

To: **Members of the Protecting the Most Vulnerable Policy Committee**

Professor Steven Broomhead
Chief Executive

Councillors:

Cllr P Bretherton - Chair

Cllr J Guthrie - Deputy Chair

Cllrs A Dirir, S Krizanac, B Lines-Rowlands,

K Morris, M Smith, J Wheeler and S Woodyatt

Town Hall
Sankey Street
Warrington
WA1 1UH

15 September 2014

Protecting The Most Vulnerable Policy Committee

Tuesday 23 September 2014 at 6.30pm

Council Chamber, Town Hall, Sankey Street, Warrington, WA1 1UH

Agenda prepared by Julian Joinson, Principal Democratic Services Officer –
Telephone: (01925) 442112 Fax: (01925) 656278
E-mail: jjoinson@warrington.gov.uk

A G E N D A

Part 1

Items during the consideration of which the meeting is expected to be open to members of the public (including the press) subject to any statutory right of exclusion.

Item

**Page
Number**

1. Apologies for Absence

To record any apologies received.

**2. Code of Conduct - Declarations of Interest
Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests)
Regulations 2012**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda no later than when the item is reached.

3. Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2014 as a correct record.

4. Child Sexual Exploitation

To consider a presentation from relevant partners, including representatives of Warrington Borough Council's Families and Wellbeing Directorate, Cheshire Constabulary's Strategic Public Protection Unit and Warrington Safeguarding Children's Board, in relation to child sexual exploitation, including the lessons learned from the Rotherham abuse case.

Part 2

Items of a "confidential or other special nature" during which it is likely that the meeting will not be open to the public and press as there would be a disclosure of exempt information as defined in Section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972.

NIL

If you would like this information provided in another language or format, including large print, Braille, audio or British Sign Language, please call 01925 443322 or ask at the reception desk in Contact Warrington, Horsemarket Street, Warrington.

**PROTECTING THE MOST VULNERABLE
POLICY COMMITTEE
15 July 2014**

Present: Councillor P Bretherton (Chair)
Councillors: A Dirir, J Guthrie, S Krizinac, M McLaughlin (substituting for K Morris), M Smith and J Wheeler

PTMV 1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors B Lines-Rowlands, K Morris and S Woodyatt.

PTMV 2 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

PTMV 3 Minutes

Decision,

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2014 be confirmed and signed as a correct record by the Chair.

PTMV 4 Creative Children's Centre – Consultation

The Committee received an update and presentation from Tracy Ryan, Service Manager, Prevention, Family Support and Youth Division, Families and Wellbeing Directorate, on the proposals to redesign children's centre provision.

The reasons for the proposals included increased Ofsted requirements, a desire to focus on the most vulnerable, making the most effective use of staff and delivering budget efficiencies. The Committee was informed that a consultation was running from 16 June to 22 August 2014 and a copy of the consultation document was provided. That document outlined the background to the service redesign, what was happening, key aims, reasons for change, details of the proposals, benefits of change, how the public could get involved and what would happen next.

The presentation included further information on the following:-

- the definition of a children's centre;
- why services were being redesigned;
- the rationale used;
- details of centres which would remain as primary sites;
- details of centres to be operated by partners/schools;
- details of centres which would be merged or relocated;
- details of centres to be operated by LiveWire with partners;
- the impact of the proposals on staffing;
- proposed savings; and
- the timeline for implementation.

Members made comments and asked a number of questions and responses were given, as follows:-

- There had been a low take up of face to face meetings with parents during the consultation process. Would this adversely affect the validity of the consultation exercise? – Over 380 responses had been received by e-mail, on line and by paper. The level of response to the consultation was considered to be satisfactory;
- What were the early indications from the feedback received? – Between 50%-60% agreed, or partially agreed, with the proposals. Around 28% disagreed. The remainder were unsure. The majority of feedback was from service users and the questions sought information about which centre those users currently attended. A high response rate had been achieved for centers at Lymm and Culcheth (Meadowview). The response rate from the inner wards was lower. Many users valued all the services provided, making it difficult to differentiate services and identify key demand. In general, services which allowed parents to return to work or which provided adult education were the most valued. Some users were prepared to pay for services. There was less interest in users running their own services in a voluntary capacity.
- What was the definition of ‘vulnerable children’, for the purposes of targeting provision? – There was no single definition of a vulnerable child. This group could include children with a Child Development Plan, those in care, those with disabilities, those with English as a second language, those suffering deprivation or child poverty or children of a lone parent. Often children were vulnerable because of a combination of those factors. Different areas of the Borough had a different demographic. Early intelligence was received from midwives, who flagged up any issues with the authority.
- Using Callands as an example, how much information would local residents typically receive about the services on offer? – All children’s centres provided written and verbal information on site and on-line information was also available. When children were born, parents were invited to register them with the authority for children’s services. Take up of registration was around 80%, which demonstrated a high level of awareness of services amongst residents. The Directorate monitored how many children ultimately accessed services. The target was 65%, although current take up was around 56%.
- The ‘Proposals’ page of the consultation document was, perhaps, difficult to understand. For example, the overall format and the use of official and locally-known names of the centres were not clear and there were some issues about consistency of the descriptions used in the column ‘What does this mean for me?’ regarding greater flexibility of services the user ‘wanted’ and ‘needed’. Members felt that the presentation information was much clearer – The consultation document was available on-line and was more user-friendly in colour. Often centres were known by two different names and it was not possible to include every variation in the documentation. The drafting of the consultation document had been a complex process and negotiations with the various partners were still on-going, meaning that certain elements could not be finalised for inclusion in the document. Staff in the various centres were on hand to explain in more detail the effects of the

proposals. An article in the local press 2 weeks ago had talked about 'closures', which had generated a lot of enquiries. Parents at one of the centres had organised a walk from their current site to the new location, to get a feel for any travel difficulties.

- For Cygnets, a recent Ofsted report had identified a lack of parental engagement. How would the authority determine what services users needed? – The position at Lymm, Culcheth and Woolston was that users wanted more leisure activities, such as 'mums and tots', which were not services at the core of formal children's centre activity. In the case of Cygnets, a much more designated need was in evidence, which could be identified through data regarding birth rates, immunisation and midwife visits. Where parents did not engage of their own volition, the authority would reach out to them.
- There were significant numbers of vulnerable families in Callands and travel to the 'super site' proposals at Liverpool Road, Sankey Valley, might be difficult. Would any services remain in the immediate locality? – Health partners would remain at Callands and the building could be available for outreach work. The authority would monitor take up of the new 'super site' and, if necessary, could intervene, for example, by providing transport.
- Some new mums did not know about the consultation and had started their own support group, but would like to have been involved – Letters were sent to all families in the Council's system, which comprised 10-12k people. This exercise should have captured most parents, but very new parents might not have been included.
- Would families in Lymm be prepared to travel to Westy for full children's centre facilities if those services were not offered at the Livewire centre in Lymm – It was envisaged that parents would access both centres. It was known from experience that families in outlying areas were prepared to travel to inner wards. The authority would monitor and manage demand carefully. The provision in Lymm was expected to be health dominated. Other services could be delivered from a variety of sites locally, such as the library.
- Would there be a cost to service providers, such as NHS midwifery, at those centres transferred to partners including LiveWire and schools. – This matter was still the subject of negotiations, but the indications were favourable that no charge would be made.
- Would the authority still have oversight of all centres under the revised structures? – The authority already delivered services in partnership with other organisations, including health partners. The Council would still be accountable for the delivery of Universal Services. The detail of the new relationships between partners was not yet fully developed. A meeting was due to be held next Monday between senior officers to develop an action plan for the proposals.
- What work was currently being done in partnership, for example, with nurseries? – The Committee had considered the draft Early Years Strategy at a previous meeting. The Strategy sought to join up all the various sectors and focused on 5 key priorities, as follows:-
 - Children being school ready;
 - Health and wellbeing;
 - Narrowing the gap;

- Managing the market; and
- Partnership working.

The children's centre proposals would strengthen delivery of the aims of the Early Years Strategy.

- For those centres which would no longer be formal children's centres, what were the implications of no longer being subject to Ofsted inspections? – Inspections under the current regime would seek information about how formal children's centres engaged with satellite centres. Ofsted had recently published information about its new inspection framework would comprise a local authority inspection, rather than inspection of individual centres. It was envisaged that this new inspection regime would more effective.

Decision,

- (1) To note the presentation and consultation document on the redesigning of children's centre provision
- (2) To endorse the direction of travel of the proposals; and
- (3) To request that the Solicitor to the Council and Head of Corporate Governance circulate a copy of the presentation slides to Members of the Committee.

PTMV 5 Review of the Committee's Work 2013/14

Members considered a report from the Chair of the Committee on the work and achievements of the Committee in 2013/14. Mr Joinson, Principal Democratic Services Officer, Resources and Strategic Commissioning Directorate, summarised the main elements of the report.

The Committee had been established with effect from 2 January 2013, following a reorganistaion of the Council's committees and the overview and scrutiny arrangements. The newly created Policy Committees had a remit which included horizon scanning for emerging national polices and new legislation and providing members with an opportunity to assist in the review and development of local strategies and policies.

Members were reminded of the Policy Framework, which described the life-span of policy as a cycle comprising five key stages. The report provided a summary of where the Committee had undertaken policy activities under its Work Programme at each of those 5 stages, including an assessment of the impact of the Committee's work. Key topics considered by the Committee in 2012/13 (part) and 2013/14 were as follows:-

Decision to Create a Policy

- Homelessness and Rough Sleepers

Policy Development

- Ageing Population Strategy;
- Educational Attainment – Narrowing the Gap for Vulnerable Groups;

Finalisation of Policy

- Options for Developing Adults Social Care In-House Provider Services;
- Early Years Strategy 2014-2017

Monitoring Policy Delivery

- Overview of the Prevalence and Impact of Loneliness in Warrington
- Overview of Family Support Model
- Welfare Reforms
- Child Sexual Exploitation
- Carers Strategy and Action Plan
- Complaint about Speech and Language Therapy Services

Policy Review

- Children and Young People's Services Annual Report
- Adult Health and Social Care Services

The main impacts of the Committee on services for vulnerable people included contributing ideas and influencing the Council and its partners to develop new policies, oversight of the direction of travel of emerging policies, ensuring new policies were robust, providing assurance that existing policies remained fit for purpose, using past performance to help to shape new priorities and listening to stakeholders.

Decision,

To note the achievements of the Committee in 2012/13 (part) and 2013/14.

PTMV 6 Proposed Work Programme 2014/15 and the Monitoring of Actions and Recommendations

The Committee received a report from the Chair of the Committee setting out a draft Work Programme for 2014/15 and including monitoring information on recommendations, actions and referrals. Steve Reddy, Operational Director Adult Services, Families and Wellbeing Directorate provided advice on the proposed content of the Work Programme.

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 11 March 2014, it had approved a number of themes for its draft Work Programme 2014/15, including some topics which would be rolled forward from the Work Programme 2013/14.

Since March, further work had been undertaken to consider the proposed topics and identify new ideas for the Work Programme.

The report contained details of the further work that had been undertaken and, where available, the business case for inclusion of a specific topic. Members were advised that additional work would be required for the majority of topics to identify the type of engagement activity appropriate for the Committee, desired outcomes and likely timescales.

The following topics were considered for inclusion in the Work Programme 2014/15:-

- Warrington Wellbeing Strategy;
- Carers Strategy and Action Plan – Update;
- Local Welfare Fund;
- Child Sexual Exploitation – Update;
- Self Harming/Substance Misuse;
- Adoption;
- Homelessness Commission – Outcome;
- Children and Young People’s Plan – Update;
- Care Act 2014; and
- Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Reforms.

Items on Look Back and Review and Creative Children’s Centre – Consultation had been completed at this meeting.

A Member enquired if it would be possible to include Services for the Elderly within the Work Programme. The Committee was reminded that the Ageing Strategy had been considered in detail last year. It was proposed that the Committee look at the following additional current matters:-

- Dementia;
- Social Isolation – Outcome of the Lottery Bid; and
- Implications of Budget Constraints on the Most Vulnerable.

Where possible, meetings should seek to involve relevant partners, particularly where they were parties to multi-agency strategies.

Officers, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, would commence development of a more detailed version Work Programme for consideration at the next meeting.

Decision,

- (1) To approve the draft Work Programme 2014/15 set out in the report at Appendix A, subject to the inclusion of the following additional items:-

- Dementia;
- Social Isolation – Outcome of the Lottery Bid; and

- Implications of Budget Constraints on the Most Vulnerable.
- (2) To request the Solicitor to the Council and Head of Corporate Governance, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, to commence development of a more detailed version Work Programme for consideration at the next meeting on 23 September 2014.
 - (3) To note the progress on the recommendations, actions and referrals set out at Appendix B of the report.

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham

Warrington's Response

***Fiona Cowan – Senior Conference & Review
Manager / Local Authority Designated Officer***

WARRINGTON
Borough Council



Introduction



- The Inquiry was commissioned by Rotherham Council to review safeguarding activity for the periods 1997-2009 and 2009-2013.
- Completed by Alexis Jay OBE with the support of Sheila Taylor from the NWG CSE and published on 26 August 2014.

What is Child Sexual Exploitation?



- *The sexual exploitation of children involves exploitative situations, contexts and relationships where children receive ‘something’ as a result of performing, and /or others performing on them sexual activities.*
- *Child sexual exploitation can occur through use of technology without the child’s immediate recognition*



What is Child Sexual Exploitation?

- *“Many children may go willingly to a location to be with perpetrators, but they do not go willingly to be raped and abused. We often get confused about the issue of consent when we discuss child sexual exploitation (CSE). Professionals often do not recognise the consequences to a child saying “no” and what the impact might be i.e. violence or threats of violence to the young person or their family, physical, sexual and emotional trauma, blackmail.....”*

Child Sexual Exploitation in Warrington



Since July 2012:

- 35 children running away from home or care
- 64 individual children at risk of CSE
 - 42 living at home
 - 13 Children in Care from other LAs
 - 9 Warrington Children in Care

Warrington Case Study



- 15 Year old female.
- Sexually abused by family.
- Living with alternative carers with a Residence Order.
- Previously sexually exploited by a neighbour.
- Self-harming.
- Thoughts of suicide.

Warrington Case Study



- 14 year old female
- Friending strangers on Social Media
- Groomed and persuaded to put inappropriate pictures on the internet.
- Mum seeks advice from School.
- School Refer to Operational Group
- CSE Co-ordinator works with Mum and child.

Warrington Case Study



- 15 Year old Male previously in Secure Unit
- Child in care placed by another Authority
- Previous abuse resulting in dangerous pattern of behaviour
- High Risk of being abused
- High Risk involving others in being abused
- Joint Police and Warrington Safeguarding Intervention

Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham



The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham found that:

1,400 Children were sexually exploited from 1997 to 2013 – on average 87 per year.

Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham



Children were:

Raped (Some by multiple males)

Doused in Petrol

Abducted and Trafficked

Threatened

Beaten

Made to witness violent rape

Intimidated

How was this allowed to happen?



“indifference towards, and ignorance of, child sexual exploitation on the part of senior managers. The report also stated that responsibility was continuously placed on young people's shoulders, rather than with the suspected abusers.”

Key Messages



- Three Key Areas :
- Leadership and Management
- Frontline Practice
- Partnership Working

Leadership and Management Elected Members and Senior Officers



- Denial of the Existence of Sexual Exploitation
- Patriarchal, Macho & Bullying Culture
- Lack of Interest
- Issues of Ethnicity Were 'Played Down'
- Poor Systems and Processes
- No Clear Leadership or Consistency

Frontline Practice



- Poor Risk Assessment and Risk Management
- Lack of Priority
- Procedures were Disregarded
- Poor Awareness of CSE and Lack of Training
- Attitudes of professionals towards victims –
'Undesirable' 'Deviant' 'Promiscuous'

Partnership Working



- Safeguarding Board not fulfilling function
- Information Sharing was Poor
- Artificial 'Professional Barriers' created
- 'Professional Jealousies' preventing effective action
- Parents Were Not Informed or Consulted

Summary



- Failings Across the Police and Social Care at Every Level:
 - Frontline lack of understanding
 - Cover Up and Poor Attitudes of Senior Officers and Elected Members
- OFSTED JAR Did Not Identify Failings

Warrington's Response to Child Sexual Exploitation



Leadership & Management

- Clear strategic response to children at risk of sexual exploitation
- Monitored by Warrington Safeguarding Children Board
- Senior Officers in WBC and Cheshire Police have supported the development of the Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy and Action Plan.

Warrington's Response to Child Sexual Exploitation



Clear Leadership from WSCB & Senior Officers

- Dedicated WSCB Sub-group
 - CSE Action Plan since October 2011
 - Operational Group
 - Risk Management Meetings
- Pan-Cheshire CSE Strategic Board
 - Pan-Cheshire Protocol & Strategy
 - Pan-Cheshire Communications Strategy

Warrington's Response to Child Sexual Exploitation



Frontline Understanding

- Social Workers, Residential Staff, Police Officers, School Safeguarding Leads, Health Visitors & Other Partner's frontline staff have attended basic Awareness Training.
- All Social Workers will now attend mandatory level 3 CSE Training.
- All staff are aware of the Protocols and how to access advice.

Warrington's Response to Child Sexual Exploitation



Frontline Practice

- Child abduction notices served on high risk individuals.
- Pro-active targeting of potential offenders
- School staff, Social Workers, Police Officers, Youth Workers, YOS Workers, Health staff and others completing CSE risk assessments and referring to Operational Group.
- Risk Management Plans for 'High Risk' children

Warrington's Response to Child Sexual Exploitation



Partnership Working

- Partner Engagement in Sub-Group & Operational Group
- Police & Catch 22 CSE workers part co-located
- Immediate Police Response to Social Care Mapping Exercise
- All parents spoken to as part of Operation
- Strategic Initiatives between Police, Social Care & Licensing.



Police response to CSE in Warrington

**Dave Aspinall – CSE
Coordinator/Investigator
Cheshire Constabulary**



Identification of risk



- Pilot ran in May 2013
- Review of children missing from home
- Review of all LAC and Children in Care from other Local Authorities (CiCOLA) living in the area
- Regular information sharing with Catch22 following return home interviews
- Comprehensive list of children at risk identified within sub divisions



Training & Awareness raising



- Over 200 Warrington Police officers and PCSO's given basic awareness training during dedicated training days
- Cheshire Police launch force wide response to CSE on 1st November 2013
- Dedicated CSE coordinator in place since November 2013
- Dedicated analyst in place to review daily intelligence submissions based in Winsford



Tracking and Prevention



- 53 Children visited as part of Operation LARNACA
- CSE risk assessments carried out with each child
- Specific information regarding CSE given to children and family members
- 21 Abduction Notices served since May 2013 on both adult males and females
- 71 Children living in Warrington have a CSE “watch flag”
- 15 Children previously living in Warrington have a CSE “Watch flag”



Tracking and Prevention



- Mapping carried out monthly using Missing From Home statistics to highlight Victim, Offender, Locations
- Monthly information sharing meeting with NPU Sergeants
- SPOC identified for each registered care home
- Links to all high school safeguarding leads
- Pupils out of school monitoring meetings

What Next?



- Report submitted to WSCB
- Full and detailed Self-Assessment
- CSE case included in multi-agency audits
- Review of the WSCB CSE Action Plan and consideration of the most effective way to deliver the CSE Strategy taking account of:
 - Recommendations from WSCB
 - Results of Self-assessment



Questions?