



Report to the Audit, Review and Learning Sub-Group

Audit of CE1s not progressing to CE2s

January 2020

Background:

Following the amalgamated review of Child ECW, a recommendation was accepted to review the Mersey and Cheshire CE and Missing Protocol. Under this recommendation, an action was raised to complete an audit of CE1s that have not progressed to CE2s. The aim of this audit was to provide assurance that, where a case does not progress to a CE2, the child or young person concerned is in receipt of an appropriate service.

Methodology:

A random sample of 12 CE1s that were closed without progressing to CE2 was selected from CE1s screened in November and December 2019. These were assessed against a bespoke audit tool.

The audit panel was comprised of the Quality Assurance Coordinator, Safeguarding Coordinator and representatives from Complex Safeguarding and Police. Apologies were received from NWBH based on capacity.

Findings:



Overall, 42% of the audits were Requires Improvement and a further 42% were graded Inadequate. The remaining 16% were graded Good.

Consent was obtained in 11/12 cases. In the case where consent was not obtained, the reason for the referral was that the young person's stepfather had sent inappropriate messages to one of this young person's friends. There was no immediate risk of exploitation to the young person who was the subject of the referral, and since the young person and the family were aware of the situation with the stepfather, no apparent reason not to seek consent.

Ethnicity was recorded in 11/12 cases, which is positive. Disabilities, however, were not consistently recorded. 5/12 CE1s had a recorded disability, 2/12 CE1s stated that the young person had no disability, and in the remaining 5/12 cases there was no disability recorded or the information was



working. 1/7 cases known to services was a child who was subject to transfer in, and when this process was completed appropriate services would be identified, however based on the information provided within the CE1 form there was felt to be insufficient information to effectively determine appropriate services for signposting. 1 young person was working well with YPDAAT which was felt to be sufficient to address any concerns, and 1 young person was the subject of an EHAT and the Lead Professional was recommended to make a referral to TAZ.

Of the 5 remaining cases, for one young person there was appropriate signposting to services identified as a strength and for another two, advice was provided which was considered to be sufficient to address the concerns. In the remaining 2 cases, there was no identified need for signposting. Triangulation of the process revealed a structure by which recommendations are shared with the referrer, however the minutes are not SMART in that they do not identify who will do this and by when. As such, although the raw data indicated that only 2/12 young people were signposted to services and a further 2/12 young people were provided with advice and information sufficient to address the concerns, the finding of the audit was that in 10/12 cases young people were either already in receipt of the appropriate services, in the process of being referred to them, or the CE screening process identified and recommended an appropriate referral. In the remaining 2/12 cases where no signposting or referral took place, the young person was living outside St Helens and was refusing to engage with services. In this case, the auditor's position was that a referral to a Muslim-based counselling or advice service would have been beneficial in the light of the concerns raised in the CE1. The Manchester Community Helpline could have provided support in this respect.

Auditors found that there is variation in the consistency of quality in both the CE1s being submitted and in the rationale at the morning meeting that is being recorded. In 4/12 CE1s, auditors recorded that there was insufficient information available on the CE1 form to permit a thorough screening. There were discrepancies between information recorded in the tickbox and narrative sections of the CE1 in 6 cases, with boxes checked that were not referenced in the narrative. In one case, the referral was made up of a short list of bullet points that were insufficient to permit full screening. The impact of cases where the CE1 information submitted is not sufficient is that the screening process cannot be fully effective. In these cases, the referrer is informed that, should concerns increase or further incidents occur, then a re-referral should be made. It is possible that additional guidance in completion would improve the quality of the CE1 forms and enable a more focused response; improved quality of the CE1 submissions might also reduce the rate of re-referral. Where there are some indicators of exploitation but insufficient information for the CE1 to be progressed, it is also possible that the referrer could be asked to provide further information as an outcome for the CE1 rather than closure: a "pending re-screening" outcome.

Next Steps:

The Safeguarding Partnership Board to determine whether these findings satisfy the action raised in the amalgamated review of Child ECW

The CARE group to consider the findings in the context of the CE process and determine whether any recommendations need to be made or actions raised