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NOTE TO THE READER

This briefing comes directly from the chapter ‘Local Site Work: Approaches, Findings and Resources’ in the MSU report ‘Towards a Contextual Response to Peer-on-Peer Abuse: Research and Resources from MsUnderstood local site work 2013-2106’. To read the briefing in context, please refer to the report, which is available on both the MSU and Contextual Safeguarding Network websites.
Incorporating contexts into assessments

Tools to assess the vulnerability, risks and strengths of young people affected by peer-on-peer abuse were in development, and/or in use, across all MSU sites. During the audit phase we reviewed a number of these assessment tools and processes, identifying the extent to which they both assessed the holistic nature of peer-on-peer abuse and considered the contextual dynamics of the phenomenon. Overall assessment tools were largely focused on the individual and familial characteristics of the young people affected by peer-on-peer abuse although many also contained information, within notes, on the dynamics of young people’s peer groups and their experiences within school and/or in their local neighbourhood. Assessment processes, particularly multi-agency discussions, often included far more contextual information than written documentation and indicated that a number of practitioners were aware of the influence that peers, families, schools and public-space risk had on the welfare of young people with whom they worked. Furthermore, many practitioners could name locations, peer groups and educational establishments where they had repeated concerns. The challenge was ensuring the assessment tools brought this knowledge to the fore – so that they could inform both the development of contextual intervention plans and local problem profiles. Opportunities were identified in two sites to address this challenge.

Routine Peer Group Information Capture

During the audit of one site researchers identified that both social workers and youth offending team practitioners had, in an ad-hoc fashion, started to map social connections between the young people with whom they worked. While this practice was not consistent across either service, in the cases where it had been used practitioners were able to refine their assessments of individual young people by considering their experiences with reference to their wider peer group:

- Was their young person adopting a leadership role within their peer group, or were they largely following the influence of others?
- Was their peer group protective or did it present a risk associated to peer-on-peer abuse?
- Were their peers largely in the same educational establishment together or did they meet in other social or public settings?

Building the answers to these questions into assessments advanced practitioner understanding of peer-on-peer abuse, and provided a route to identifying interventions that considered a young person’s peers. Although this approach demonstrated the potential for contextual assessment practices in the site, it was:

- Inconsistent – only used when individual practitioners thought it may be helpful
- Absent from strategy – was an operational approach that lacked strategic direction or recognition
- Lacked quality assurance – the informal nature of this activity meant that it was largely unregulated – this in turn reinforced its inconsistent application and practitioners were unclear about when peer groups could be mapped and for what purpose

Researchers working in the site undertook a piece of work to provide consistency in the local approach, ensure its inclusion within local strategies and introduce a process by which peer mapping could be quality assured.

In the first instance a workshop was held with practitioners who had been involved in peer group mapping processes, including practitioners from the youth offending team, police, children’s
social care, the youth service and the local CSE specialist service. The workshop aimed to identify the ways in which peer groups were being mapped in the site, the purpose of these mapping activities and the potential challenges of further development, or implementation, of these processes. Discussing these three points identified that:

- Peer group mapping could be used to identify young people who were vulnerable to peer-on-peer abuse, inform the assessment of individuals who had already been identified, and inform detached and peer group intervention where concerns were escalating.
- Within the site peer group information was being used, informally, to identify and assess risks associated with CSE and serious youth violence. This process largely occurred during multi-agency meetings, sometimes called by an individual worker who had identified peer connections that were of concern.
- The identification of peer groups who were vulnerable to peer-on-peer abuse could be used to inform interventions offered by detached youth workers but such an approach was under-developed.
- There were a number of challenges with formalising peer mapping processes – including: the different IT systems in use within the site (which all separately held information on peer groups); a need to clarify who owned (was responsible for) peer maps once they had been developed; a need to distinguish between mapping to inform assessment (safeguarding) and mapping as part of an intelligence gathering process (enforcement).

As a result of the workshop a briefing was produced for the local site steering group and local safeguarding children board. The briefing documented the opportunities and challenges identified during the workshop. It also made a proposal for one activity that the research team could undertake within the site during the remainder of the delivery period – noting that other challenges (such as sharing information between IT systems and building intelligence profiles) were beyond the remit/responsibility of the MSU project.

The research team proposed piloting a peer group information capture form to inform the assessment of individuals affected by peer-on-peer abuse. The form (included in Appendix F) was designed for use by children’s social care and the youth offending team. It included trigger questions that would be used by a worker within either service when they contacted a young person’s education provider and/or the youth service. The answers given to the question would then be integrated into the assessment tools already used by children’s social care (social care assessment) and the youth offending team (Asset Plus).

The questions used in the form were considered and re-drafted by the local site steering group and the local safeguarding children board to ensure strategic buy in. Managers from each service were briefed on the content of the form and its use to aid quality assurance processes. The use of the form itself at the point of any referral where there were concerns regarding peer-on-peer abuse ensured that questions related to peer-group influence were asked consistently.

Developing the pilot and the information capture form raised important questions regarding ethics, consent and information storage. While peer associations are mapped routinely as part of police investigations across the country, questions were raised as to whether a service could ethically map a peer group without the consent of the individual young people featured in the map (or their parents). Associated to this question, debates surfaced about who would hold peer group information once it had been provided and who would oversee the actions taken if concerns regarding peer groups were identified. Ultimately most of these discussions were addressed by the form being used to capture information consistently that should be informing
individual safeguarding assessments – it was not used for intelligence gathering or wider proactive activity with peer groups. In addition, information was only captured by children’s social care and the youth offending team during the pilot period, ensuring statutory oversight of any safeguarding concerns related to peer groups. Nonetheless, the fact that these debates surfaced at all is important, and points to the need for wider (and likely national) advice regarding the place of peer group mapping within processes intended to safeguard young people.

Contextualising asset plus training

Most assessment tools used within sites were focused on the individual and familial characteristics of young people affected by abuse and violence. However, during the delivery period the Youth Justice Board introduced new assessment tool into youth offending teams: Asset Plus. Asset Plus is an assessment tool that considers contextual factors, particularly peer group dynamics, when considering the risks associated to young people’s offending. Our work within one site allowed us to explore how this tool could be used to assess risks associated with peer-on-peer abuse.

The audit of this site identified a need for a holistic assessment tool within the youth crime prevention service. This service, which was separate to the youth offending team, was currently using a range of assessment tools that were issue-specific (CSE, domestic abuse, youth violence etc.) and they requested one that provided a more holistic account of young people’s experiences of abuse. Given the multitude of assessment tools already in use within this site the research team were reluctant to introduce another. However, during the delivery phase the youth offending team and the youth crime prevention service both adopted Asset Plus. Practitioners within the site were due to be trained on how to use Asset Plus during the delivery period. It was agreed by the site steering group, and the relevant service, that supplementary training would be designed by the research team to identify ways that Asset Plus could be used to provide a contextual and holistic assessment of peer-on-peer abuse. The research team would design the training content via knowledge of how Asset Plus works and applied the evidence based on peer-on-peer abuse.

The researcher responsible for designing the training content attended the Asset Plus training alongside site professionals who would be delivering Asset Plus training to all other practitioners within the participating site. Going through this process enabled the researcher to both hear the way in which Asset Plus would be communicated to practitioners and identify opportunities for the tool to be used when assessing risks associated to peer-on-peer abuse.

Having attended the Asset Plus training sessions the researcher set about designing the supplementary training content. Training content applied research into peer-on-peer abuse to the structure of the Asset Plus assessment framework – identifying elements of the framework that were particularly helpful for developing a contextual assessment of risk/resilience and/or a contextual intervention plan.

Training was run over a half day period and structured into two parts:

SECTION 1: An overview of peer-on-peer abuse

- General research evidence into the nature and scale of peer-on-peer abuse
- Exploring contextual and holistic dynamics of peer-on-peer abuse (case file activity)

SECTION 2: Using Asset Plus in response to peer-on-peer abuse

- Information gathering during assessment – building information on contextual as well as individual risk/vulnerability/resilience factors
• Conclusions and explanations – provide an explanation of risk, vulnerability and resilience in relation to contexts as well as individuals
• Pathways and planning – identify opportunities to intervene with the contexts associated to the abusive incidents, and individuals concerned, in addition to any required 1:1 and family support

The training session was largely interactive and included a number of activities during which participants would build and apply a contextual understanding of peer-on-peer abuse.

During Section 1 this interactive element was enabled through engagement in case file reviews. The site participating in the deliverable had also undertaken reviews into local cases of peer-on-peer abuse (detailed in Appendix C) which in turn had been worked into learning vignettes. The researcher used these vignettes as the basis for the Asset Plus training, by firstly asking attendees to identify the contextual dynamics of a local case (compared to the wider research evidence on peer-on-peer abuse).

During Section 2 three interactive tools were introduced – all of which are reproduced, along with the training slides in Appendix G:

1. Information gathering table: The first column of the table captures the information gathering sections on Asset Plus. The remaining columns break down the contexts to which this information could relate – home, peer group, school, neighbourhood or indeed individual. Drawing information from the case vignette practitioners were asked to complete the table, gathering information about: personal, family and social factors; offending and anti-social behaviour; and foundations for change in relation to contextual as well as individual factors. This exercise was intended to highlight an opportunity within Asset Plus to collect information related to all contexts potentially associated to peer-on-peer abuse – unlike many other assessment tools which are largely restricted to collecting information on family and personal characteristics.

2. Explanations and conclusions exercise: Using the table in which they have gathered information from the case vignette, participants were then asked to explain, and draw some conclusions about, the nature of the abusive incident and the young person’s involvement in it. Going through some of the same processes they would do in Asset Plus, participants were asked to:
   - Rate desistance factors – those related to contexts as well as individuals
   - Identify any significant contextual or individual events in the past that may have informed the young person’s behaviour
   - Make some judgements about which contextual risk/resilience factors were likely to change
   - Identify the contextual risk/protective factors that had been used to explain the ratings applied in the assessment
   - During this exercise, participants were returning to processes and concepts that had already been introduced to them in Asset Plus training, but were now working through them with a contextual lens. In this way the fact that a young person’s peer group dynamics or the cultural context of their school/neighbourhood could enable or prevent desistance – as well as that young person’s familial or individual attitude – was bought to the fore. Participants were encouraged to articulate where these factors were unlikely to change, for example exposure to high levels of street based violence within their local neighbourhood, which in turn would provide
opportunities to more critically assess intervention plans (and partnerships) at a later stage.

3. The final interactive exercise involved the development of a contextual intervention plan. Participants were given a new table (featured in Appendix G) which drew upon elements of the intervention plan in Asset Plus. As illustrated in the table below, the first column of the table provided space for a participant to note a key area of intervention for a young person, such as addressing their abusive behaviour within their intimate relationship. The second column provided space to document work with the young person - whether the young person required a referral for this activity (i.e. to a domestic abuse programme), a target for the young person to aim for in relation to this area of intervention (i.e. stop threatening their partner) and a note of what the young person would do to achieve this (i.e. fully participate in the programme).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key area of intervention</th>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Other Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threatening behaviour towards partner</td>
<td>Referral: Domestic abuse project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: To improve attitudes towards women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young person will: Fully participate in the programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Contextual intervention plan

The next section in the intervention plan for Asset Plus was 'other controls'. Other Controls enables a practitioner to identify controls external to the young person that if put in place could enable them to address the key area of intervention. This is an element of Asset Plus that is critical for enabling contextual practice. During the training exercise the interactive table broke down potential areas for other controls into family, peers, school and neighbourhood. In doing so it asked participants to explicitly consider each context associated to the young person, whether the nature of any of these was associated to the area in need of intervention, and importantly what controls could be put in place to address any negative associations.

In the exemplar table these controls included:

- Speaking with the young person’s mum to identify the impact of historic domestic abuse on the family dynamic and whether she needed any support in this regard
- Mapping the peer group dynamic of the young person to ascertain whether they were following the lead of their peers when they abused their partner (as their peers participated) or whether they initiated the assault. This would ensure that any risk within the peer group dynamic itself could be identified and if necessary addressed so that it did not undermine the input from the 1:1 domestic abuse programme

The session was delivered on four occasions to staff within the youth offending and youth crime prevention service. Having completed all three activities participants were asked what lessons
they would take away with them as a result of the day, what they would change about the training content and what they felt was most useful. Comments back included:

‘The message I took from the session was to be more aware of peer on peer abuse and how it interlinks with other aspects of their lives…I already communicate well with other agencies to get a bigger picture of what is going on in young people’s lives, and mostly include the family. However, with the older young people I work with the family sometimes is not as involved, so (I will) try to involve them more to get a fuller picture of the young person’s life. (I will) Also try to keep track of young people’s peer groups more effectively, and use the tools with young people I work with who are in probation where they do not use asset plus where possible– for my own planning with them which I can share with their case managers.’

‘As a seconded Probation Officer, recently seconded into Youth Justice, the whole of the content of the training was beneficial to me to help main gain another perspective and a better understanding of the issues involved for the young people I am working with…. this for me was an excellent training event, difficult subject matter very well delivered and interaction rather than just being lectured to’.

‘I really enjoyed the session and felt that I took away further understanding in terms of the complexities and depth of these types of cases. In terms of areas for improvement I would have liked the session to be spread over a full day.’

The research team were in agreement about the length of time required for the training. In order to make full use of the resources a whole day was required. Participants were also relatively new to Asset Plus and so some needed reminding about the key concepts and processes featured in the assessment tool. Once Asset Plus has been in use for a longer period of time participants may find the resources even more helpful and easy to apply.

Going through this process demonstrated to the research team that Asset Plus is an assessment tool with contextual capability – providing a direct means through which practitioners can explicitly capture information on peer group dynamic (as well as school and neighbourhood) and feed this into their individual intervention plans and wider area problem profiles. The supplementary training designed to enable this requires further piloting over full-day sessions and its impact needs to be monitored for any changes it makes to youth offending practice.
Methodology

Rationale for contextual case reviews

Tasked to research the contextual dynamics of abuse during adolescence and implications for safeguarding

Research into adolescent risk indicates that it is largely associated to extra-familial vulnerability

- Identify context associated to experiences of extra-familial risk
- Identify extent to which safeguarding responses engage with those identified contexts
- Go beyond the ‘process’ question to whether the response engaged with where the risk was located

A Theoretical Framework

Bronfenbrenner – Social Ecological Theory

APPENDIX C: CONTEXTUAL CASE REVIEW TEMPLATE AND GUIDANCE SLIDES
Bourdieu – Constructivist Structuralism

Development of Bronfenbrenner’s mesosystem

Three key concepts:
- Social fields (structures): the rules (doxa) of the environment
- Habitus (agency): an individual’s feel for the rules
- Symbolic violence: engagement in that which is detrimental

Symbolic Violence

Because the foundation of symbolic violence lies not in mystified consciousness that only need to be enlightened but in dispositions attuned to the structure of domination of which they are the produce, the relation of complicity that the victims of symbolic domination grant to the dominant can only be broke through a radical transformation of the social conditions of production of the dispositions that lead the dominated to take the point of view of the dominant on the dominant themselves. (Bourdieu, 2001:41-42)

Learning about healthy relationships while being surrounded by harmful ones

Habitus – agents not subjects

- Active, not puppets
- ‘Generative’ capacity
- Potential to act differently through active engagement in alternative social field
- Social rules may be ‘entrenched but not unsurpassable’ (McNay 2003,97)

Embodiment: Tennis player example

You need only think of the impulsive choice made by the tennis player who runs up to the net, to understand that it has nothing to in common with the learned construction that the coach, after analysis, draws up in order to explain it and deduce communicable lessons from it. The conditions of rational calculation are practically never given in practice (Bourdieu 1990, 11)

Constructivist Structuralism – Interplay

- Embodying social rules actively engaged in constructing the social field
- Active two-way relationship - reflexive
- Multiple engagement in multiple fields – limited by their field of influence

For case review purposes: who are the agents engaged in interplay (public, peers, professionals etc.)
Instead of asking 'Why is my child a heroin addict? What went wrong in his or her development' we should, from a sociological perspective, be asking ‘What is it about this free, liberal, advanced, technological democracy that makes heroin a desirable, alternative possible course of action?’ Development through dependency then becomes an instrument in the process of social and cultural reproduction. (Jenks, 2005:40)

For the purposes of case review: Dependent upon who, where and in what circumstance?

Conceptual Framework for Contextual Case Review

In relation to young people’s experiences of abuse and vulnerability:
1. Young people develop within a range of social systems
2. Social systems interplay with one another
3. Young people construct, and are constructed by, social systems
4. Young people embody rules of social systems and engage in harmful norms in the absence of alternative systems
5. Young people are dependent upon those who run/manage social systems, as well as their peers, for their social development
6. Safeguarding young people, therefore, involves assessment of and intervention with all social systems (both intra and extra-familial contexts) in association to young people’s experiences of abuse

Method

Template Approach

- Drawing data from multiple sources:
  - Chronologies
  - Witness statements
  - Assessments
  - Referral forms
  - Historic case notes (social care, policing etc.)
- Template provides a means of uniformity
- Need to log all material reviewed and then material that is drawn upon
- Templates can then be subject to further manual analysis (for individual case review) and Nvivo / SPSS to identify trends across individuals in each case and across cases

Stage (1) Behaviour and Individuals

Case Overview
- Incident Summary
- Year of incident and response
- Codes for young people featured and role
- Agencies involved pre and post

Structure of Case Review Template

Three stage template
- Characteristics of the behaviours and the individuals who were associated
- Nature of the contexts associated to each young person featured in the case
- Nature of the response (prior to incident, identification, response (assessment, meetings, interventions), outcomes
Completed in non-linear fashion
Stage (1) Behaviour and Individuals

Incident
- Definitions
- Abusive behaviours (pre, during and post): cross and qualitative
- Weapons used
- Technology featured
- Location/s
- Escalation – qualitative account

Stage (1) Behaviour and Individuals

Young person’s characteristics (by their code – from page 1)
- Age
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Sexuality
- LAC Status
- Record of offending
- Gang-association
- Child protection / child in need
- In education / exclusion

Missing incidents – frequency, length and when reported and qualitative examples

Stage (2) Associated Contexts

Home/Families, Peer Groups, Schools and Neighbourhoods

- Cross if identified and then provide a qualitative account
- Code above each table for the young person associated
- Additional code for context is required (peer group, school, particular location)

Stage (2) Associated Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HA01 Peers (PG1)</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuse behaviours</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Violence between peers - HA01 ‘punched’ by HA02 a month prior to the incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally harmful behaviours and bullying amongst HA01 peer group - HA01 called a ‘weakling’ by HA02 during an argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful gender norms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group reinforce harmful ideas about gender roles calling HA03 ‘a slag’ during the rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity to safeguard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>HA01 confides in one peer about what has happened. They suggest that HA02 tell a teacher but they don’t seek help from anyone else – they are afraid to lose their friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective factors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>HA01 can identify one peer that he can talk to and uses this person as a confidant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage (2) Associated Contexts

Overview Table for each young person (summary of context tables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Evidence of safety</th>
<th>Evidence of risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home (add if more than one)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (insert codes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood (insert codes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage (2) Associated Contexts

Case Summary (condensing all overview tables)

- Number of homes:
- Safety/harm in featured homes:
- Number of peer groups:
- Safety/harm in featured peer groups:
- Number of schools:
- Safety/harm in featured schools:
- Number of neighbourhood localities:
- Safety/harm in featured neighbourhood settings:
### Stage (3) Engagement with services and response

Prior to the response (for each young person)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Prior to incident</th>
<th>Prior to identification</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s social care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector (insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector (insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage (3) Response

#### Identification
- By who and qualitative account of the process
- Initial response

Multi-agency meetings: held, attendance and actions

Assessments (of the incident)

#### Stage (3) Response

Interventions – with individuals and contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Stage (3) Response

Outcomes
Specific parts of the process (charge, relocation etc.)
- For each individual (code used)
- Qualitative account where available

Safeguarding outcomes:
- Individuals – code, safeguarded, qualitative explanations
- Contexts – evidence of safety and/or on-going risk

### Conclusions

- Written into template post analysis
- Changes to local responses since incident (based on interviews with professionals and reviews of any strategic documents)
- Thematic issues – risks and resilience
- Recommendations

### Data Collection

- Taken from multiple sources
- Anonymised at the point of input into the template
- Quotations noted with " marks
- Spreadsheets
- Logging documents: reviewed and used
- Codes: Table of codes for individuals and contexts
Analysis
- Manual analysis for initial overview tables within the template
- Second phase coding framework in Nvivo to link sections of the template:
- Where appropriate third phase using SPSS for counting statistical information for large numbers of individuals / contexts

Coding Framework
- Escalation (contextual child/tree nodes)
- Behaviour
- Individual characteristics
- Contexts – Home, Peer Group, School and Neighbourhood (behaviour child/tree nodes)
- Assessments (contextual child/tree nodes)
- Interventions (contextual child/tree nodes)

Resources
- Case file folder in shared file – restricted access
- Case Template
- Spreadsheet – source record
- Spreadsheet – individual codes
- Spreadsheet – contextual codes

Previous contextual reviews
- Three stages (Prof Doc, Sites, Commissioned)
- Template has been revised at each stage to accommodate team use and ease of collection
- Overarching findings:
  - Assessment inconsistently captures extra-familial risk
  - Escalation occurs beyond family but impacts familial capacity to safeguard
  - Contextual risk is managed by relocation not contextual intervention
- Used to produce case studies and accompanying resources in training

Confidentiality
- Case reviews include the use of confidential material
- Sites that commission case reviews are confidential unless agreed with the sites
- Case reviews cannot be discussed beyond the case review team
- Case review materials must be saved in secure folders at all times
Discussion and Questions

For more information and resources visit our website www.beds.ac.uk/ic
carlene.firmin@beds.ac.uk

@uniofbedscse
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Evidence Base, collection and analysis plan

Evidence base and data collection
Relevant files, where available, are required regarding:

- the incident itself (investigation documents, minutes of meetings to discuss response and young people affected, assessments)
- paperwork related to the featured young people prior to and following the incident/s under review (records for children’s social care, youth offending, police, education etc.)
- supplementary contextual data of relevance (i.e. Ofsted reports for named schools, crime data for the geographical area)

In addition to available paperwork additional data can be sourced through interviews (telephone or in person) with professionals:

- involved in the response to the incident
- who have a current role in responding to incidents of a similar nature

Evidence is to be taken from the paperwork and interviews and placed into the following template. As such, evidence on the nature of the contexts associated to the young people involved, as well as them as individuals, will be drawn out from the evidence base and placed into the template

Analysis plan
Data to be taken from case file template and:

- Quantitative evidence abstracted and submitted into SPSS
- Whole template loaded onto NVivo to be subjected to qualitative analysis

Drawing upon Bourdieusian social theory, which identifies a relationship between context and individual action, data will be analysed to ascertain:

- Nature of the incident and escalation towards it
- The relationship between individuals and environments prior to, during and following the incident
- The extent to which professionals responses addressed the identified nature of the incident/s and the relationships between individuals/environments outlined in the previous bullet point
- The extent to which the response may differ in current circumstances

All four points will be used to generate both recommendations for future practice and vignettes to be used in local training.
Case Overview

Incident/s or Offence/s under investigation (qualitative account):

Year (of incident):

Year (of response):

Young people featured:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Complainant</th>
<th>Suspect</th>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agencies featured:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to identification</th>
<th>Code (if relevant)</th>
<th>Post identification</th>
<th>Code (if relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incident/s under review/investigation

Definition of incident/s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child sexual exploitation</th>
<th>Domestic Abuse</th>
<th>Serious youth violence</th>
<th>Gang-associated violence</th>
<th>Harmful sexual behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abusive behaviours:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Prior (during escalation)</th>
<th>During incident</th>
<th>Following incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insert qualitative description:

Weapons used:

Technology featured:

Location/s of incident/s:

Escalation (qualitative account):
Young people featured

Code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Sexuality</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>Offending</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>CIN/CP</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Qualitative examples:

Code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Sexuality</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>Offending</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>CIN/CP</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Qualitative examples:

Code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Sexuality</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>Offending</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>CIN/CP</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Qualitative examples:

Missing episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>No of episodes</th>
<th>Length of missing</th>
<th>Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|      |         |                |                   |          |

|      |         |                |                   |          |

Qualitative examples:
# Environments associated to featured young people

*Below to be completed for each featured young person*

**Code:**

Overview table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Evidence of safety</th>
<th>Evidence of risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home (add if more than one)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (insert names)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood (insert localities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Home:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful gender norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity to safeguard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful gender norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity to safeguard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighbourhood**

Contextual Case Review Template - Copyrighted: University of Bedfordshire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive behaviours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful gender norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity to safeguard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Once completed for each featured young person condense to identify:*

Number of homes:
Safety/harm in featured homes:

Number of peer groups:
Safety/harm in featured peer groups:

Number of schools:
Safety/harm in featured schools:

Number of neighbourhood localities:
Safety/harm in featured neighbourhood settings:
### Professional engagement prior to incident and identification

**Code:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior to incident</th>
<th>Prior to identification</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s social care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior to incident</th>
<th>Prior to identification</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s social care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional response following identification

Identification

Identified by:

Qualitative account:

Initial response to identification:

Multi-agency meetings

Risk assessment of incident

Intervention with young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention with contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcomes

### Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocations (home)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed move (school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion (school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Safeguarded</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Qualitative account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood locality (code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to the local response since

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-agency working</th>
<th>Time of offence/response</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with schools involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local problem profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thematic findings follow analysis

To be inserted
Recommendations

To be inserted
APPENDIX F: PEER GROUP INFORMATION CAPTURE FORM

Peer Group Mapping – a pilot to contextualise assessment processes

Introduction
Since January 2014 the MsUnderstood Partnership1 has been working with practitioners in this site to build their local response to peer-on-peer abuse. Peer-on-peer abuse includes peer-on-peer sexual exploitation, serious youth violence, teenage relationship abuse and young people who display harmful sexual behaviour. Following an audit of existing practices within this site a delivery plan was devised to build upon the current strengths of the local response. The audit process identified that both youth offending and social work practitioners were engaging in peer group mapping activity to assess the needs of those affected by peer-on-peer abuse – a unique strength in this site – but approaches required greater oversight, strategic leadership and consistency. In light of this finding the delivery plan, signed off by LSCB in November 2014, included an action to create greater consistency in the consideration of peer group dynamics when conducting assessments. This paper outlines a proposal for how to progress this action for approval by the LSCB.

Background – wider research and findings from the site case review exercise
During the past decade international and UK research has increasingly highlighted that the nature of young people’s peer groups will influence the extent to which they are vulnerable to peer-on-peer abuse (Barter et al., 2009; Firmin, 2015; Letourneau and Borduin, 2008).

A review of five cases of peer-on-peer abuse in this site illustrated that such vulnerabilities exist in the county – with young people committing physical and sexual offences alongside their peers (three out of the five cases) and being encouraged by peer group norms to normalise harmful attitudes (five out of the five cases).

As noted in the introduction, the audit of this site’s response to peer-on-peer abuse identified that individual youth offending and social work practitioners were mapping young people’s peer groups as part of their assessment process in an ad hoc rather than consistent fashion. The fact that peer group mapping was occurring at all was a strength in the local response, and the ways in which practitioners were using such exercises enabled them to contextually consider the vulnerability of the individual young people on their caseload. The practice also enabled practitioners to link individuals with whom they were working and to, on occasion, design complementary intervention plans for young people who they knew were offending alongside one another or who were routinely exposed to risk when together.

This paper proposes an approach, to be piloted, that could enable greater consistency (in terms of quality and process) in the collection of information on peer group dynamics during the assessment of young people affected by peer-on-peer abuse in this site.

Objectives of peer group mapping
In February 2016 a workshop was held to identify, and discuss the potential for, peer group mapping in the site. The following services were represented:

- Children’s social care (SWAN Unit)
- The CSE Service
- Youth service
- The Police
- Youth offending service

By discussing peer group mapping exercises currently underway in the site and the potential to quality assure and develop these approaches in the future, attendees agreed a number of

---

1 MsUnderstood is a partnership led by the University of Bedfordshire that was formed in 2013 to develop local and national responses to peer-on-peer abuse www.msunderstood.org.uk
objectives for peer group mapping exercises. Attendees agreed that peer mapping exercises in
the site could be used for the following three reasons:

- Concerns regarding peer groups could be shared proactively to enable early identification
  and intervention
- Information on peer groups and peer dynamics could be shared upon request to assist
  with the assessment of individual young people who were at risk of being abused by,
  and/or abusing, their peers
- Information on identified peer groups of concern could be shared reactively with requests
  for disruption activity with those agencies who are able to engage with them (such as
  schools, the youth services and community safety services)

Each of these approaches had slightly different primary objectives – the first being to identify
concerns, the second to assess individual young people and the third to disrupt escalating issues
– however each would arguably enable the other.

Meeting the identified objectives
During the workshop attendees identified range of ways in which practitioners are, or could, meet
the identified objectives, and the challenges/barriers to developing peer mapping processes as
they currently stand:

- A lengthy discussion took place regarding IT systems, data protection and existing
  pathways such as the MASH and where information sharing and mapping processes
  currently sit, who owns that information and the purposes for which it is shared
- Examples were given regarding how information is currently shared and mapped at
  present, partnership examples of schools, the CSE service and children’s social care
  working together to map groups associated to existing cases
- The potential for engaging youth workers with identified peer groups within the detached
  programme of work was also identified
- A need to distinguish, and recognise the relationships, between information sharing,
  intelligence gathering and building an assessment was also discussed. This is critical as
  the processes required for intelligence gathering (in terms of police investigation) is not
  the same as those in place for information sharing in order to conduct an assessment of a
  young person, or to identify a need for early intervention from a safeguarding perspective

An overarching concern associated to all of the above was the need to improve the consistency
with which peer groups were considered when identifying, assessing and responding to the risk
of peer-on-peer abuse. Further discussion about this document at the April site steering group
meeting highlighted the importance of quality assurance, consent and data ownership for all of
the above, and the importance of communication and partnership for any further development of
peer mapping exercises.

Given that the MsUnderstood partnership only operated in this site until the end of May 2016
much of this work will need be developed beyond the life of this particular programme. It is
recommended that the LSCB and Community Safety Partnership consider this as part of their
wider development programme in relation to exploitation and Carlene Firmin, Head of the
MsUnderstood Partnership, provided some advice in regards to this matter at the close of the
programme.

However, within the delivery period the second objective outlined above (ensuring the collection
of peer-group information as part of the assessment process) could be pursued. This objective was
not about the gathering of intelligence or the tasking of disruption activity – both of which would
be relatively new to current practice in the site. Instead it is focused on developing a level of
consistency, quality assurance and oversight to peer mapping exercises that are already
underway (in an ad hoc fashion) in responses to peer-on-peer abuse in the site.

It is recommended that a template form (outlined later in this document) is piloted with a small
number of identified practitioners in the youth offending service, children’s social care and the
CSE service. They will use the template with a small number of practitioners from identified schools, alternative education providers and the youth service to:

- Capture information on young people’s peer groups and peer dynamics in a consistent format as a routine part of existing assessment processes.
- Provide a baseline against which participating practitioners can consider whether peer group influence is a protective or risk factor (or neither) to be considered in any future intervention plan for that young person.

The principle aim of this pilot was to advance the ability of the assessments to identify the strengths and risks within young people’s peer associations and what this may mean for the plan that professionals devise for them. It is not an intelligence gathering tool. It is seeking to capture peer information in a similar fashion to information gathering on family dynamics at present, and to provide an order/framework to that which is already underway. The data gathered through this exercise therefore, should be treated in the same way as any other information that a practitioner gathers during an assessment. The information form is not a standalone document and is only to be utilised as part of a wider assessment process for a young person considered to be at risk abusing, or being abused by, their peers. As the youth service and education providers engage with young people in peer settings these seem to be the best sources of such information for the initial stage of this pilot.

**Pilot timetable and participants**

This paper was presented to the site Steering group on Tuesday 5th April and the LSCB on Tuesday 26th April. It was amended following initial feedback from the MSU steering group. Following the presentation to the LSCB and electronic feedback requests to the site steering group revisions were made (following recommendations) and a final template (and process) approved for a pilot by relevant members of the LSCB.

At the site steering group on the 5th April an initial discussion of pilot participants took place. It was agreed that, pending recommendation/approval from the LSCB 2-3 educational establishments (at least one mainstream) would be contacted to participate in addition to the youth service.

Managers from the CSE Service, Youth Offending Team and Children's Social Care agreed to identify members of staff to participate from their services.

Proposed participants to engage in the pilot phase are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants requesting information and conducting assessment (two practitioners from each)</th>
<th>Participants providing information and receiving feedback post assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth offending team</td>
<td>Education providers x 4 (two mainstream and two alternative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's social care</td>
<td>Youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, participants from YOS, the CSE service and children’s social care were proposed as services that would use the form to request information on a young person’s peer group when they are referred into their service with concerns related to peer-on-peer abuse (peer-on-peer CSE, teenage relationship abuse, serious youth violence, harmful sexual behaviour). This form would be sent to the youth service and relevant school (if participating in the pilot). The information that was returned would be incorporated into the existing assessments conducted by those services. Any particular concerns/actions that emerged from the peer group information form would be communicated back to the information providing practitioners (education and
youth service) with a request that should the information change the requesting organisation was notified – and their assessment updated accordingly.

Ethics approval for the University of Bedfordshire to monitor the pilot had been given by the two stage University of Bedfordshire ethics approval process (as part of the wider application for the MsUnderstood partnership work programme).

It was proposed that the pilot take place for 2-3 weeks during May for initial review and feedback to the University of Bedfordshire, prior to recommendations being made for further testing and adaptation beyond the life of the MsUnderstood process. The pilot needed to consider:

- the feasibility of the exercise
- the usefulness/outcomes of the exercise
- the extent to which the process aids the assessment process
- what quality assurance processes would need to be in place to safeguard appropriate use of the form, and information gathered, during a wider roll-out

Upon completion these questions would be answered. It would then be the decision of the LSCB as to whether further testing was required, gradual roll-out was pursued or if other approaches were taken to achieve consistency and quality assurance for peer group mapping work in the site.

Peer-Group Information Capture Form

The peer group information capture form has been developed in order to inform existing assessment processes of young people who have been abused by, and/or who have abused, a peer. It provides a routine and consistent format for requesting, collating and analysing this type of information as part of the assessment process, which in turn yield opportunities to quality assure activities that are already underway. For the purposes of the pilot it was recommended that:

1. A maximum of four, minimum of two, education providers were identified to participate (and individual practitioners within those agencies) in addition to identified practitioners in the youth service
2. The youth offending service, the children’s social care and the CSE service also identified practitioners each who were willing to pilot the tool.
3. All participating professionals meet together with Carlene Firmin to discuss the tool and ask any questions that they may have had prior to the pilot phase
4. Participating practitioners from the youth offending service, children’s social care and the CSE service send the peer group information capture form (PGI) to identified practitioners within education and youth service as part of their assessment processes upon receipt of any relevant referrals
5. Participating practitioners in education and the youth service completed the form based on the information they had and return it to the requester
6. The requesting service, having incorporated the information into the assessment, reported back to the information provider, outlining whether the information informed the assessment and whether any other actions were required to safeguard the young people discussed
7. An information sharing agreement was required to ensure that the information flow outlined above was adhered to and that information was used for the purposes of assessment alone (during the pilot phase)
**Draft Form**

**Peer Group Information Capture Form (PGI)** *(as it was prepared for the site pilot – would need editing into for reuse by other sites in terms of tense and background information)*

This form has been produced to pilot a more consistent way for education providers and the youth service to share information about the nature and dynamics of young people’s peer groups with practitioners who are assessing their vulnerability to peer-on-peer abuse (both being abused by peers and abusing others).

This pilot:

- Has been approved by the LSCB and forms part of the MsUnderstood peer-on-peer abuse support programme that has been operating in the site since 2013
- Has been devised to explore ways to consistently record and consider information on young people’s peer groups when assessing young people at risk of peer-on-peer abuse. We know such information sharing occurs in an ad hoc basis and the pilot intends to explore one way of providing quality assurance, monitoring and consistency to such activities
- Will only involve services (and practitioners within those services) who have been recruited into the pilot beforehand
- Will only be collecting information for the purposes of informing existing assessment processes
- Will hold the information collected to the same standards as any other information that is collected when a young person is subject to an assessment following a referral to either the CSE service, the youth offending service or children’s social care
- Is intended to capture information which more explicitly reflects the contribution, and potential contribution, that education providers and the youth service can make to assessing the vulnerability and safety of young people affected by peer-on-peer abuse
- Will be subject to review with all participating practitioners to feedback views for development/adaptation/roll-out across other services in the future
- Is not an intelligence gathering exercise

Should you have any queries/concerns about this form or the process being followed please contact Carlene Firmin [carlene.firmin@beds.ac.uk](mailto:carlene.firmin@beds.ac.uk).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information requester: (name and agency)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information provider: (name and agency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of young person concerned:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of assessment being conducted by requesting organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you (the information provider) aware of any peer relationships of the young person concerned?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes please complete the remainder of this form, if no please return this form stating so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the young person of concern have many peer relationships or a small number? Are they socially isolated?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide the names of the young people with whom this young person spends their time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider any of the above individuals to have a positive or protective influence on the young person concerned? (Please explain answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider any of the above individuals to have a negative or risky influence on the young person concerned? (Please explain answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the young person concerned appear to follow the influence of any of their peers? (Please name which peer and explain your answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the young person concerned appear to lead or influence the behaviour of any of their peers? Please name which peer/s and explain your answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any other information regarding the nature and quality of this young person’s peer associations that you think would inform my assessment? (if so please share here)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session Outline

Section (1) - Nature of the challenge:
- Evidence base: why a good assessment and intervention plan would be CONTEXTUAL
- Case Studies: Explore the contextual nature of extra-familial violence and abuse with reference to the case reviews undertaken by the MSU partnership in Sheffield (interactive exercise)

Section (2) - Building a response:
- Information gathering: Identify ways to gather contextual information to ensure that social and environmental factors comprising safety and well-being are fully explored
- Conclusions and information: Identify ways to draw contextual conclusions and explanations in relation to abuse and violence and appropriately weight the interplay between individual, familial and social/environmental factors
- Pathways and Planning: Develop contextual pathways and plans to address the social contexts that compromise young people’s safety and well-being

Current Definitions

- Domestic Abuse
- Child sexual exploitation
- Serious Youth Violence
- Harmful Sexual Behaviour

Domestic Abuse – Definition

Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are or have been intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. The abuse can encompass but is not limited to psychological, physical, sexual, financial, emotional

Definition – Child Sexual Exploitation

Sexual exploitation of children and young people under 18 involves exploitative situations, contexts and relationships where young people (or a third person or persons) receive ‘something’ (e.g., food, accommodation, drugs, alcohol, cigarettes, affection, gifts, money) as a result of them performing, and/or another or others performing on them, sexual activities. ... In all cases, those exploiting the child/young person have power over them by virtue of their age, gender, intellect, physical strength and/or economic or other resources. Violence, coercion and intimidation are common, involvement in exploitative relationships being characterised in the main by the child or young person’s limited availability of choice resulting from their social/economic and/or emotional vulnerability.
Definition – Serious Youth Violence

Any offence of most serious violence or weapon enabled crime, where the victim is aged 1-19 i.e. murder, manslaughter, rape, wounding with intent and causing grievous bodily harm. ‘Youth violence’ is defined in the same way, but also includes assault with injury offences.

Definition – Harmful Sexual Behaviour

Children and young people presenting with sexual behaviours that are outside of developmentally ‘normative’ parameters.

Peer-on-peer abuse in England

• When surveyed, a quarter of girls and 18% of boys report experience some kind of physical violence from a partner (Barter, et al., 2009)
• Between 30 and 70% of young women report encountering sexual harassment in school (JEVAW, 2010; GirlGuiding UK, 2014)
• 10-15 year olds in 2013 were estimated to have experienced 465,000 incidents of violent crime, 79% of which had been perpetrated by someone also aged 10-15 (ONS, 2015)
• More than four in ten teenage schoolgirls aged between 13 and 17 in England have experienced sexual coercion. (University of Bristol and University of Central Lancashire, 2015)
• A survey of adult survivors of child sexual abuse in England in Wales in 2011 founds that around two thirds had been abused by a young person and not an adult (Radford, et al., 2011).

Peer Groups

Homes

Mother stated that ‘there were things going on in Sara world that she did not have access to’ … She described that Sara was ‘being controlled by others who were more powerful’ than her mother.  
(Firmin, 2015)

Sean’s mother had reported that her son’s behaviour was ‘out of control’ a year before … Sean’s mother had called the police to report her son missing stating that she was struggling to manage his behaviour and that he was returning home with unexplained amounts of money and would pack a bag and stay with friends  
(Firmin, 2015)

Most of the young people and family members interviewed saw factors outside the family as having a greater influence on their gang association. Issues widely seen as more significant included growing up in a ‘hostile’ environment where gang membership and violence were normalised; negative experiences of school; the pull of peer subculture… and the search for identity, independence and respect  
(Catch 22, 2013:4)
Suspects had sexually harmed and assaulted young women together... Suspects reassured one another and blamed the complainant

(Firmin, 2015)

One suspect had no recorded offences in his history and yet committed a serious sexual offence when initiated by two of his peers... Two suspects told a third when to join in the assault and when to stop. Two suspects held the complainant down while a third assaulted her

(Firmin, 2015)

For some young men... control could be a collective endeavour, facilitated via social media, to insult; those men deemed unable to keep their girlfriends on lockdown.

(Carr, et al. 2013:8-9)

After a few minutes he stopped and left 6G1 there. She put her clothes back on and went to join her friends. Later that day boys in the school started shouting ‘skirt’ at her.

(Case 6) (Firmin, 2015)

There is some boys in the school that like keep asking me to have sex with them and I am just like "no", like on a daily basis...like they will walk around school and try dragging me into corners and feel me up and everything and it’s just irritating because they don’t understand.

(Barter, et al. 2009:110)

Educational Settings

Following the witnessing of a physical assault on a female student, 681 is ‘spoken to’ and staff note that he is ‘seriously on a red alert from the head teacher’. The girl (666) has informed the teacher that he had done this before and that he is in a local gang.

(Case 6) (Firmin, 2015, bold added by author)

School moves Susan to another part of the school to avoid contact with the boy... Susan is having problems with another girl in class – school change Susan’s timetable so that she is not in class with this girl... In the New Year staff say that Susan has been threatened by someone from a different school... school assign a mentor to Susan – the following week Susan is recorded as making ‘rude and offensive comments during mentoring time, threatening a member of staff’ – school gives a fixed term 3 day exclusion.

(Case 4) (Firmin, 2015, Bold added by author)

A related point in some schools was that, while they placed a laudable emphasis on treating each student as an individual, they sometimes lost sight of group behaviour that was impairing strongly on the behaviour of individuals.

(Institute of Physics, 2015:10)

Neighbourhood

Robbery and violence Bullying Sexual harassment CSE in parks, shopping centres
(881 was) surrounded by a group of males and had his bag poked by a sharp implement. He was patted down and slapped around the head. (On another occasion) searched by a lone male and had his phone taken.

(Case 8) (Firmin, 2015)

“Big men will stop little girls in the road and the street. In person, it’s real. But you can block it online.” “I was on my own the other day and a man said, ‘Come here and get in my car and we can go for fish and chips.’ It was on a main road so it was okay, but it would have been more scary if it had been at night.” “I get approached all the time when I am in school uniform.”

(Coffey, 2015)

The impact on a young person

- Missing
- Physical Injuries
- Drugs and alcohol
- Offending
- Sexual Health
- Disengagement from school
- Change in appearance
- Mental health and emotional well-being

Contextual Framework for Exploring Adolescence

In relation to young people’s experiences of abuse and vulnerability:
1. Young people develop within a range of social systems
2. Social systems interplay with one another
3. Young people construct, and are constructed by, social systems
4. Young people embody rules of social systems and engage in harmful norms in the absence of alternative systems
5. Young people are dependent upon those who run/manage social systems, as well as their peers, for their social development

Exploring these dynamics case studies

Case Review Methodology

Four cases submitted (1 x IDVA, 1 x CSE Service, 1 x YOS, 1 x CYT)
1 x DH, 1 x CSE, 1 x HSB, 1 x SYV… But not that straightforward

Case template completed using case file information plus Care First and IYSS records
- The incidents
- The associated contexts
- The response

Coded using 12 nodes and 90 tree nodes

Analysis run on nature of behaviour and nature of response

Used to build vignettes
**Example Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Pathways and Planning</th>
<th>Intervention Plan Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reviewing the assessment sheet identify factors that you would ‘flag for action’ for include in the intervention plan</td>
<td>1. Post-It Reflection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Take the intervention plan sheet – contextual adaptation of the integrated plan. Use the information in the assessment sheet and the factors that have been flagged to build the plan</td>
<td>a) What will you take away from this session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Today: Quality assurance</td>
<td>b) What will you do to implement the learning from today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify key external controls that the service can drawn upon to address extra-familial risk or enhance extra-familial resilience</td>
<td>2. Monitoring implementation: looking for volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality Assurance – has interplay between the different contextual factors (and the relevant weighting of them) been appropriately considered?</td>
<td>3. Join the contextual safeguarding practitioners network – June onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanations and conclusions**

Today – Using same A3 Sheet and case study

1) Rate future desistance factors: How does the research into peer-on-peer abuse help us think about weighting these contexts

2) Past behaviours and significant life events – how did they impact contexts as well as individuals?

3) Make some judgements: which contexts of risk/resilience are likely to change

4) Identify which contextual risk/protective factors can be used to EXPLAIN ratings

**Contextual Pathways and Planning**

Today: Review the assessment sheet and take the intervention plan sheet

1. Reviewing the assessment sheet identify factors that you would ‘flag for action’ for include in the intervention plan

2. Take the intervention plan sheet – contextual adaptation of the integrated plan. Use the information in the assessment sheet and the factors that have been flagged to build the plan

**Next Steps**

1. Post-It Reflection:
   a) What will you take away from this session
   b) What will you do to implement the learning from today

2. Monitoring implementation: looking for volunteers

3. Join the contextual safeguarding practitioners network – June onwards

**Explanations (2)**

Beyond Today:

- Using Episodes – opportunity to identify interplay between different contexts and any circumstances/influences that have stronger influence than others: is context the most appropriate aspect connecting offences

- Predicting adverse outcomes and safety/well-being – ensure record of contextual concerns (for example continued risk of violence on the street, or peer group attitudes continue to be problematic etc.) so that the plan can seek to target those contextual concerns

**Intervention Plan Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Pathways and Planning</th>
<th>Intervention Plan Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reviewing the assessment sheet identify factors that you would ‘flag for action’ for include in the intervention plan</td>
<td>1. Post-It Reflection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Take the intervention plan sheet – contextual adaptation of the integrated plan. Use the information in the assessment sheet and the factors that have been flagged to build the plan</td>
<td>a) What will you take away from this session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Today: Quality assurance</td>
<td>b) What will you do to implement the learning from today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify key external controls that the service can drawn upon to address extra-familial risk or enhance extra-familial resilience</td>
<td>2. Monitoring implementation: looking for volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality Assurance – has interplay between the different contextual factors (and the relevant weighting of them) been appropriately considered?</td>
<td>3. Join the contextual safeguarding practitioners network – June onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

1. Post-It Reflection:
   a) What will you take away from this session
   b) What will you do to implement the learning from today

2. Monitoring implementation: looking for volunteers

3. Join the contextual safeguarding practitioners network – June onwards
Keep in touch

carlene@msunderstood.org.uk
carlene.firmin@beds.ac.uk
@carlenefirmin
### Contextual Information Gathering Exercise - Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal, Family and Social Factors</th>
<th>Young Person</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Living arrangements and environmental factors</td>
<td>Child to parent violence</td>
<td>Pro-criminal peer associations</td>
<td>No access to education</td>
<td>Gang-affiliated neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parenting, family and relationships</td>
<td>Historic exposure to domestic abuse</td>
<td>Limited association with safe and pro-social peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exposure to crime, drugs use and violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Young person’s development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Associated to sexually exploitative young people through his partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning, education, training and employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offending and Anti-social behaviour</th>
<th>Young Person</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Offending and Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Potential attitudes related to gender, power and control</td>
<td>Older siblings involved in offending behaviour</td>
<td>Offends along peers – especially Seb</td>
<td>Exclusion from education providers creates greater risk on time on the street or with peers</td>
<td>Largely street based offending in X part of the local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Patterns and attitudes</td>
<td>Reputational pressures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other behaviours of particular concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundations for Change</th>
<th>Young Person</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Resilience and goals</td>
<td>On-going involvement of peers in offending behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of access to education</td>
<td>On-going criminality in the local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engagement and participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Factors affecting desistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contextual Integrated Plan Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Area of Intervention</th>
<th>Young Person</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive behaviours in intimate relationship</td>
<td>Referral: Therapeutic support for impact of exposure to domestic abuse</td>
<td>Meeting with mum to explore the impact of domestic abuse on family dynamic</td>
<td>Map peer group dynamics and identify if Micah is the leader or follower with Seb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Person's Target: Develop skills to build healthy and safe relationships</td>
<td>OTHER CONTROLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions: Attend therapeutic support sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>