

JG challenged: how can this group be assured regarding what it is in the intervention that causes reduction/cessation in an individual child or children going missing? RH responded that Catch 22 record the details of interventions and direct work with children and that an admin worker has been commissioned for Catch 22 to upload this information directly onto ICS.

KK

KK clarified that this admin role is currently in the HR process.

**Action:** KK to update on progress at next meeting.

It was noted that there have been 8 CCE referrals on the new pathway in Q3: this was agreed to be clear evidence of the need for the pathway and its functionality.

JG asked for clarification around how information from return interviews is shared with other practitioners. KK advised that there has been a gap: while there has been verbal communication of key information from return interviews, this has not been fully recorded onto agency systems: with the commissioned admin post for Catch 22 this will now be uploaded. RH clarified that the minutes from the morning meeting would capture this information sharing as well as identifying and monitoring any actions that arise as a result of this.

KK challenged that there may be an information sharing gap around persistent absence and its links to child exploitation. KK and EF have identified the 10 most prolific missing children and will do a piece of work around the key themes of these cases. This will feed back into the Safeguarding Unit as well as this group.

KK

**Action:** KK and EF to present this information to this group at the next meeting

JG asked the group to identify the key challenges around Missings: EF stated that capacity for interventions with children who go missing is too low. RH stated she agreed that more capacity for interventions and return interviews is needed. JG asked if the group was in agreement that the LA response to children who go missing is reactive rather than proactive? RH felt this was inevitable given the

workload pressures on Catch 22 staff. EF noted that there is no common understanding of the key risk factors for St Helens children. KK noted that the new commission arrangements entail a task of improving understanding of risk factors among parents, carers and care homes. A discussion took place around placements and how sometimes children are placed with others who pose similar risks, thereby increasing the risk to both children: placements are not always easy to find it was noted that the current solution of Catch 22 alerting the social worker to the specific KK/EF concerns is currently the only available option.

**Action:** KK and EF to look at good practice around risk reduction in other areas.

## 6. Standing Items: Areas of vulnerability: Child Sexual Exploitation:

RH advised that the CE process is now in place within the new MACE process.

### Child Criminal Exploitation:

CT stated that the CCE process is also now up and running smoothly. The ToR for