

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

3rd MARCH 2015

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR SCRUTINY REVIEW ON MULTI-AGENCY
WORKING AGAINST CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION**

REPORT OF SCRUTINY GROUP SPECIALIST

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to inform members of the comments received on during the period of public comment and having considered these to agree the terms of reference for the review.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee:

- Consider the responses received on the terms of reference during the period of public comment
- Following consideration of these comments consider and agree the terms of reference for the review of multi-agency working against CSE (Appendix1)

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee agreed at the meeting on the 4th November 2014 to undertake a review on the issue of Child Sexual Exploitation. It was agreed that the focus of the review would be to look at how organisations are working together to prevent CSE, support and protect victims and their families and prosecute perpetrators.

- 3.2 Following discussions it was agreed it was important to ensure that local people and organisations had confidence in the work of the Committee and to assist with this the Terms of Reference for the review would be published for a period of public comment. The Terms of reference were published on 16th January 2015 and was promoted through the media. The Committee Chair was interviewed by 2 radio stations, an article was published in the Shropshire Star and the opportunity to comment was posted on the Council's Facebook page and twitter account. The initial deadline for responses was set as the

6th February 2015. The number of responses was low and so the deadline for comments was extended until the 15th February 2015.

4.0 SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED

4.1 The response form asked 3 specific questions about the terms of reference for the review:

- What issues do you think should be included?
- Who do you think should be involved?
- Any other comments you want to make on the terms of reference?

4.2 In total 21 responses were received. The tables below sets out information which summarises the responses received.

Responses Received from:	Number of responses
Members of the Public	4
Elected Member / co-opted Scrutiny Member	12**
Organisation / partnership / forum	6*

* This does not include the organisations that have agreed to take part in the review without making further comment on the terms of reference.

** Includes comments from Members of the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee at briefing meeting on 17th February.

4.4 All the responses received were supportive of the review. Some responses referred to specific cases of CSE. The details of these individual cases are not set out in this report and individual staff and officers have not been identified. The full responses have been shared with Members of the Committee prior to the meeting and will be available as a confidential document at the meeting. The analysis of the responses to the 3 questions is set out below.

4.5 Question 1: "What issues should be included in the review?"
Due to the low numbers of responses it is difficult to provide a qualitative description of the responses. However a number of themes have been identified and a summary of the issues raised is provided.

Involvement in Developing Services
<p>Enabling survivors of CSE to reform the services that have failed them Working with survivors to help educate young people about CSE Consulting survivors in their views of services and the help they received and what they think of proposed plans for the future Professionals cannot view their services externally – what they think is an appropriate response may not actually work for victims and</p>

survivors.
Support for Victims and Survivors
Survivors are victims and should not be treated as criminals Funding for charities that support victims and survivors of CSE Survivors have to wait for counselling unless they have funds to pay privately
Views on previous cases
Dissatisfaction with the response from police and social services prior to police intervention Parents have not had their say about how their issues have been handled prior to police intervention
Prevention
Not placing vulnerable girls in accommodation in areas where CSE has been identified as an issue.
Working with landlords who have concerns about their properties being used in CSE.
Licencing
It is estimated that there are approximately 600 licenced drivers and 500 licenced vehicles working in the Borough of Telford & Wrekin . Of those 142 drivers (though not all may be active) and 89 vehicles are licenced by Telford and Wrekin Council.

4.6 It should be noted that there were some very positive comments about individuals providing statutory services and particularly the support provided by voluntary sector organisations.

4.7 Question 2: Who do you think should be involved?
There were a range of organisations and individuals that were identified that could contribute to the review. These are set out below:

Voluntary Sector Organisations
Representatives from young people’s organisation: Scouts,. Guides, Cadet Forces, Boys / Girls Brigades, Representatives from local sports organisations with significant youth membership Representatives from local faith based organisations working with young people Voluntary organisations that support vulnerable young people: KIP, STAY and YMCA

Axis – a counselling organisation that provided support to survivors of CSE Drug and alcohol organisations NACRO and TACT Public Sector
Public Sector
Probation Service Local Authority Children’s Safeguarding Lead Shropshire Council Safeguarding and Licencing
Victims / survivors and their families
Three responses stated that it is important to seek the views of survivors and their families. One individual who responded expressed an interest in contributing to the review
Education
Further Education Colleges Independent schools
Other
Landlords

4.8 Question 3: Any other Comments you want to make on the terms of reference?

In addition to the comments set out above the following responses were also received:
The Local Safeguarding Children’s Board supported the review and the terms of reference. The Board and individual members also agreed to respond to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review and that the responses will be co-ordinated by the Board.
The Primary Heads Forum responded that it is difficult for Head teachers to attend meetings. The Secondary Heads Forum responded that it is difficult for one Head to represent the group. It was suggested that a meeting with a schools safeguarding lead may be a way for schools to contribute to the review. ***
West Mercia Police sent a letter to the Chair of the CYP Scrutiny Committee which was very positive about the review.

*** Alternative ways of engaging with schools and further education colleges are being explored.

5.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The comments on the draft terms of reference have highlighted the need to engage with victims, survivors and their families, voluntary organisations that support vulnerable young people.

6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations contained within this report. Any costs associated with the review process will need to be met from within existing resources.
- 6.2. Any financial implications arising from the recommendations of the review will be identified within a future report.

7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no additional legal comments to make in addition to the matters already covered within the body of the report and the draft terms of reference.

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 There are no environmental implications resulting from this report

9.0 WARD IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 There are no direct ward implications resulting from this report

Report prepared by Fiona Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist, 01952 383113