

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, ROTHERHAM.
S60 2TH

Date: Wednesday, 9th July, 2014

Time: 1.30 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine whether the following items should be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended March, 2006) of the Local Government Act, 1972.
2. To determine any item(s) the Chairperson is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for absence.
4. Declarations of Interest.
5. Questions from members of the public and the press.
6. Communications.
7. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th June, 2014. (Pages 1 - 8)
8. Appointment of representative on working panels and groups, 2014/2015.
 - Recycling Group.
9. Peer Review - the impact of childhood neglect. (Pages 9 - 13)
10. Young people missing from home and Care. (Pages 14 - 18)
11. Date and time of the next meeting: -
 - Wednesday 17th September, 2014, to start at 2.00 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall. (Pre-meeting/briefing for all Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission to start at 1.15 p.m..)

Improving Lives Select Commission membership: -

Chair – Councillor Russell

Vice-Chair – Councillor Ahmed

Councillors Ali, Astbury, Buckley, Burton, Clark, Dodson, Lelliott, Reynolds, Roddison and Turner (12).

Co-opted members: - Ms. Jones (GROW: Giving Real Opportunities to Women) and Mr. Smith (Safe@Last).

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
11th June, 2014

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Astbury, Buckley, Burton, Roddison and Reynolds and Co-opted member Ms. J. Jones and Ms. N. Jones (observing).

Councillor P. Lakin, Deputy Leader, was in attendance for item 6.

Apologies for absence were received from: - Councillors Clark, The Mayor (Councillor Barry Dodson), J. Hamilton and Turner and from Co-opted member Mr. Smith.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

2. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS.

There were no members of the Public or the Press in attendance.

3. COMMUNICATIONS.

The Senior Adviser for Scrutiny and Member Development (Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic, Resources Directorate) raised two communications under this item: -

- From September 2014, Improving Lives Select Commission meetings would start at 2.00 p.m.. Pre-meetings would take place before the meetings from 1.15 p.m., all members of the Select Commission were invited to attend.
- An Adult Safeguarding Awareness Induction Session was planned for 29th July, 2014. Invitations had been issued to all Elected Members and they were encouraged to attend.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30TH APRIL, 2014.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 30th April, 2014, were considered.

Councillor Buckley was in attendance at this meeting.

Resolved: - That, with the amendment to the attendance, the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.

5. APPOINTMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVES ON PANELS AND WORKING GROUPS.

Resolved: - That the following appointments of representatives from the Improving Lives Select Commission to the panels and working groups for the 2014/2015 municipal year be agreed: -

- Health, Welfare and Safety Panel – Councillor Russell (substitute Councillor Ali);
- Recycling Group – To be agreed;
- Environment and Climate Change Steering Group – Councillor Astbury.

6. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION: WORK PROGRAMME 2014/2015.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Senior Adviser for Scrutiny and Member Development that outlined the proposed work programme for the Improving Lives Select Commission during the 2014/2015 municipal year.

Further to Minute No. 64 of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 30th April, 2014 (Improving Lives Select Commission's Work Programme 2013/2014 Update and Forward Planning 2014/2015), the submitted report outlined the remit/terms of reference of the Select Commission as directed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and the Council's Constitution. Also included was the proposed work programme for 2014/2015 based on agreement from the previous meeting.

The Improving Lives Select Commission had agreed to have safeguarding as its central theme, including: -

- Child Sexual Exploitation;
- Update on the 'Families for Change' and 'Early Help' programmes;
- Children missing from care and home;
- Safeguarding annual reports (Adults and Children and Young People);
- Update on the implementation of the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review of domestic abuse services.

The submitted appendix outlined the full work programme and Members were asked to confirm whether they agreed that the issues were a priority for the Improving Lives Select Commission and whether there were any other areas they wished to include. The proposed work programme was consistent with the Council's key policy agendas and the Corporate Plan

Priorities. The work programme needed to be realistic and best focus effort and resources during a time of reducing resources and staffing.

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised: -

- It was noted that the work programme for the Improving Lives Select Commission would be flexible to allow for consideration of any items that may arise out of urgency.

Resolved: - (1) That the Improving Lives Select Commission's terms of reference and the role of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be noted.

(2) That the work programme attached at appendix one be approved for 2014/2015.

(3) That it be noted that the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme during 2014/2015 would be flexible to accommodate any items of urgency, through the re-prioritisation of existing items.

(4) That all members and partners of the Improving Lives Select Commission be urged to bring forward any items of urgency that arose.

7. OFSTED INSPECTION READINESS: CHILDREN IN NEED OF HELP AND PROTECTION, CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER AND CARE LEAVERS.

Councillor Russell, Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission, welcomed the Performance and Quality Manager (Performance and Quality, Neighbourhood and Adult Services) and the Service Manager for Strategy, Standards and Early Help (Safeguarding Children and Families' Services, Children and Young People's Services) to the meeting. The Officers had been asked to provide an overview to the Select Commission on Rotherham's readiness for Ofsted's new inspection framework of the services for 'children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers'. The update also included the outcomes for local authorities across the country that had already been inspected under the new framework.

The submitted report was referred to, along with a presentation that was displayed to the Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission.

- The new inspection framework came into existence from 19th November, 2013, and all local authorities would be inspected within a three-year period under the framework;
- The inspection focussed on local authorities' functions to 'help, care and protect children and young people, along with the overall effectiveness, leadership, management and governance of services;

- The inspection would be 'single-framework' and cover the local authority, but not partner agencies, including all of the functions of social care;
- The Services/functions that would be inspected included Early Help, Child Protection, Looked After Children, Fostering, Adoption, Care Leavers and Local Safeguarding Children Board;
- The inspection would include four 'Key Judgements': -
 - The experiences and progress of children who need help and protection;
 - The experiences and progress of children looked after and achieving permanence (including adoption and care leavers);
 - Leadership, management and governance;
 - A review of the effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board.
- The inspection methodology was considered in detail. The new Framework undertook inspections over a four-week period and included interviews and group meetings on site, scrutiny of key documents and case file audits. Emphasis would be given to the individual child's journey;
- Twenty-four hours' notice would be given;
- There were four judgement grades – 'Outstanding', 'Good' (which was the new minimum standard), 'Requires Improvement' and 'Inadequate'. The Service was aware of the differences in quality between attaining 'Good' and 'Requires Improvement';
- If any one of the key judgements were considered to be Inadequate, overall effectiveness could only be judged as Inadequate;
- The new grading structure matched the school inspection framework;
- The profile of inspections that had taken place under the new framework since November, 2013, was considered. 27 local authorities had been or were in the process of being inspected. Sixteen reports had been published. No local authorities had been judged to be Outstanding under the new framework;

- Key messages about preparedness had been taken from the local authorities that had already been inspected. These included having staff trained and ready to undertake file audits, ensuring that evidence was available to demonstrate children's journeys and IT infrastructure;
- The inspection had been described as 'the most detailed and exacting inspection ever'. The length of the inspection and the difficulties of co-ordinating the high number of inspectors (seven individuals, although sometimes nine) was challenging. The month-long inspection was a significant deflection from staffs' day jobs;
- Key themes had been identified in the outcomes of the local authorities that had been inspected, including ensuring the child's voice was captured and considered throughout the process, consideration was given to the feedback of experiences of children and families, engagement and attendance of Partners, and management oversight and performance management;
- The Officers shared the ways in which Rotherham was preparing for the inspection. These actions included: -
 - Ensuring that the required data-set was in place;
 - An inspection plan of actions covering the time when inspectors would be on-site;
 - Deep dive / mock inspection activity and implementing any actions identified;
 - Briefings to all stakeholders on the new inspection framework;
 - A training programme had been developed for social care staff and managers called 'Triple A';
 - Ensuring that the rich knowledge of social workers was reflected in case files;
 - Reflect when risk had been assessed;
 - Evidence multi-agency and partnership work;
 - Ensure that the thresholds for Social Care intervention were understood by all partners.

Discussion ensued and the following questions were asked by the Improving Lives Select Commission: -

- **How ready/confident was the Service for multi-agency working? Were there any difficulties in getting agencies together to work? How were case files chosen for audit and, given there were a number of auditors, how did we ensure that auditing was consistent? TripleA had been running since January – was all training for social workers and managers completed?**

The Service was assured that multi-agency working was embedded, as evidenced in Child Protection Plans and Child in Need processes. There was a potential detachment between what agencies think Social Care's threshold was and the actual threshold. 'Working Together 2013' Statutory Guidance applied. The Local Safeguarding Children Board was the body to challenge and scrutinise this aspect.

Case files were randomly selected by Ofsted. In preparation for the audit, Social Workers followed-up with an 'end of assessment process', including question and answers with the family and/or child. Often positive feedback was received following a Statutory Assessment/s. Independent Reviewing Officers also looked for rigour and challenged practice. The Service wanted to establish a norm for asking people their opinions. In addition, the LAC Council and the Lifestyle survey sought childrens opinions.

TripleA was now a mandatory expectation of all social work staff. TripleA was starting 'Phase 2'. Rotherham had a 3% vacancy turnover, which was one of lowest in the region and comparable to statistical neighbours.

- **How are we evidencing the voice of the child from engagement to exit from the service? How did this change for different age-ranges? Did training address this?**
- **Do we have a waiting list – if so, how do we safeguard this? Are Action Plans timely and specific, and do they match why the referral came in and reflect needs?**
- **Is supervision timely/monthly? Are actions being followed up in the next supervision?**

The importance of the child's voice was highlighted in the 2012 inspection. A piece of work looking at Child Protection processes had been undertaken. It could be very difficult capturing a child's wishes and feelings and making sure they were evidenced. Every document/plan that had been refreshed now included sections to ensure a child/rens wishes were recorded, included and acted upon. Case studies could be provided to show examples of a child's voice and wishes being met.

Social care did not operate a waiting list. If a Section 47 investigation was required this had to be completed.

The Service could demonstrate that supervision was taking place and key issues were being discussed. Mock-inspection work was looking at this and exception reporting to the Strategic Director was taking place.

- **How much more work does this generate, could it be called an 'inspection industry'. Impact on staff. How can the Council support Officers going through this process?**

The inspections were focused on outcomes for children, young people

and families, and this was helpful. The new framework felt like a multi-agency assessment with only local authorities being held to account for some agencies they did not directly line manage.

Support staff were picking up the burden and supporting front-line staff.

The inspection framework was challenging but helpful and not demoralising. The new framework was tougher. There was a stable and consistent leadership, management and governance at the highest level of the Service.

- **Issues arising from the Self-Assessment?**

Consistency was the main issue as some things were not embedded everywhere.

- **How were positive stories about the Service publicised?**

Good news was collated into an annual report. Rotherham was being promoted as an employer of choice and there was a communication and media strategy in place to best promote the Service.

- **How do you ensure that multi-agency partners are engaged and contributing, for example Early Years or Schools/Academies?**

There had been some challenges relating to governance of academy schools, Officers were addressing this where issues had been highlighted.

- **Risks and uncertainties – ‘Requires Improvement’ and ‘Good’ – did the Service know where the differences lay in-between these judgements and how to achieve ‘Good’, and did the Secretary of State still have the option of external intervention?**

Yes, yes and yes!

The Deputy Leader thanked Members for the debate and challenge. The new inspection framework would change again later in the year and further updates would be provided.

The Chairperson thanked the Officers in attendance for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion. She emphasised the importance of the Service being ‘Ofsted-ready’. It was clear that all partners in Rotherham were committed to working together to improve outcomes for children, young people and their families in the Borough. From the presentation and discussion section of this meeting, the Chairperson was assured that the level of preparedness within Rotherham had been carefully thought-out and was of a good standard.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That the progress made by Rotherham's Children and Young People's Services in preparation for an inspection under the new framework be noted.

8. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 9th July, 2014, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall (pre-meeting for all Members to take place from 12.45 p.m.).

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Improving Lives Select Commission
2.	Date:	9th July, 2014
3.	Title:	Peer Review – The Impact of Childhood neglect
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People’s Service

5. Summary

This report provides details to Improving Lives Select Commission on the proposed Peer Review which is due to take place around the impact of childhood neglect in September, 2014. It also covers the current profile of neglect cases in Rotherham.

6. Recommendations

That Improving Lives Select Commission receive this paper and note plans for the peer review.

7. Proposals and Details

Sector Led Improvement

Members of the commission will be aware that there is an expectation that local authorities provide each other with a level of support and challenge. In the Yorkshire and Humber Region the Directors of Children's Services work collaboratively with the support of a dedicated (shared funded) officer who facilitates and supports peer reviews for children's services (education and social care) across the region. Directors and Senior Managers in the region have undertaken specific training for them to undertake such peer reviews.

Peer Review – Neglect

It has been agreed that a Peer Review will take place in Rotherham during the week beginning 8th September which will be led by Eleanor Brazil, Director of Children's Services in Doncaster. The focus of this review will be childhood neglect, the impact that it has on the lives of children and what Rotherham are doing to combat this. It is anticipated that this will look at how partners respond to this issue including the role of our schools. Other members of the team are Mick Gibbs (North Lincolnshire) and Maxine Squire (York City).

The planning for this review has already commenced and officers have started pulling together key evidence and documents in readiness for the review, briefings are taking place with staff and partners and performance data is being analysed to allow officers to evidence to the peer review team what Rotherham's approach is to neglect cases.

Members of the commission will recall that during the OFSTED Child Protection inspection in July 2012 inspectors asked officers when " enough is enough" in relation to children living with the effects of neglect after identifying a couple of cases where children had been living with long term neglect.

The RSCB then commissioned a review of neglect that was subsequently carried out, as a result of this review changes were made which included:

- Revised care plan to ensure social workers apply SMART methodology when planning interventions with families.
- Increased challenge by Safeguarding Conference Chairs and a re-developed "challenge procedure" for Chair's to more effectively challenge operational decision making.
- Roll out of a range of toolkits to aid practitioner reflection on neglect cases, included the Graded Care Profile.
- Improved legal gatekeeping at MASP to ensure that cases where Neglect is prevalent are escalated more swiftly
- Re-allocation of the Family Recovery Programme away from edge of care to be engaged at the point a child is placed on a child protection plan, to allow for early intensive intervention.

In addition, we have also revised our assessment forms as part of the roll out of our single assessment framework in social care, and the new format introduced will enable better quality assessment of need, balancing risks against strengths.

Neglect however is not an isolated issue or area of focus, and cuts across much of the work we deliver in CYPS. Whilst OfSTED challenged the LA on their tolerance of neglect at the acute end of the continuum of need (i.e. not removing children soon enough when subjected to child protection level neglect), we have also implemented strengthening measures at an earlier stage, which improve how we tackle neglect more quickly in the life of a child, which include, and the infrstcure we have put in place for professionals includes:

- Delivering a workforce development programme (Triple A), mandatory for all social workers, which focuses on improved assessment and analysis of families from day 1 of social work engagement.
- Development of the Early Help Support Panel to allow practitioners supporting families through early help services (e.g. via a Family CAF) to raise concerns and seek additional guidance/support before families hit crisis point and are referred to social care.
- Continued delivery of our Troubled Families programmes, providing targeted interventions for neglectful parenting that results in poor school attendance, ASB and worklessness
- Multi-agency learning and development provision rolled out, focused on Neglect.

OFSTED have recently published their report “ in the childs time: professional responses to neglect” findings from this are being used with managers in the service to inform the work of the service, key findings were :

- One third of neglect cases where social care have been involved for a long time have evidence of delay and or drift
- Assessments do not always take account of family history or the impact that neglect has on a child
- Engaging parents in child protection work is often difficult as they are likely to have complex issues of their own
- Non-compliance and disguised compliance of parents

Childhood Neglect In Rotherham

Neglect is often recognised throughout a gradual building picture where a number of factors then trigger interventions and support. It is however not just the responsibility of children’s social care and relies on our partners to recognise the signs and intervene early with support packages to avoid escalation into social care.

In 2013/14 there were 2916 referrals to children’s social care that progressed to assessment, 43% of these had a referral reason which referenced neglect or factors* considered to lead to neglect (domestic abuse, parental drug / alcohol use and mental health).

The Multi-Agency Support Panel considers complex cases where children need a high level of multi-agency resource, or a decision that they meet the threshold for

legal intervention, and many of these include families where there has been substantial neglect. The involvement of key staff from agencies working with adults (RDASH and IDVA, for example) has been instrumental in helping to create plans for children and young people which acknowledge the impact of their parents lifestyle on the children's wellbeing, including understanding the underlying reasons for neglect, and addressing those in cases where substance abuse and domestic abuse are leading to conditions of neglect.

As at 20th June, 34% (463) children in need had a referral reason of neglect or one of the factors* above

Once neglect becomes a significant concern children often become the subject of a child protection plan (CPP), as at 20th June 51% (185) of CPPs had a registration category which includes neglect.

Neglect is also an evident factor when children become looked after with 61% (236) of our current looked after children population having experienced some form of neglect during their life.

8. Finance

There are no significant costs to the peer review itself, other than incidental costs such as car parking costs, IT set up costs, refreshments etc. it's worth noting however that the LGA equivalent of these reviews are in the region of £20,000. These reviews will require officer time to support and preparation time in advance of the review itself in addition to time spent during the review itself (3 days in this instance).

It is clear however that the cost of neglect to CYPS is significant due to the number of cases that social workers are currently involved with.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

It is recognised as good practice to take part in a peer review as these external reviews often contribute to local improvement plans and assist with self assessments to be undertaken and evidence used.

OFSTED however would expect to be presented with previous peer reviews when they inspect children's services under their new framework

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Sector Led improvement is a valuable tool and one that the government recognise as good practice. OFSTED would expect to see a copy of such a report if they were to carry out an inspection in Rotherham

11. Background Papers and Consultation

OFSTED inspection report Rotherham 2012

OFSTED In the Child's time : professional responses to neglect, March 2014

Multi-Agency Review of Serious Neglect, August 2013

12. Contact Details

Clair Pyper, Director of Safeguarding, Children and Families,
clair.pyper@rotherham.gov.uk, Ext 23905

Sue Wilson, Performance and Quality Manager,
sue-cyps.wilson@rotherham.gov.uk , Ext 22511

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Improving Lives Select Commission
2.	Date:	9th July, 2014
3.	Title:	Young People Missing from Home and Care
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young Peoples' Services

5. Summary

This report informs Members of current national and local developments regarding young people missing from home and care.

6. Recommendations

That members accept this report and note its content.

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Background

In January 2014 The Department of Education published new statutory guidance on children who run away or go missing from home or care. The guidance makes it clear that local authorities are responsible for protecting children whether they go missing from their family home or from local authority care. The guidance also comments on widespread concerns about children in care being sexually exploited.

The Joint All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) Inquiry on Children Who Go Missing from Care and the Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Gangs and Groups each noted that looked after children missing from their care placements are particularly vulnerable. It was noted that children in residential care are at particular risk of going missing and particularly vulnerable to sexual and other exploitation.

It is worth noting that although looked after children are particularly vulnerable when they go missing, the majority of children who go missing are not looked after, but children who go missing from their family home.

Department for Education (DfE) guidance has always indicated that local authorities should agree with local police and other partners a protocol for dealing with children who run away or go missing in their area. Where appropriate, they should also have agreed protocols with neighbouring authorities or administrations. The protocols should be agreed and reviewed regularly with all agencies and be scrutinised by the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB)

Rotherham’s protocol was updated last year to ensure that it is up to date with the revised guidance. It was drafted in consultation with partners including South Yorkshire Police and Safe@last and endorsed by the safeguarding board.

The regional protocol has not been updated. There are plans to address this by summer 2014.

Structures for managing children who go missing from home and/or care in Rotherham are well organised. There are good working relationships between the local authority and partner agencies and regular meetings to analyse patterns and trends. Latterly there has been some concern regarding the management of cases when children have run away more than once and with the accuracy of reporting. Each of these matters was discussed at the Child Sexual Exploitation Silver Group on 10th February with plans made to address the matters.

Structures for managing children who go missing from out of borough placements are less robust. The DfE guidance states that;

‘If children placed out of their local authority run away, the local protocol should be followed, in addition to complying with other processes that are specified in the policy of the responsible local authority’.

There are concerns that independent sector care placement providers are not following this guidance. Following discussions with South Yorkshire Police and the Rotherham Childrens’s Social Care Placements Team, the lead officer for missing children has contacted every provider with firm instructions as to what is required in relation to young people placed with them by Rotherham Council. Arrangements have been put in place throughout the rest of the year for the lead officer to visit providers to ensure the protocols are implemented effectively.

7.2 Children Missing January to May 2014.

The table below shows the number of children in total who have gone missing each month from January to May 2014.

	Jan	Feb	March	April	May		
Total no.	23	25	30	60	47		

7.3 Patterns and Trends

The figures show the total number of children reported missing in the month. Month by month reports break the data down. For example in May 2014

- 47 young people went missing
- 23 had never been missing before (49%)
- 3 had not been missing in the previous three months
- 21 had been missing in the last 3 months
- 17 of those missing were male
- 24 of those missing were female
- 33 were aged 10-16 with most of these being between 14-16
- 3 children were considered to be at medium risk of child sexual exploitation and one at high risk. Strategy meetings have been held where sexual exploitation is a concern.

The increase at age 15 reflects the national picture. There is a sharp increase at age 15 in Rotherham. The following provides an insight to the picture nationally:

- Figures compiled by the police show that the 15-17 age group are the highest number of missing persons. (Missing persons: data and analysis, NPIA 2011)
- The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) state that young people are most likely to run away between the ages of 13 and 15,

At the age of 15 children may feel that they are that much more 'worldly wise' and can look after themselves, it is also a time for challenging boundaries previously accepted.

For all children, adolescence is a stressful time of dramatic physical changes, peer pressure and an emerging identity. Those with parental support are usually able to successfully navigate this period, but without it, emotions can overwhelm a child to the point that he or she believes that leaving will bring relief.

Some feel that leaving home is the only way to escape a situation in which there is frequent fighting or where they feel unwanted. A great many are fleeing situations that are physically, sexually and/or emotionally abusive. Some children run away because they're in trouble with the law and afraid their parents will find out.

The May figures reflect a pattern that is consistent with previous months. There has been a notable increase since April 2014. This reflects a change in reporting procedures rather than a change in pattern. In April 2014 the Department of Education implemented new reporting categories. These are;

Missing

- Anyone whose whereabouts *cannot be established* and where the circumstances are *out of character*, or the context suggests the person may be a *subject of crime* or at *risk of harm* to themselves or another.

Absent

- A person not at a place where they are expected or required to be.

South Yorkshire Police reacted by changing their recording system which now records children missing when they have been absent from home or care for just a few hours. These cases would not previously have been recorded.

7.4 Managing children who are reported missing and specifically those considered high risk.

There are systems in place to ensure that any child reported missing is risk assessed. The risk assessment is continually updated until the child is recovered. South Yorkshire Police and the Children's Social Care Services have up to date information regarding children considered to be at the highest level of risk. This would include children with a disability, very young children and those known to be at risk of child sexual exploitation.

Forums are in place where individual cases are discussed on a weekly and monthly basis with action plans devised to manage the risk.

8. Finance

There are no additional financial implications arising from this report.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

It should be noted that the risk to children who go missing are not confined to child sexual exploitation. Children may come to other forms of harm.

Children missing from education are often not reported as 'missing persons'. The absence from school may trigger a visit from the school's education welfare officer but may not necessarily be referred to the police as missing person case.

The Rotherham runaways action group have representatives from health and education with regards to records and action required when children are reported missing from education.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Through their inspections of local authority children's services, Ofsted will include an assessment of measures with regard to missing children as part of their key judgement on the experiences and progress of children who need help and protection.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Children who run away or go missing from home or care January 2014 (DFE 2014)
APPG inquiry into children missing from care June 2012
Running Away; Ofsted 2012
Lessons to Learn: The Children's Society 2012
Still Running (three) The Children's Society 2011
Missing Children and Adults Strategy The Home Office 2011

Interim Guidance on the Management, Recording and Investigation of Missing Persons ACPO 2013

Contact Name:

Morri McDermott, Operations Manager - Telephone: ext. 23681
morri.mcdermott@rotherham.gov.uk
