]	[0.968]
as.factor(age_merged)12	0.282	12.664	12.461
	(1.071)	(320.862)	(278.803)
	[0.792]	[0.969]	[0.964]

as.factor(age_merged)13	0.633	13.138	12.977
	(1.035)	(320.862)	(278.803)
	[0.541]	[0.967]	[0.963]
as.factor(age_merged)14	0.423	13.143	12.986
	(1.032)	(320.862)	(278.803)
	[0.682]	[0.967]	[0.963]
as.factor(age_merged)15	0.550	13.042	12.977
	(1.028)	(320.862)	(278.803)
	[0.593]	[0.968]	[0.963]
as.factor(age_merged)16	0.507	13.007	12.928
	(1.028)	(320.862)	(278.803)
	[0.622]	[0.968]	[0.963]
as.factor(age_merged)17	0.606	13.021	12.841
	(1.032)	(320.862)	(278.803)
	[0.557]	[0.968]	[0.963]
year_season2019Q2	0.004	-0.330	-0.345
	(0.247)	(0.185)	(0.168)
	[0.988]	[0.075]	[0.040]
year_season2019Q3	-0.060	-0.311	-0.257
	(0.262)	(0.198)	(0.181)
	[0.820]	[0.116]	[0.156]
year_season2019Q4	-0.491	-0.325	-0.278
	(0.284)	(0.203)	(0.185)
	[0.084]	[0.110]	[0.132]
year_season2020Q1	-0.398	-0.162	-0.251
	(0.277)	(0.197)	(0.183)
	[0.151]	[0.412]	[0.170]
year_season2020Q2	-0.027	-0.617	-0.526
	(0.298)	(0.270)	(0.238)
	[0.929]	[0.022]	[0.027]
year_season2020Q3	-0.263	-0.955	-0.677
	(0.306)	(0.302)	(0.253)
	[0.390]	[0.002]	[0.007]
year_season2020Q4	-0.746	-0.328	-0.274
	(0.338)	(0.237)	(0.210)
	[0.028]	[0.166]	[0.192]

year_season2021Q1	-0.094	-0.244	-0.227
	(0.328)	(0.252)	(0.226)
	[0.775]	[0.333]	[0.315]
year_season2021Q2	-0.887	-0.096	-0.192
	(0.402)	(0.254)	(0.232)
	[0.027]	[0.705]	[0.407]
year_season2021Q3	0.096	-0.405	-0.419
	(0.307)	(0.267)	(0.246)
	[0.755]	[0.129]	[0.089]
year_season2021Q4	-0.387	-0.195	-0.181
	(0.346)	(0.234)	(0.213)
	[0.264]	[0.405]	[0.396]
year_season2022Q1	-0.393	-0.126	-0.063
	(0.338)	(0.232)	(0.209)
	[0.245]	[0.587]	[0.765]
accused_suspectN/A - Stops only	-0.313 (0.558) [0.575]	-1.315 (0.479) [0.006]	-1.296 (0.455) [0.004]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.172	-0.382	-0.342
	(0.183)	(0.142)	(0.126)
	[0.348]	[0.007]	[0.007]
log_CCHI_score	-0.032	0.021	-0.023
	(0.072)	(0.049)	(0.044)
	[0.656]	[0.662]	[0.597]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.233	0.111	-0.221
	(0.377)	(0.365)	(0.331)
	[0.537]	[0.762]	[0.505]
BCU fixed effects?	Y	Y	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y	Y	Y
Number of observations	8,032	8,032	10,946

 Table 71: Regression analysis results - relationship between diversion and arrest for violent offences

	Model: Arrest in 6 months	Model: Arrest in 12 months	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	10.55	13.66	10.55
Estimated effect of diversion (pp)	-6.31***	-7.89**	
Estimated effect of formal diversion (pp)			-4.79*
Estimated effect of informal diversion (pp)			-6.93***
Number of observations	5,693	4,645	5,588

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 72: Full logit regression results - relationship between diversion and arrest for violent offences

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months	Model: Arrest in 12 months	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Intercept	-16.773 (344.340) [0.961]	-17.613 (360.512) [0.961]	-16.697 (344.437) [0.961]
Treatment	-0.981 (0.193) [0.000]	-0.949 (0.175) [0.000]	
Treatment (formal diversion)			-0.658 (0.324) [0.042]

Treatment (informal diversion)			-1.144 (0.219) [0.000]
n_previous_reports_cat1	0.829	1.288	0.820
	(0.250)	(0.216)	(0.252)
	[0.001]	[0.000]	[0.001]
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.869	0.813	0.847
	(0.416)	(0.422)	(0.418)
	[0.037]	[0.054]	[0.043]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	1.444	1.723	1.291
	(0.440)	(0.445)	(0.450)
	[0.001]	[0.000]	[0.004]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	0.108	2.340	0.086
	(1.189)	(0.800)	(1.192)
	[0.928]	[0.003]	[0.942]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	0.875	0.358	0.944
	(0.399)	(0.402)	(0.399)
	[0.028]	[0.373]	[0.018]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	-16.328	-0.997	-16.196
	(1386.779)	(1.224)	(1387.660)
	[0.991]	[0.415]	[0.991]
n_previous_arrests_cat2 n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	-16.328 (1386.779) [0.991] 2.217 (1.344) [0.099]	-0.997 (1.224) [0.415] 1.570 (1.335) [0.239]	-16.196 (1387.660) [0.991] 2.318 (1.335) [0.083]
n_previous_arrests_cat2 n_previous_arrests_cat3-5 n_previous_arrests_cat6+	-16.328 (1386.779) [0.991] 2.217 (1.344) [0.099] 1.805 (1.467) [0.218]	-0.997 (1.224) [0.415] 1.570 (1.335) [0.239] -0.558 (1.312) [0.671]	-16.196 (1387.660) [0.991] 2.318 (1.335) [0.083] 1.783 (1.468) [0.224]
n_previous_arrests_cat2 n_previous_arrests_cat3-5 n_previous_arrests_cat6+ sex_mergedMale	-16.328 (1386.779) [0.991] 2.217 (1.344) [0.099] 1.805 (1.467) [0.218] 0.780 (0.197) [0.000]	-0.997 (1.224) [0.415] 1.570 (1.335) [0.239] -0.558 (1.312) [0.671] 0.819 (0.177) [0.000]	-16.196 (1387.660) [0.991] 2.318 (1.335) [0.083] 1.783 (1.468) [0.224] 0.750 (0.198) [0.000]
n_previous_arrests_cat2 n_previous_arrests_cat3-5 n_previous_arrests_cat6+ sex_mergedMale sex_mergedUnknown/Missi ng	-16.328 (1386.779) [0.991] 2.217 (1.344) [0.099] 1.805 (1.467) [0.218] 0.780 (0.197) [0.000] 0.159 (0.502) [0.751]	-0.997 (1.224) [0.415] 1.570 (1.335) [0.239] -0.558 (1.312) [0.671] 0.819 (0.177) [0.000] -0.322 (0.508) [0.526]	-16.196 (1387.660) [0.991] 2.318 (1.335) [0.083] 1.783 (1.468) [0.224] 0.750 (0.198) [0.000] 0.169 (0.501) [0.736]

ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN	-0.303	0.044	-0.280
	(0.300)	(0.276)	(0.303)
	[0.312]	[0.874]	[0.354]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN	0.183 (0.526) [0.727]	-0.005 (0.571) [0.994]	0.183 (0.530) [0.730]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown /Missing	0.426 (0.214) [0.046]	0.789 (0.197) [0.000]	0.372 (0.217) [0.086]
as.factor(age_merged)11	11.755	13.027	11.764
	(344.340)	(360.511)	(344.438)
	[0.973]	[0.971]	[0.973]
as.factor(age_merged)12	12.989	13.542	12.970
	(344.339)	(360.511)	(344.437)
	[0.970]	[0.970]	[0.970]
as.factor(age_merged)13	13.626	14.147	13.616
	(344.339)	(360.511)	(344.436)
	[0.968]	[0.969]	[0.968]
as.factor(age_merged)14	13.672	14.282	13.565
	(344.339)	(360.511)	(344.436)
	[0.968]	[0.968]	[0.969]
as.factor(age_merged)15	13.817	14.279	13.793
	(344.339)	(360.511)	(344.436)
	[0.968]	[0.968]	[0.968]
as.factor(age_merged)16	13.524	14.171	13.472
	(344.339)	(360.511)	(344.436)
	[0.969]	[0.969]	[0.969]
as.factor(age_merged)17	13.670	-1.110	13.645
	(344.339)	(2818.675)	(344.437)
	[0.968]	[1.000]	[0.968]
year_season2019Q2	-0.067	-0.005	-0.062
	(0.257)	(0.226)	(0.259)
	[0.795]	[0.984]	[0.812]
year_season2019Q3	0.052	-0.195	0.050
	(0.278)	(0.253)	(0.280)
	[0.850]	[0.441]	[0.860]

year_season2019Q4	-0.290	-0.102	-0.273
	(0.294)	(0.246)	(0.297)
	[0.325]	[0.678]	[0.357]
year_season2020Q1	-0.474	-0.794	-0.457
	(0.297)	(0.284)	(0.299)
	[0.110]	[0.005]	[0.127]
year_season2020Q2	-0.724	-0.838	-0.859
	(0.405)	(0.393)	(0.426)
	[0.074]	[0.033]	[0.044]
year_season2020Q3	-1.215	-0.880	-1.217
	(0.464)	(0.340)	(0.465)
	[0.009]	[0.010]	[0.009]
year_season2020Q4	-0.281	-0.370	-0.283
	(0.338)	(0.299)	(0.340)
	[0.405]	[0.215]	[0.406]
year_season2021Q1	-0.067	0.290	-0.073
	(0.364)	(0.291)	(0.366)
	[0.854]	[0.319]	[0.842]
year_season2021Q2	-0.683	-0.523	-0.791
	(0.401)	(0.314)	(0.423)
	[0.088]	[0.096]	[0.061]
year_season2021Q3	-0.076	-0.130	-0.087
	(0.344)	(0.311)	(0.345)
	[0.824]	[0.676]	[0.801]
year_season2021Q4	-0.342 (0.352) [0.330]		-0.324 (0.353) [0.359]
year_season2022Q1	0.117 (0.301) [0.697]		0.058 (0.308) [0.851]
accused_suspectN/A - Stops only	-0.017 (0.702) [0.981]	1.187 (0.810) [0.143]	0.075 (0.708) [0.916]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.638	-0.282	-0.480
	(0.187)	(0.175)	(0.199)
	[0.001]	[0.108]	[0.016]

log_CCHI_score	0.009 (0.062) [0.888]	-0.018 (0.058) [0.752]	0.005 (0.062) [0.942]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.891 (0.714) [0.213]	-1.782 (0.809) [0.028]	-0.938 (0.723) [0.195]
BCU fixed effects?	Y	Y	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y	Y	Y
Number of observations	5,693	4,645	5,588

Table 73: Regression analysis results - relationship betwo	een specific types of diversion and
arrest for violent offences	

	Model: Arrest in 6 months (specific type of diversion)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	10.55
Estimated effect of community resolution (pp)	-7.89*
Estimated effect of triage (pp)	-3.28
Estimated effect of not in the public interest diversion (pp)	-7.71***
Estimated effect of youth caution (pp)	-5.31*
Estimated effect of youth conditional (pp)	-10.55
Number of observations	5,293

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 74: Full logit regression results - effect of specific type of diversion on arrest for violent offences

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Intercept	-16.591 (342.684) [0.961]
Treatment (community resolutions)	-1.498 (0.620) [0.016]
Treatment (not in the public interest)	-1.395 (0.256) [0.000]
Treatment (triage)	-0.408 (0.293) [0.164]
Treatment (youth caution)	-0.758 (0.368) [0.039]
Treatment (youth conditional caution)	-14.682 (2230.863) [0.995]
n_previous_reports_cat1	0.822 (0.253) [0.001]
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.915 (0.421) [0.030]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	1.281 (0.449) [0.004]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	0.157 (1.205) [0.896]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	0.910 (0.398) [0.022]

n_previous_arrests_cat2	-16.141 (1397.196) [0.991]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	2.350 (1.349) [0.081]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	1.741 (1.478) [0.239]
sex_mergedMale	0.732 (0.202) [0.000]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missing	0.180 (0.502) [0.720]
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK	0.162 (0.186) [0.384]
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN	-0.234 (0.307) [0.446]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN	0.254 (0.537) [0.637]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown/Missing	0.386 (0.220) [0.080]
as.factor(age_merged)11	11.787 (342.685) [0.973]
as.factor(age_merged)12	12.892 (342.683) [0.970]
as.factor(age_merged)13	13.450 (342.683) [0.969]

as.factor(age_merged)14	13.432 (342.683) [0.969]
as.factor(age_merged)15	13.688 (342.683) [0.968]
as.factor(age_merged)16	13.319 (342.683) [0.969]
as.factor(age_merged)17	13.532 (342.683) [0.969]
year_season2019Q2	-0.019 (0.261) [0.941]
year_season2019Q3	0.033 (0.284) [0.906]
year_season2019Q4	-0.213 (0.300) [0.477]
year_season2020Q1	-0.402 (0.301) [0.181]
year_season2020Q2	-0.819 (0.428) [0.056]
year_season2020Q3	-1.142 (0.467) [0.015]
year_season2020Q4	-0.264 (0.342) [0.440]
year_season2021Q1	-0.026 (0.368) [0.944]

year_season2021Q2	-0.689 (0.425) [0.105]
year_season2021Q3	0.005 (0.349) [0.989]
year_season2021Q4	-0.250 (0.356) [0.483]
year_season2022Q1	-0.015 (0.325) [0.963]
accused_suspectN/A - Stops only	0.115 (0.709) [0.871]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.448 (0.199) [0.025]
log_CCHI_score	0.005 (0.062) [0.932]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.957 (0.723) [0.186]
BCU fixed effects?	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y
Number of observations	5,293

Table 75: Regression analysis results - relationship between diversion and arrest for violentoffences, by ethnicity

	Model: Arrest in 6 months (White CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (Black CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (All ethnic minority CYP only)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	7.59	11.84	11.17
Estimated effect of diversion (pp)	-5.25**	-6.15**	-6.64***
Number of observations	1,805	1,921	2,642

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 76: Full logit regression results - relationship between diversion and arrest for violent offences, by ethnicity

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months (White CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (Black CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (All ethnic minority CYP only)
Intercept	-20.412	-18.226	-18.589
	(2298.075)	(1965.475)	(1769.689)
	[0.993]	[0.993]	[0.992]
Treatment	-1.234	-0.801	-0.975
	(0.379)	(0.325)	(0.288)
	[0.001]	[0.014]	[0.001]
n_previous_reports_cat1	-1.630	1.146	1.127
	(1.180)	(0.382)	(0.340)
	[0.167]	[0.003]	[0.001]
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.246	0.220	0.415
	(1.042)	(0.754)	(0.652)
	[0.814]	[0.770]	[0.524]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	1.768	1.354	1.407
	(0.883)	(0.707)	(0.669)
	[0.045]	[0.055]	[0.035]

n_previous_reports_cat6+	2.489	-17.883	-17.735
	(1.466)	(5773.980)	(5936.847)
	[0.090]	[0.998]	[0.998]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	0.875	0.787	1.054
	(1.096)	(0.676)	(0.584)
	[0.425]	[0.244]	[0.071]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	-17.731	-17.549	-17.310
	(12258.509)	(7260.528)	(7406.341)
	[0.999]	[0.998]	[0.998]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5		19.798 (5773.980) [0.997]	19.517 (5936.847) [0.997]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	-2.291	19.272	19.488
	(18135.019)	(5773.980)	(5936.847)
	[1.000]	[0.997]	[0.997]
sex_mergedMale	1.025	1.043	1.056
	(0.378)	(0.340)	(0.317)
	[0.007]	[0.002]	[0.001]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missi ng	0.192 (1.127) [0.865]	1.230 (0.637) [0.054]	1.090 (0.614) [0.076]
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK			
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN			-0.645 (0.319) [0.043]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN			0.014 (0.524) [0.979]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown /Missing			
as.factor(age_merged)11	15.619	-0.020	0.267
	(2298.075)	(2253.595)	(1997.348)
	[0.995]	[1.000]	[1.000]
as.factor(age_merged)12	15.244	15.333	15.292
	(2298.075)	(1965.475)	(1769.689)
	[0.995]	[0.994]	[0.993]

as.factor(age_merged)13	16.169	15.601	15.668
	(2298.075)	(1965.475)	(1769.689)
	[0.994]	[0.994]	[0.993]
as.factor(age_merged)14	15.214	15.969	15.909
	(2298.075)	(1965.475)	(1769.689)
	[0.995]	[0.994]	[0.993]
as.factor(age_merged)15	16.437	15.600	15.959
	(2298.075)	(1965.475)	(1769.689)
	[0.994]	[0.994]	[0.993]
as.factor(age_merged)16	15.665	15.952	15.935
	(2298.075)	(1965.475)	(1769.689)
	[0.995]	[0.994]	[0.993]
as.factor(age_merged)17	16.038	15.845	15.991
	(2298.075)	(1965.475)	(1769.689)
	[0.994]	[0.994]	[0.993]
year_season2019Q2	-0.324	-0.466	-0.057
	(0.586)	(0.425)	(0.356)
	[0.581]	[0.272]	[0.873]
year_season2019Q3	-0.536	-0.330	0.019
	(0.662)	(0.457)	(0.395)
	[0.419]	[0.470]	[0.962]
year_season2019Q4	-0.984	-0.246	-0.190
	(0.715)	(0.445)	(0.412)
	[0.169]	[0.580]	[0.645]
year_season2020Q1	-0.563	-0.636	-0.625
	(0.638)	(0.454)	(0.418)
	[0.377]	[0.161]	[0.135]
year_season2020Q2	-0.312	-0.815	-0.812
	(0.794)	(0.624)	(0.559)
	[0.694]	[0.191]	[0.146]
year_season2020Q3	-0.704	-1.741	-1.732
	(0.779)	(0.810)	(0.783)
	[0.366]	[0.032]	[0.027]
year_season2020Q4	-0.514	-0.490	-0.475
	(0.731)	(0.523)	(0.473)
	[0.482]	[0.349]	[0.315]

year_season2021Q1	0.438	-0.353	-0.755
	(0.630)	(0.647)	(0.616)
	[0.487]	[0.585]	[0.220]
year_season2021Q2	-17.382	-0.976	-0.438
	(1246.661)	(0.689)	(0.548)
	[0.989]	[0.157]	[0.425]
year_season2021Q3	0.481	-0.577	-0.287
	(0.691)	(0.555)	(0.481)
	[0.486]	[0.299]	[0.551]
year_season2021Q4	-0.326	-0.284	-0.025
	(0.752)	(0.513)	(0.456)
	[0.665]	[0.580]	[0.957]
year_season2022Q1	-0.773	0.197	0.260
	(0.746)	(0.454)	(0.411)
	[0.300]	[0.664]	[0.528]
- accused_suspectN/A Stops only	-14.450 (2380.872) [0.995]	-2.291 (1.623) [0.158]	-1.267 (1.337) [0.343]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.067	-0.385	-0.417
	(0.381)	(0.301)	(0.266)
	[0.861]	[0.201]	[0.118]
log_CCHI_score	0.056	0.073	0.050
	(0.119)	(0.105)	(0.090)
	[0.642]	[0.485]	[0.583]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-2.442	-0.257	-0.497
	(1.957)	(1.250)	(1.129)
	[0.212]	[0.837]	[0.660]
BCU fixed effects?	Y	Y	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y	Y	Y
Number of observations	1,805	1,921	2,642

Appendix F: GLA population estimates of CYP by ethnicity

We use the following filters on the GLA dataset, to obtain estimates of CYP ethnic groups in London. First we select individuals ages 10-17 years old in the data. We then restricted the projections to the years 2015-2022. We further restricted the data to London boroughs in our sample (i.e. excluding the City of London). We then grouped the categories into ethnicities to align with ethnic groups in the combined MPS data. We then took the average of the population estimates across 2015-2022, which is noted below.

Table 77: Average CYP population estimates by ethnicity

White CYP	Black CYP	Asian CYP	Middle Eastern CYP
1,082,957	591,636	604,203	112,395

The original dataset is available at: https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ethnic-group-population-projections

Appendix G: Analysis outputs for knife crime exploratory analysis (number of CYP involved in knife offences)

Year	All knife offences	Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)	% of CYP committing knife crime with ≥3 knife offences
2015	1,742	111	4.6%
2016	1,778	151	4.6%
2017	1,829	149	4.8%
2018	1,588	125	4.8%
2019	1,320	119	3.7%
2020	1,119	78	3.6%
2021	1,164	84	3.9%
2022	846	38	3.2%

Table 78: Number of unique CYP involved in all knife offences, and unique CYP with atleast 3 knife offences between 2015-2022

Table 79: Sex of unique CYP involved in all knife offences, and CYP with at least 3 knife offences between 2015-2022

	Male	Female	Unknown/Missing
All knife offences	9,253	938	241
Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)	408	3	6
% of CYP committing knife crime with ≥3 knife offences	4.4%	0.3%	2.5%

Table 80: Number of incident cases for all knife offences and for CYP with at least 3 priorknife offences across age of CYP 2015-2022

Age	All knife offences	Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)	% of knife crime cases with ≥3 knife offences
10	78	1	1.3%
11	290	8	2.8%
12	590	15	2.5%
13	1,026	62	6.0%
14	1,624	144	8.9%
15	2,552	424	9.5%
16	2,961	231	7.8%
17	2,838	152	5.4%

Table 81: Ethnicity of unique CYP for all knife offences and CYP with at least 3 prior knife offences between 2015-2022

	White	Black	Asian	Middle Eastern	Unknown/M issing
All knife offences	2,493	5,311	884	123	1,621
Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)	32	277	10	-	98
% of CYP committing knife crime with ≥3 knife offences	1.3%	5.2%	1.1%	0.0%	6.0%

Table 82: Proportion of CYP with at least three knife-related offences across London boroughs

Borough	Total Knife Crime	Knife offences (≥ 3 prior offences)	% of CYP with ≥ 3 prior knife offences
Barking And Dagenham	350	17	4.9%
Barnet	296	9	3.0%
Bexley	189	5	2.6%
Brent	370	6	1.6%
Bromley	313	30	9.6%
Camden	249	17	6.8%
City Of Westminster	266	17	6.4%
Croydon	709	53	7.5%
Ealing	312	10	3.2%
Enfield	460	34	7.4%
Greenwich	429	26	6.1%
Hackney	546	72	13.2%
Hammersmith And Fulham	274	25	9.1%
Haringey	423	41	9.7%
Harrow	210	11	5.2%
Havering	245	9	3.7%
Hillingdon	226	9	4.0%
Hounslow	241	14	5.8%
Islington	313	29	9.3%
Kensington And Chelsea	241	20	8.3%
Kingston Upon Thames	113	6	5.3%
Lambeth	779	83	10.7%

Lewisham	569	91	16.0%
Merton	200	10	5.0%
Newham	509	26	5.1%
Redbridge	292	8	2.7%
Richmond Upon Thames	95	5	5.3%
Southwark	698	64	9.2%
Sutton	180	1	0.6%
Tower Hamlets	459	33	7.2%
Waltham Forest	435	40	9.2%
Wandsworth	275	14	5.1%
Other	35	2	5.7%
Unknown/Missing	92	18	19.6%

Table 83: Proportion of CYP with at least three knife-related based on previous arrestsbetween 2015-2022

	All knife offences	Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)	% of CYP committing knife crime with ≥3 knife offences
No previous arrests	2,832	32	1.1%
1 previous arrest	551	27	4.9%
2 previous arrests	254	23	9.1%
3 previous arrests	160	22	13.8%
4 previous arrests	97	17	17.5%
5 previous arrests	70	8	11.4%
6 previous arrests	54	15	16.9%

7 - 10 previous arrests	89	19	38.0%
≥11 previous arrests	50	13	26.0%

Table 84: Number of incident cases for knife possession and knife-enabled offencesbetween 2015-2022

Offence type	All knife offences	Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)	% of knife crime cases with ≥3 knife offences
Knife possession	6,467	448	6.9%
Knife enabled (Total)	5,081	434	8.5%
Homicide (Knife enabled)	4,201	337	8.0%
Violence (Knife enabled)	468	49	10.5%
Robbery (Knife enabled)	427	49	11.5%

Table 85: Crime harm for all knife offences and incident cases with at least 3 knife offences

Crime harm category	All knife offences	Knife offences (≥ 3 prior offences)	% of CYP with ≥ 3 prior knife offences
High harm	7,581	71	1.5%
Medium harm	2,187	203	9.3%
Lower harm	4,664	476	6.3%

Appendix H: Analysis outputs for knife crime exploratory analysis (disposal outcomes for CYP involved in knife offences)

Table 86: Disposal outcomes for incident cases involving all offences, all knife offences, and at least three knife offences

Outcome	All offences	All knife offences	Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)
Diverted	91,599	1,867	35
Escalated	61,444	6,773	651
Indeterminate outcomes	118,383	2,746	169

Table 87: Percentage of disposal outcomes for incident cases involving all offences, all knife offences, and at least three knife offence

Outcome	All offences	All knife offences	Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)
Diverted	22.6%	16.4%	4.1%
Escalated	33.7%	59.5%	76.1%
Indeterminate outcomes	43.6%	24.1%	19.8%

Table 88: Percentage of disposal outcomes for incident cases involving all offences, all knife offences, and at least three knife offence

Outcome	Formal diversion	Informal diversion	Proportion of formal diversion
All offences	13,014	53,091	19.7%
All knife offences	1,114	1,004	52.6%
Knife offences (≥ 3 knife offences)	21	18	53.8%

Table 89: Percentage of disposal outcomes for incident cases involving all offences, all knife offences, and at least three knife offence

Disposal outcome	All offences	All knife offences	% of all offences involving knife offences
Community resolution	14,809	93	0.6%
Triage	23,857	528	2.2%
Not in public interest	19,500	414	2.1%
Youth caution	12,073	1,013	8.4%
Youth conditional caution	3,258	760	23.3%
Warning	1,832	0	0.0%

Table 90: Number of unique CYP with community resolution, youth caution, youth conditional caution, charge and no further action , indeterminate outcomes for knife offences across 2015-202

Disposal outcome	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Charge	895	879	864	705	524	510	479	352
Youth conditional caution	137	159	145	140	148	95	103	77
Youth caution	197	206	194	180	191	126	148	105
Community resolution	12	26	13	26	14	4	14	5
No Further Action	312	285	264	155	111	78	76	49

Appendix I: Analysis outputs for knife crime exploratory analysis (Descriptives of all CYP diverted for knife offences)

Table 91: Number of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes forknife offences, between 2015-2022

Year	Diverted CYP	Escalated CYP	CYP with indeterminate outcomes
2015	229	1048	369
2016	272	1054	363
2017	284	1012	463
2018	293	863	383
2019	264	680	323
2020	185	647	249
2021	206	608	308
2022	128	443	261

Table 92: Proportion of unique CYP with diverted, escalated or indeterminate outcomes forknife offences, between 2015-2022

Year	% of diverted CYP	% of escalated CYP	% of indeterminate CYP
2015	13.9%	63.7%	22.4%
2016	16.1%	62.4%	21.5%
2017	16.1%	57.5%	26.3%
2018	19.0%	56.1%	24.9%
2019	20.8%	53.7%	25.5%
2020	17.1%	59.9%	23.0%
2021	18.4%	54.2%	27.5%

2022	15.4%	53.2%	31.4%

Table 93: Number of incident cases across age of CYP involved in knife offences

Age	Diverted	Escalated	Proportion of diverted cases
10	48	6	88.9%
11	189	25	88.3%
12	314	88	78.1%
13	370	352	51.2%
14	358	759	32.1%
15	361	1,462	19.8%
16	140	2,036	6.4%
17	87	2,045	4.1%

Table 94: Sex of CYP diverted or escalated for knife offences, between 2015-2022

	Male	Female	Unknown/Missing
Diverted (knife offences)	1,464	301	89
Escalated (knife offences)	5,512	345	50
Proportion of CYP diverted	21.0%	46.6%	64.0%

Table 95: Ethnicity of CYP diverted (vs. escalated) for knife offences (2015-2022)

	White	Black	Asian	Middle Eastern	Unknown/M issing
Diverted	660	677	226	24	267
Escalated	1,245	3,364	420	72	806
Indeterminate	588	1,270	238	27	548

Proportion of	34.6	16.8%	35.0%	25.0%	24.9%
CYP diverted					

Table 96: Diverted or escalated CYP involved in knife offences based on previous arrestsbetween 2015-2018

Previous arrests	Diverted (knife offences)	Escalated (knife offences)	Proportion of cases diverted (vs escalated)
No previous arrests	746	1,309	36.3%
1 previous arrest	29	377	7.1%
2 previous arrests	3	190	1.6%
3 previous arrests	2	108	1.8%
4 previous arrests	1	69	1.4%
≥ 5 previous arrests	1	196	0.5%

Table 97: Diverted and escalated CYP for knife possession and knife-enabled offences

Offence Type	Diverted (knife offences)	Escalated (knife offences)	Proportion of cases diverted (vs escalated)
Knife possession	1,512	4,324	25.9%
Knife enabled	356	2,608	12.0%
Homicide (Knife enabled)	7	291	2.3%
Violence (Knife enabled)	338	1,983	14.6%
Robbery (Knife enabled)	11	349	3.1%

Table 98: Rate of diversion for knife-enabled offences between 2015-2022

Year	Diverted (knife possession)	Escalated (knife possession)	Proportion of cases diverted (vs escalated)
2015	172	776	18.1%

2016	219	769	22.2%
2017	222	654	25.3%
2018	226	570	28.4%
2019	226	443	33.8%
2020	154	420	26.8%
2021	181	376	32.5%
2022	112	316	26.2%

Table 99: Rate of diversion for knife-enabled offences between 2015-2022

Offence	Diverted (knife enabled)	Escalated (knife enabled)	Proportion of cases diverted (vs escalated)
2015	61	386	13.6%
2016	53	385	12.1%
2017	62	457	11.9%
2018	67	367	15.4%
2019	39	303	11.4%
2020	31	273	10.2%
2021	27	288	8.6%
2022	16	149	9.7%

Table 100: Rate of diversion across London boroughs for knife offences

Borough	Diverted cases	Diverted or escalated cases	Proportion of cases diverted (vs escalated)
Barking And Dagenham	78	262	29.8%
Barnet	60	213	28.2%
Bexley	76	154	49.4%
Brent	81	295	27.5%
Bromley	100	281	35.6%
Camden	35	176	19.9%
City Of Westminster	60	230	26.1%
Croydon	168	545	30.8%
Ealing	81	265	30.6%
Enfield	109	349	31.2%
Greenwich	115	349	33.0%
Hackney	89	433	20.6%
Hammersmith And Fulham	40	206	19.4%
Haringey	80	355	22.5%
Harrow	33	160	20.6%
Havering	53	178	29.8%
Hillingdon	71	187	38.0%
Hounslow	50	190	26.3%
Islington	52	248	21.0%
Kensington And Chelsea	29	206	14.1%
Kingston Upon Thames	32	92	34.8%
Lambeth	90	607	14.8%

Lewisham	115	461	24.9%
Merton	42	148	28.4%
Newham	106	420	25.2%
Redbridge	96	231	41.6%
Richmond Upon Thames	16	73	21.9%
Southwark	162	556	29.1%
Sutton	80	147	54.4%
Tower Hamlets	86	336	25.6%
Waltham Forest	102	356	28.7%
Wandsworth	39	198	19.7%
Other	4	23	14.8%
Unknown/Missing	10	88	11.4%

Table 101: Rate of diversion across different levels of crime severity

Crime harm category	Diverted	Escalated	Proportion of cases diverted (vs escalated)
High harm	9	444	2.0%
Medium harm	109	1,182	8.4%
Lower harm	1,730	4,332	28.5%

Appendix J: Analysis outputs for knife crime exploratory analysis (Regression analysis of CYP diverted for knife offences)

	Model: Arrest in 6 months	Model: Arrest in 12 months	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	13.30	17.38	13.30
Estimated effect of diversion (pp)	-9.36**	-7.71	
Estimated effect of formal diversion (pp)			-9.05*
Estimated effect of informal diversion (pp)			-9.69
Number of observations	1,123	923	1,067

 Table 102: Regression analysis results - relationship between diversion and arrest for knife

 offences

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

 Table 103: Full logit regression results - relationship between diversion and arrest for knife

 offences

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months	Model: Arrest in 12 months	Model: Arrest in 6 months (type of diversion)
Intercept	-16.794 (2377.734) [0.994]	-18.832 (1979.876) [0.992]	-16.673 (2516.910) [0.995]
Treatment	-1.319 (0.425) [0.002]	-0.676 (0.355) [0.057]	

Treatment (formal diversion)			-1.240 (0.497) [0.013]
Treatment (informal diversion)			-1.411 (0.761) [0.064]
n_previous_reports_cat1	-0.092	0.331	-0.094
	(0.513)	(0.461)	(0.513)
	[0.858]	[0.473]	[0.855]
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.420	0.798	0.419
	(0.807)	(0.910)	(0.805)
	[0.603]	[0.381]	[0.603]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	0.951	32.282	0.878
	(0.975)	(2234.243)	(0.975)
	[0.329]	[0.988]	[0.368]
n_previous_reports_cat6+	0.697	24.712	0.657
	(1.996)	(24032.098)	(1.992)
	[0.727]	[0.999]	[0.742]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	1.731	-0.238	1.723
	(0.701)	(0.913)	(0.702)
	[0.014]	[0.795]	[0.014]
n_previous_arrests_cat2	-0.570	-30.485	-0.565
	(1.571)	(2234.243)	(1.575)
	[0.717]	[0.989]	[0.720]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	2.296	-7.543	2.340
	(2.101)	(24033.351)	(2.095)
	[0.274]	[1.000]	[0.264]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	-18.219	-42.000	-18.229
	(7527.408)	(26328.511)	(7513.501)
	[0.998]	[0.999]	[0.998]
sex_mergedMale	1.125	1.030	1.057
	(0.774)	(0.591)	(0.774)
	[0.146]	[0.081]	[0.172]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missi ng	-15.646 (2014.900) [0.994]	-15.901 (1657.766) [0.992]	-15.741 (2066.290) [0.994]

ethnicity_merged3 BLACK	0.175	0.196	0.134
	(0.351)	(0.341)	(0.354)
	[0.617]	[0.565]	[0.705]
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN	-0.269	-0.392	-0.258
	(0.558)	(0.527)	(0.562)
	[0.630]	[0.458]	[0.646]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN	-17.286 (1664.708) [0.992]	-17.538 (1678.565) [0.992]	-17.316 (1666.529) [0.992]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown /Missing	0.918 (0.482) [0.057]	1.690 (0.437) [0.000]	0.882 (0.483) [0.068]
as.factor(age_merged)11	15.158	14.412	15.238
	(2377.733)	(1979.875)	(2516.909)
	[0.995]	[0.994]	[0.995]
as.factor(age_merged)12	0.212	14.383	0.224
	(2544.830)	(1979.875)	(2686.566)
	[1.000]	[0.994]	[1.000]
as.factor(age_merged)13	16.253	16.277	16.287
	(2377.733)	(1979.875)	(2516.909)
	[0.995]	[0.993]	[0.995]
as.factor(age_merged)14	16.185	16.042	16.106
	(2377.733)	(1979.875)	(2516.909)
	[0.995]	[0.994]	[0.995]
as.factor(age_merged)15	15.766	15.754	15.794
	(2377.733)	(1979.875)	(2516.909)
	[0.995]	[0.994]	[0.995]
as.factor(age_merged)16	15.682	15.760	15.710
	(2377.733)	(1979.875)	(2516.909)
	[0.995]	[0.994]	[0.995]
as.factor(age_merged)17	15.645	37.093	15.667
	(2377.733)	(6731.351)	(2516.909)
	[0.995]	[0.996]	[0.995]
year_season2019Q2	-0.621	-1.317	-0.636
	(0.501)	(0.502)	(0.504)
	[0.215]	[0.009]	[0.207]

year_season2019Q3	-1.222	-0.909	-1.231
	(0.615)	(0.538)	(0.617)
	[0.047]	[0.091]	[0.046]
year_season2019Q4	-1.719	-1.957	-1.712
	(0.733)	(0.695)	(0.734)
	[0.019]	[0.005]	[0.020]
year_season2020Q1	-0.839	-0.752	-0.867
	(0.539)	(0.481)	(0.542)
	[0.120]	[0.118]	[0.110]
year_season2020Q2	-2.008	-1.682	-2.028
	(1.081)	(0.831)	(1.082)
	[0.063]	[0.043]	[0.061]
year_season2020Q3	-0.567	-0.765	-0.588
	(0.620)	(0.571)	(0.622)
	[0.361]	[0.180]	[0.345]
year_season2020Q4	-0.801	-1.050	-0.836
	(0.634)	(0.551)	(0.634)
	[0.206]	[0.056]	[0.188]
year_season2021Q1	-0.569	-0.688	-0.543
	(0.628)	(0.589)	(0.632)
	[0.365]	[0.243]	[0.390]
year_season2021Q2	-0.723	-0.773	-0.762
	(0.647)	(0.556)	(0.650)
	[0.264]	[0.165]	[0.241]
year_season2021Q3	0.096	-0.126	-0.097
	(0.558)	(0.544)	(0.581)
	[0.863]	[0.817]	[0.867]
year_season2021Q4	-0.711 (0.638) [0.265]		-0.706 (0.641) [0.271]
year_season2022Q1	-0.723 (0.596) [0.225]		-0.738 (0.597) [0.216]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.518	-0.519	-0.472
	(0.399)	(0.352)	(0.449)
	[0.195]	[0.141]	[0.293]

log_CCHI_score	-0.069 (0.145) [0.636]	-0.011 (0.137)	-0.078 (0.146)
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.467 (1.419)	-1.003 (1.232)	-0.542 (1.420)
BCU fixed effects?	[0.742] Y	[0.413] Y	[0.703] Y
Offence type dummies?	Y	Y	Y
Number of observations	1,123	923	1,067

Table 104: Regression analysis results - relationship between specific types of diversion andarrest for knife crimes

	Model: Arrest in 6 months (specific type of diversion)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	13.30
Estimated effect of community resolution (pp)	-13.30
Estimated effect of triage (pp)	4.70
Estimated effect of not in the public interest diversion (pp)	-13.30
Estimated effect of youth caution (pp)	-7.84
Estimated effect of youth conditional (pp)	-13.30
Number of observations	923

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 105: Full logit regression results - relationship between specific types of diversion andarrest for knife crimes

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months	
Intercept	-16.946 (2833.099) [0.995]	
Treatment (community resolution)	-17.809 (4372.029) [0.997]	
Treatment (not in the public interest)	-17.170 (1263.550) [0.989]	
Treatment (triage)	0.358 (0.808) [0.658]	
Treatment (youth caution)	-0.977 (0.718) [0.174]	
Treatment (youth conditional caution)	-19.012 (9992.610) [0.998]	
n_previous_reports_cat1	-0.025 (0.526) [0.962]	
n_previous_reports_cat2	0.540 (0.835) [0.517]	
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	1.263 (1.078) [0.241]	
n_previous_reports_cat6+	0.714 (2.078) [0.731]	
n_previous_arrests_cat1	1.692 (0.738) [0.022]	
n_previous_arrests_cat2	-1.009 (1.634) [0.537]	
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5	2.491 (2.189) [0.255]	
n_previous_arrests_cat6+	-19.097 (12427.251) [0.999]	
sex_mergedMale	1.564 (1.071) [0.144]	
sex_mergedUnknown/Missing	-15.135 (2514.750) [0.995]	
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK	-0.006 (0.380) [0.988]	
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN	-0.114 (0.583) [0.844]	
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN	-18.145 (2904.651) [0.995]	
ethnicity_mergedUnknown/Missing	0.929 (0.520) [0.074]	
as.factor(age_merged)11	-1.080 (3452.927) [1.000]	
as.factor(age_merged)12	-1.398 (3267.304) [1.000]	
as.factor(age_merged)13	15.796 (2833.098) [0.996]	

as.factor(age_merged)14	16.013 (2833.098) [0.995]
as.factor(age_merged)15	15.720 (2833.098) [0.996]
as.factor(age_merged)16	15.542 (2833.098) [0.996]
as.factor(age_merged)17	15.465 (2833.098) [0.996]
year_season2019Q2	-0.837 (0.545) [0.124]
year_season2019Q3	-1.291 (0.638) [0.043]
year_season2019Q4	-1.841 (0.759) [0.015]
year_season2020Q1	-1.322 (0.613) [0.031]
year_season2020Q2	-1.978 (1.094) [0.071]
year_season2020Q3	-0.399 (0.638) [0.532]
year_season2020Q4	-0.763 (0.664) [0.251]
year_season2021Q1	-0.263 (0.654) [0.687]

year_season2021Q2	-0.853 (0.680) [0.210]
year_season2021Q3	0.041 (0.608) [0.946]
year_season2021Q4	-0.573 (0.669) [0.392]
year_season2022Q1	-0.730 (0.619) [0.238]
accused_suspectSuspects	-0.381 (0.454) [0.401]
log_CCHI_score	-0.119 (0.153) [0.439]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	-0.814 (1.469) [0.580]
BCU fixed effects?	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y
Number of observations	923

Notes: In each cell, the first row is the estimated coefficient from the logit model, the second row (in regular brackets) contains the standard error and the third row (in square brackets) contains the p-value.

Table 106: Regression analysis results - relationship between diversions for knife crimes on arrest, by ethnicity

	Model: Arrest in 6 months (White CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (Black CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (All ethnic minority CYP only)
Mean outcome for escalated group (%)	11.35	14.41	12.98
Estimated effect of diversion (pp)	-11.35	-12.27	-11.49
Number of observations	334	483	658

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 107: Full logit regression results - relationship between diversions for knife crimes on arrest, by ethnicity

Model variable	Model: Arrest in 6 months (White CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (Black CYP only)	Model: Arrest in 6 months (All ethnic minority CYP only)
Intercept	-736.560	3.082	2.124
	(953383.413)	(10907.276)	(9231.009)
	[0.999]	[1.000]	[1.000]
Treatment	-98.874	-2.039	-2.290
	(287405.633)	(0.849)	(0.788)
	[1.000]	[0.016]	[0.004]
n_previous_reports_cat1	39.481	0.695	0.350
	(727849.195)	(0.801)	(0.656)
	[1.000]	[0.385]	[0.594]
n_previous_reports_cat2	873.499	0.644	0.632
	(827871.166)	(1.347)	(1.260)
	[0.999]	[0.632]	[0.616]
n_previous_reports_cat3-5	153.016	0.481	0.427
	(979771.442)	(1.545)	(1.541)
	[1.000]	[0.756]	[0.782]

n_previous_reports_cat6+		19.268 (5237.734) [0.997]	17.963 (3536.306) [0.996]
n_previous_arrests_cat1	0.755 (728340.124) [1.000]	1.647 (1.247) [0.187]	1.525 (1.137) [0.180]
n_previous_arrests_cat2		1.306 (2.268) [0.565]	0.969 (2.188) [0.658]
n_previous_arrests_cat3-5		55.225 (7533.450) [0.994]	34.909 (4563.892) [0.994]
n_previous_arrests_cat6+		-36.820 (18864.080) [0.998]	-35.690 (18319.605) [0.998]
sex_mergedMale	-226.491 (255892.842) [0.999]	18.872 (3052.799) [0.995]	18.593 (2843.983) [0.995]
sex_mergedUnknown/Missi ng	-277.931 (580430.863) [1.000]	1.362 (14451.626) [1.000]	2.755 (8521.233) [1.000]
ethnicity_merged3 BLACK			
ethnicity_merged4/5 ASIAN			-0.781 (0.622) [0.209]
ethnicity_merged6 MIDDLE EASTERN			-22.130 (3913.573) [0.995]
ethnicity_mergedUnknown /Missing			
as.factor(age_merged)11	132.471 (815912.437) [1.000]	-0.371 (9543.200) [1.000]	-0.535 (8001.898) [1.000]
as.factor(age_merged)12	-147.590 (605680.538) [1.000]	0.092 (9302.737) [1.000]	-0.026 (7537.508) [1.000]

as.factor(age_merged)13	77.592	17.755	17.351
	(579697.537)	(8493.993)	(6902.582)
	[1.000]	[0.998]	[0.998]
as.factor(age_merged)14	79.382	18.692	17.050
	(607378.699)	(8493.993)	(6902.582)
	[1.000]	[0.998]	[0.998]
as.factor(age_merged)15	73.035	16.953	16.220
	(402988.269)	(8493.993)	(6902.582)
	[1.000]	[0.998]	[0.998]
as.factor(age_merged)16	174.484	17.491	16.464
	(595665.191)	(8493.993)	(6902.582)
	[1.000]	[0.998]	[0.998]
as.factor(age_merged)17	77.992	17.604	16.340
	(607543.952)	(8493.993)	(6902.582)
	[1.000]	[0.998]	[0.998]
year_season2019Q2	-57.076	-1.198	-0.915
	(175104.345)	(0.865)	(0.773)
	[1.000]	[0.166]	[0.237]
year_season2019Q3	-434.130	-2.206	-1.732
	(983087.973)	(1.027)	(0.867)
	[1.000]	[0.032]	[0.046]
year_season2019Q4	65.806	-37.600	-36.566
	(425975.636)	(4793.556)	(4086.277)
	[1.000]	[0.994]	[0.993]
year_season2020Q1	164.286	-0.318	-0.713
	(94838.140)	(0.903)	(0.809)
	[0.999]	[0.724]	[0.378]
year_season2020Q2	214.810	-20.790	-20.248
	(292269.426)	(5294.464)	(4736.183)
	[0.999]	[0.997]	[0.997]
year_season2020Q3	141.573	-3.136	-1.791
	(292783.116)	(1.310)	(0.897)
	[1.000]	[0.017]	[0.046]
year_season2020Q4	-73.246	-0.575	-0.885
	(265575.631)	(0.991)	(0.925)
	[1.000]	[0.562]	[0.339]

year_season2021Q1	-70.655	-0.876	-0.904
	(418293.002)	(0.827)	(0.807)
	[1.000]	[0.290]	[0.262]
year_season2021Q2	-89.445	-0.004	0.022
	(251417.071)	(0.994)	(0.834)
	[1.000]	[0.997]	[0.979]
year_season2021Q3	264.950	-1.417	-0.743
	(340108.325)	(0.992)	(0.828)
	[0.999]	[0.153]	[0.370]
year_season2021Q4	1.872	-0.264	-0.328
	(266390.916)	(0.915)	(0.846)
	[1.000]	[0.773]	[0.698]
year_season2022Q1	-76.120	-0.271	-0.295
	(369150.260)	(0.853)	(0.763)
	[1.000]	[0.751]	[0.699]
accused_suspectSuspects	161.596	-1.568	-1.365
	(248858.601)	(0.716)	(0.673)
	[0.999]	[0.029]	[0.043]
log_CCHI_score	60.130	0.157	0.122
	(19872.518)	(0.262)	(0.228)
	[0.998]	[0.548]	[0.593]
CCHI_score_missing_ind	253.966	-14.865	-14.637
	(1373716.211)	(3558.633)	(2885.074)
	[1.000]	[0.997]	[0.996]
BCU fixed effects?	Υ	Y	Y
Offence type dummies?	Y	Y	Y
Number of observations	334	483	658

Notes: In each cell, the first row is the estimated coefficient from the logit model, the second row (in regular brackets) contains the standard error and the third row (in square brackets) contains the p-value.