

## **Report: Current Cohort CCE & CSE**

**Date: Quarter 2 2018-2019, Covering July, August and September.**

**Author:** Safeguarding Coordinators, Safeguarding Children's Unit.

### **Recommendations:**

1/ CSC: To identify how many child's need assessments have been completed prior to closure of cases with a CE flag at the age of 17 plus.

2/ YPDAAT: To offer assurance around their efforts to engage young people who are referred with additional concerns around CE.

3/ YJS: To develop a task and finish group to review a sample of cases on those young people open to their service for CE, in order to identify if any indicators were present which may have enabled earlier proactive intervention in order to reduce the likelihood of YJS involvement.

### **Gender Mix and Ages**

Of the 28 young people open to the MACE process in Q2, 17 were Females and 11 Males, 16 recorded under the category CSE and 12 recorded under the category of CCE.

Of the 28 young people on the Cohort, 7 young people are Looked After by the Local Authority, placed in St Helens.

Of the 28 young people, there are 3 young people, who have been placed in St Helens, one placed by Wirral Local Authority and 1 by London Borough of Brent and 1 Wigan.

### **IRO Data – Cases Of concern Out Of Borough.**

The IRO'S (Independent Reviewing Officers) were asked to look through their case and asked the following Questions:

From Their caseloads do they feel there are any young People where CSE or CE is a concern?

And / or if they are aware of any missing episodes and there is a suspicion a reason for the missing episodes may be linked to Child Exploitation?

6 IRO's responded and provided the following information:

8 Cases were raised as a concern for CCE or CSE, out of the 8 cases 2 were flagged with CCE or CSE.

There were 4 boys, 4 girls. 1 female was flagged for CSE and 1 Male for CCE.

The male who has a flag on for CCE was a result of Safeguarding Coordinators being concerned that a young person from St Helens has been placed approx. 20 mins away in another Local Authority and although, the process dictates the area the young person resides in takes ownership of the CCE or CSE process, our concern related to ongoing offending incidents occurring on us and there was limited Independent oversight of this, as such it was agreed to bring this back under Safeguarding Coordinators remit on a trial basis for cases placed within the Merseyside boundary. This is the reason I believe why he has a current CCE flag.

Age 17	Age 16	Age 15	Age 14	Age 13	Age 12
5	7	6	5	2	3

It is recognised fact that although there are concerns / risks relating to U17 years, however, there is a significant risk to those people aged 17 years approaching 18 year old. This relates not only to accommodation difficulties but also in relation to support services available, the young person may have had significant input / support only for this to be withdrawn at the point of reaching 18 years of age.

The 2014 Care Act advises that were a child is turning 18 and there is likely to be a need for continued support, a Child's needs assessment must be undertaken. Support must continue until the assessment is completed and that assessment either indicated they did not qualify for services or services were in place.

This may place this age range at increased risk of harm.

### **5 young people are age 17 years:**

Out of the 5 young people in our current cohort, all 3 are females, 2 are males.

1 is subject to a Full Care Order and has a child of her own, this young woman has also been discussed at MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference) Only the highest risk cases of Domestic Violence are discussed in order to put together a Multi-Agency safety plan together, in an attempt to keep the person safe and hold the perpetrator to account.

Unfortunately, to date she has not been able to engage with the support services (this could be due to having a greater fear of her partner and consequences of not abiding by his requests, than working with Children's Social Care) as such she does not have her child in her care. However, it is evident within case file recording that coercive control remains prevalent in the relationship and a recommendation has been made, suggesting the case is returned to MARAC.

### **When looking at the cohort known to St Helens:**

#### **Out of the 28 young people**

Out of the 24 previously known: 12 were known due to Neglect, 4 for behavioural difficulties, 4 cases were known due to allegations around Sexual abuse, 2 parental Mental Health and 1 person was known due to his views (In primary school for terrorism) and 1 child due to drug misuse of parent.

Education issues	M/H needs, CAMHS	ADHD	ASD	Alcohol use	Drug Use	Criminality / ASB	First language not English
15	7	4	1	10	10	11	3

Self-Harm / Self Esteem	Previous or current CP Plan	Family Members involved in CE	First Known for CE	Known for Missing Episodes	Issues around Sexuality
10	10	5	3	12	1