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Executive Summary

At their meeting on 10 April 2015 the Hampshire Police and Crime Panel agreed the topics they would review in 2015/16 through their proactive scrutiny work-programme.

This first report, for 2015/16, concludes and makes recommendations upon the topic of ‘child sexual exploitation’, where Members reviewed the actions of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire (and the Isle of Wight) in his aim to ‘work effectively with Hampshire Constabulary to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation (CSE) are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services’ through leading the introduction of a ‘Sexual Crime Strategy’ and by raising awareness and encouraging ‘joined up working around CSE’. Additionally, building on the work of the Panel’s ‘victims and witnesses’ proactive scrutiny, to understand how the PCC is improving the experience of victims and witnesses of CSE across the criminal justice system.

Concerns regarding the sexual exploitation of children were brought to the public fore in August 2014, following the publication of initial findings from an inquiry into widespread child sexual exploitation in Rotherham between 1997 and 2013. Following publication of this report, Hampshire Constabulary were requested by the Commissioner to undertake a legacy review of historic case files for the same time period, the outcomes of which are expected to be known during 2015/16.

This report finds that the Commissioner has been instrumental in setting up a multi-agency ‘Gold Group’, to both support this review and to establish multi-agency executive commitment to prevent, and support, victims and potential victims of CSE. Further evidence was received by the Panel praising efforts made by the Commissioner and his office to encourage and facilitate a multi-agency agency approach in tackling and preventing CSE across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. The Panel have identified, thorough this report, an opportunity for the Commissioner to increase engagement with partners in both the health and education sectors, as well as Licencing Authorities, ensuring a fully holistic approach in identifying and supporting both those at risk and victims of CSE.

Additionally, the Panel have identified a need for greater consistency pan-Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, in the assessment of children at risk of sexual exploitation, and opportunity for the Commissioner, through his influence with partners, to increase the use of shared technology to support the automation of the risk-assessment process.
It was recognised, through the evidence, that knowledge of CSE is still in its infancy and that in particular an increased understanding was needed, both locally and nationally, to better identify how internet and smartphone technology is used to facilitate CSE.

The Rotherham inquiry, and much of the media attention that followed, focused on ‘Asian males targeting white females’, and through both written and specifically oral evidence it was highlighted that greater engagement regarding CSE was needed with both Faith and BAME communities within the two counties. The Commissioner has stated that this would be a priority action area for Hampshire Constabulary and recognised the importance that such communities should not feel stigmatised by the stereotypes which had been portrayed in the media.

Recommendations will be made to the Commissioner through this report which aim to contribute to efforts to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation (CSE) within Hampshire and the Isle of Wight are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services.
Hampshire Police and Crime Panel
Child Sexual Exploitation

1. Background

1.1 At their meeting on 24 January 2014 the Hampshire Police and Crime Panel (hereafter referred to as ‘the Panel’) agreed to introduce proactive scrutiny sessions to their work-programme for 2014/15. This would enable them to build on their ‘statutory functions’ by moving to a fuller work-programme focusing on scrutinising core elements of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire’s (hereafter referred to as ‘the Commissioner’) Police and Crime Plan.

1.2 The topics for review in 2015/16 were selected by the Panel’s Police and Crime Plan Working Group and drafted into a work-programme for agreement at meeting of the Panel on 23 January 2015. The first topic for review in 2015/16 was agreed to be ‘child sexual exploitation’.

1.3 The review group agreed that the scrutiny of this topic would be based upon oral and written evidence and background research. The evidence was gathered by means of invitations to stakeholders to contribute written views, and to attend the proactive scrutiny session of the Panel to present oral evidence.

1.4 The child sexual exploitation review considered the actions of the Commissioner in his aim to ‘work effectively with Hampshire Constabulary to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation (CSE) are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services.’ It reviewed evidence relating to the Commissioner’s set outcome, and aimed to formulate recommendations to the Commissioner which would support him and his work in this area.

2. Discussion and Conclusions

2.1 Five key areas were identified by the Working Group for review. These were:

- How well is the PCC working with partners to encourage a joined up approach in tackling child sexual exploitation?

- How is the PCC engaging with the wider community to raise awareness of, and help safeguard against, child sexual exploitation?
• What effective interventions and strategies exist to prevent and intervene against child sexual exploitation?

• What improvements could be made, if any, to ensure individuals are referred to appropriate services?

• What best practice exists which could also be considered by the PCC as part of his pledge to safeguard children at risk of sexual exploitation?

2.2 In order to receive evidence which answered the five key areas of the review, the Working Group sought responses from stakeholders to the following five questions:

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

5) Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?

Additionally, in order to review how the PCC was holding the Chief Constable to account for Hampshire Constabulary’s response to CSE, the following further questions were specifically addressed to Hampshire Constabulary and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire and the IOW:

6) How is the PCC working with Hampshire Constabulary to prioritise the response to and the protection of those at risk of child sexual exploitation across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight?
7) What are the reporting mechanisms are being used by Hampshire Constabulary to record instances of CSE, and how is this data being reported to, and monitored by, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner?

2.3 With regard to how well the Commissioner is working with partners to encourage a joined up approach in tackling child sexual exploitation:

2.3.1 The Commissioner identified tackling child sexual exploitation as a key priority for his term of office, highlighting this under ‘Priority Two’ of his Police and Crime Plan, where a commitment was made to “raise awareness and encourage joined up working around child sexual exploitation (CSE)”. Additionally, under Priority One of the Police and Crime Plan, the Commissioner laid out his intention to ‘work effectively with Hampshire Constabulary to ensure that vulnerable people (including children at risk of CSE) are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services’.

2.3.2 Both oral and written evidence received by the Panel has praised efforts made by the Commissioner and his Office in encouraging and facilitating multi-agency working in this area. The evidence has highlighted the work that has been taken forward by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) to develop approaches and commission services which lead to his key outcomes. For example Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services commented that there was engagement from all levels of staff within the OPCC, with Barnardos’ written submission particularly noting that members of the Commissioner’s office demonstrated genuine interest and a passion to support those affected by, or at risk of, CSE.

Legacy Review

2.3.3 In August 2014 an independent inquiry published its initial report, which related to alleged widespread child sexual exploitation in Rotherham between 1997 and 2013. The report conservatively estimated that 1400 children had been subject to sexual exploitation in the Borough during this period and condemned ‘the collective failures of political and officer leadership’.

2.3.4 As a direct consequence of concerns raised following this enquiry, and the national attention the report received, the Commissioner met with the Chief Constable of Hampshire Constabulary and commissioned a legacy review of case files for the same period (1997-2013). An intention was given that the review would be fully transparent, a with commitment that any victims identified would receive appropriate support.
2.3.5 Following this meeting the Commissioner approached the Chairs of the Local Safeguarding Boards within Hampshire and the IOW as well as the Chief Executives of the four top-tier local authorities in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, informing them of the review and inviting them to support the process. As a result the ‘Gold Group’, a multi-agency strategic group, was formed. The group, hosted by Hampshire Constabulary, includes key representatives from each of the four top-tier local authorities, as well as a Director of Nursing from the West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and the Assistant Director of Nursing from the NHS England.

2.3.6 The Commissioner set initial terms of reference for the group, which were agreed by March 2015 and, as well as providing a forum for sharing of information between the agencies to enable risks and threats to be identified and resource assigned to historical investigations, the group collectively agreed six strategic commitments. These commitments not only aimed to support the legacy review but were established to provide executive commitment across both counties to prevent, and support victims of, CSE in the future.

**Multi-agency working**

2.3.7 Each of the four authorities within the Hampshire Policing area have established a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). The Hubs enable safeguarding concerns raised in respect of children and vulnerable adults to be triaged and assessed using a multi-agency approach. By bringing together professionals from a range of agencies the intention is that response times will be quicker, and that a co-ordinated approach will lead to better informed decision making. Evidence provided to the Panel demonstrated support for the MASH principle, with the Winchester Community Safety Partnership (CSP) stating that the MASH is a ‘great concept and joins agencies and their response’.

2.3.8 The Commissioner has provided funding for a specialist CSE team to be based within each MASH. Police officers and local authority staff will work jointly within these specialist teams and will be supported by a dedicated analyst. A focus will be applied to early intervention with the intention of protecting vulnerable children from being groomed and to disrupt locations used by perpetrators to target potential victims.
2.3.9 The Commissioner also provided support to a successful bid to the Innovation Fund, awarded by the Department for Education, for the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs to host a Missing, Exploited and Trafficked (MET) team. Under the heading of the ‘Willow Project’ these teams specifically focus on assessing and safeguarding the needs of children who repeatedly go missing or are exploited and trafficked into and within Hampshire and the IOW. Both Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services informed Members through written evidence that the Commissioner had provided funding for and committed specific staff to work within this project, demonstrating his ‘commitment and support to partnership working on the MET agenda’.

2.3.10 Sexual Exploitation Risk Assessment Forms (SERAF) exist to support practitioners in identifying children at highest risk of exploitation, through a risk scoring process, and enables interventions to be planned at an earlier stage. Southampton National Probation Service, through their oral evidence, brought forward concerns regarding the awareness of and consistency in completing these forms by partner organisations, suggesting that this may affect the validity of their use. Winchester CSP also raises this as a key area for action, but hope that this will be addressed by the Willow Project, through both their location within the MASH, and their ability to engage with and inform front line staff.

2.3.11 Furthermore, as part of the Willow Project, the OPCC is undertaking a proactive piece of work with Hampshire & IOW Children’s Services to develop a ‘toolkit of interventions’, for use with children identified as MET and will look to promote creative methods of early intervention to disrupt perpetrators.

2.3.12 The Commissioner, and his staff, regularly attend and contribute towards a number of other multi-agency meetings and forums including the Local Children’s Safeguarding Boards (LSCB) and the LSCB MET groups as well as introducing Community Safety Alliance Meetings, enabling the Commissioner to engage partners at both a strategic and operational level in preventing and tackling CSE. Winchester CSP in particular note that the Commissioner is ‘very proactive in his approach to partnership working’ and that the Commissioner’s support for the introduction of such forums has enabled the evolvement of partnership discussions in relation to CSE.

2.3.13 In engaging and utilising the experience of the Local Safeguarding Children’s Boards the Commissioner has led the development of a pan-Hampshire and Isle of Wight ‘Problem Profile’. The Problem Profile is a monthly report which identifies children deemed to be at risk of CSE, as well as missing children
and perpetrators, and provides shared intelligence around locations where CSE is being facilitated. The report is generated utilising intelligence submitted from a number of partner agencies and both Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services identified that whilst the profile is still in its infancy, it is a key document which should ensure that all partner agencies are working together to identify, manage and respond to the needs and risks of children vulnerable to CSE.

2.3.14 The Problem Profile is also shared through the MET boards and groups. As well as an overarching pan- Hampshire and IOW strategic MET board there are four strategic upper authority MET boards and a number of operational MET groups within the Hampshire policing area.

2.3.15 The strategic upper local authority boards are co-chaired by Hampshire Constabulary and the Portsmouth, Southampton, Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services respectively. Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services both provided comment to the contribution made by the Constabulary within these meetings stating that they actively encourage partners to provide a consistent approach in identifying children at risk of CSE, and in the subsequent response to these risks.

2.3.16 A further example of how the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner has contributed towards the strategic MET groups was highlighted within evidence provided by Barnardos who stated that Laura Franklin, Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for IOW (APCC IOW), and lead officer for safeguarding within the OPCC, often shared at these meetings, and as appropriate between meetings, the latest research and information received by the Commissioner relating to CSE and that this information was felt to be both informative and relevant.

2.3.17 The Commissioner has established a number of operational MET groups across Hampshire and the IOW to take a lead on the operational elements of the Strategic MET Groups’ work. Within these meetings the Problem Profile is reviewed, checking that a SERAF is completed for each child at risk and that there is a risk management plan in place for any identified offenders. Meetings are held monthly, with Hampshire Constabulary noting that the meetings are ‘well attended by partner agencies’.

2.3.18 The National Probation Service within Southampton brought forward concerns that the processes followed by the Southampton operational MET group are restricted in their scope and that it was identified that this may limit the value that the group can contribute to tackling CSE. As a result the MET operational
A group in the city was conducting a review, in consultation with its members, to ensure it was fully effective in supporting those most at risk.

Commissioning

2.3.19 A key theme found in the evidence in which the Commissioner is able to bring his influence to this area is through his commissioning strategy. The Commissioner has committed £70,000 from his budget to set up a multi-agency ‘Anti-Slavery Partnership’. This forum aims to deliver a co-ordinated approach to all forms of exploitation and to tackle both child and adult slavery. It is anticipated that policies developed through the forum will be forwarded for and be adopted by both adult and child safeguarding boards. There are only two other examples of such partnerships currently known in the UK, and the forum has been endorsed by Kevin Hyland, the Independent Anti-Slavery Commissioner for the UK.

2.3.20 Evidence received by the Panel has shown that the Commissioner has also provided funding to a number of organisations and projects which focus on raising awareness of and preventing CSE, as well as supporting victims. Previous evidence received from the OPCC has highlighted that commissioning funds are provided with an expectation of evidence-based outcomes and examples noted include funding provided to Love 146, an international human rights organisation, to provide safe accommodation for children trafficked from abroad, and to Gosport CSP, to provide targeted youth support in relation to the use of drugs and the links with CSE.

Training Provision

2.3.21 The Commissioner has provided training, which Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services regard as high quality, for partners at a number of events focussed on CSE. Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services also state that the OPCC has contributed and provided support to their awareness raising events as well as proactively lending support to other partner agencies for training events which benefit from having police representation.

2.3.22 The OPCC has additionally provided funding for the delivery of training around the issue of CSE by third party and voluntary sector partners including Barnardos, who provided training for staff within residential units. Love 146 note that the Commissioner has identified that additional training around trafficking from abroad and its link to CSE would be beneficial and through his representation at the various multi-agency strategic and operational boards is
well placed to promote and identify opportunities for such training to be delivered.

2.3.23 Hampshire Constabulary have also delivered CSE training to 2,100 frontline policing staff, over 200 GPs and 80 probation staff, and have run two key pan-Hampshire and IOW communications campaigns. The first “Are you ok?” is a force wide internal campaign seeking to raise awareness of CSE amongst policing staff to enable them to better identify vulnerability. This is accompanied by an external campaign “You are not alone” which further hopes to increase awareness with partners, parents and children, including those who may be victims.

Engaging Partners

2.3.24 In order to tackle CSE it has been identified in the evidence and through best practice that a holistic approach is required; engaging with families, communities and partners, including those in education, health and local government in order to better enable early identification of both victims and perpetrators.

2.3.25 Both written and oral evidence received by the Panel has identified the need for further engagement with schools and the education sector to encourage them to raise awareness of and educate pupils on CSE and how it can be perpetrated. Oral evidence received the Panel notes that historically there has been reluctance by some schools to promote awareness of CSE due to concerns that a school might be stigmatised if pupils were identified as victims, or at risk of exploitation.

2.3.26 It was recognised that the Commissioner had taken steps to improve engagement through the introduction of programmes such as ‘Chelsea’s Choice’, a drama-based awareness session for secondary school pupils which is delivered by Hampshire Constabulary and has received funding from the OPCC, and through the commissioning of a young care leaver to visit schools to talk to pupils about CSE. From oral evidence it was felt that school staff needed to have access to appropriate support following these sessions and training on how to manage any concerns around CSE that may be brought forward by pupils.

2.3.27 In September 2015 the Commissioner will be launching a voluntary Education Charter on the Isle of Wight. It is anticipated that all primary and secondary schools on the island will sign up to the Charter and included within it is a
commitment from secondary schools to place priority on delivering CSE education and awareness.

2.3.28 The independent inquiry into child sexual exploitation in Rotherham (see paragraph 2.2.3) highlighted that with the growth of mobile and web based technology perpetrators were targeting much younger children. An extract from the report reads:

‘One of the most worrying features is the ease with which young children aged from about 8-10 years can be targeted and exploited in this way without their families being aware of the dangers associated with internet use.’

2.3.29 The Commissioner himself recognised importance of working with ‘young people from a very early age to inform them of the dangers of CSE’, however little evidence was received within this review demonstrating engagement focussed on primary schools.

2.3.30 Another area in which the Commissioner could lend his support is engagement with health partners, specifically sexual health and GPs, in encouraging health professionals to report concerns regarding potential exploitation and to ensure that they are informed of the support services available for referral. Whilst some engagement has taken place, with Hampshire Constabulary delivering awareness training to 200 GPs and medical staff, CIS'ters cited that day to day time pressures have a significant impact on health professional’s ability to report concerns. They further noted they had been commissioned by the NHS to provide 20 one day sessions to GPs on child sexual abuse awareness, of which 16 sessions were cancelled due to GP’s workload demand.

2.3.31 The evidence has also highlighted that whilst the OPCC work closely with the Youth Offending Teams (YOT) in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, there was not direct engagement by the OPCC with the YOTs in relation CSE, despite evidence demonstrating that offending behaviour such as drug and alcohol abuse and gang involvement can be indicators of exploitation.

2.4 With regard how the Commissioner is engaging with the wider community to raise awareness of, and help safeguard against, child sexual exploitation:

2.4.1 Through his evidence to the Panel, the Commissioner has made clear his intention to ‘continue to openly discuss CSE in a public environment rather than attempting to hide it away under the carpet’. Whilst the subject is
currently widely and frequently reported in the media, following the Rotherham case review, it will be important in the future, as media interest subsides, that the Commissioner, through his profile with both partners and the general public, continues to maintain and increase the wider awareness of CSE across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

2.4.2 As well as raising public awareness of the priority placed on tackling CSE by the Commissioner through his Police and Crime Plan, Hampshire Constabulary have run a number of targeted CSE awareness raising campaigns, including ‘Are you ok?’ which is described in paragraph 2.3.23

2.4.3 Whilst the internet is often used to facilitate CSE, it can also be used as a tool to prevent it and to increase public awareness, particularly in engaging young people and those responsible for their care through providing help to identify and protect against possible risk behaviours. The Hampshire and IOW Youth Offending Teams note that Hampshire Constabulary have been proactive in targeting social media campaigns at young people, with Hampshire and IOW Children’s Service praising the work undertaken by the OPCC in raising CSE awareness through Hampshire Constabulary’s webpages.

2.4.4 The Commissioner has advocated the use of nationally available web services including the ‘CEOP’ website, a national crime agency command who work with child protection partners within the UK and overseas. ‘Think you know’, a partner site of CEOP, provides age appropriate resources for children and those responsible for their care. Other web based sources highlighted include ‘Wud U’, an app designed to help teachers and other professionals to educate children on keeping themselves safe and ‘PACE’ (Parents Against Sexual Exploitation) which provides support to parents of children who are or are at risk of being exploited. Oral evidence to the panel supported the use of these nationally available resources, as this provides consistency and prevents duplication of effort and workload at a local level.

2.4.5 One of the most effective strategies in identifying and tackling CSE, as highlighted by CIS’ters, is to provide children and young people with access to positive role models. Understanding this a young care leaver has been funded by the OPCC to visit schools and talk to pupils, as this method is better able to engage children at a more direct level. Funding was also provided to the Leigh Park Project which offers diversionary schemes for young people to raise confidence and self respect as well as providing access to positive role models and trusted adults.
2.4.6 A need for greater engagement with faith and minority groups was drawn from both oral and written evidence to the Panel, with the National Probation Service in Southampton raising concerns that CSE victims in minority ethnic groups are under represented. Concerns were raised over a ‘wall of silence’ that potentially exists within some BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic) communities, where potential CSE concerns were not being raised with the authorities, and as a result this was exploitation was continuing by perpetrators. The Commissioner recognised that it was important that these communities didn’t feel stigmatised by the stereotypical models of CSE which had been portrayed in the media such as ‘Asian males targeting white females’.

2.4.7 Hampshire Constabulary’s CSE action plan has also identified enhancing links with minority and faith groups as a priority. To address this efforts are being focussed on continuing to provide a strong neighbourhood policing presence within all communities, and looking to building trust through ensuring victims satisfaction around the support and service provided for other crime types, including hate crime. Additionally, following the intention laid out by the Commissioner within his Police and Crime Plan, Hampshire Constabulary continues to aim for the number of BAME personnel across the force to be reflective of the ethnic diversity of the two counties by March 2016 and informing the Panel that they would be looking at how other forces were engaging with BAME communities within their policing areas.

2.4.8 Hampshire Constabulary informed Members that they also planned to ask leaders and members of BAME communities how the Constabulary could further increase engagement. It was noted particularly within the Southampton area that there was good visibility of policing presence and that events for BAME communities were well attended by Hampshire Constabulary, which had supported the building of relationships with communities.

2.5 With regard to what effective interventions and strategies exist to prevent and intervene against child sexual exploitation:

2.5.1 Child Sexual Exploitation has now been recognised as a national priority, however CSE was only defined nationally by the College of Policing in November 2012, as part of their National CSE Plan, and brought further to the fore following the publication of a report into concerns about in widespread exploitation in Rotherham in August 2013. Understanding and knowledge of CSE is therefore still in its infancy, and growing, and this is reflected within the
findings of this report, highlighting that new and existing interventions and strategies are currently being developed both locally and nationally.

2.5.2 Developing interventions and strategies to prevent and intervene against CSE is challenging due to the variety of methods and approaches used to facilitate CSE some of which are widely recognised, including the ‘Boyfriend/Inappropriate Relationships Model’ where perpetrators pose as a ‘boyfriend’ and shower the child with gifts and affection who is then expected to initiate a sexual relationship in return, or the ‘Peer on Peer Model’ where perpetrators befriend young people and develop a friendship with them with the intention of coercing them into having sexual relations with others as well as gang related sexual exploitation.

2.5.3 The emergence of mobile internet and smartphone facilitated exploitation poses new challenges; in the digital age children are exposed to higher levels of digital technology, breaking down barriers and the traditional awareness of ‘stranger danger’. Through the internet perpetrators are able access potential victims more easily, including those as young as eight (see paragraph 2.3.2); with the digital exchange of inappropriate images or content being instant, this content is often used to shame and blackmail the victim into further exploitation.

2.5.4 Both the Commissioner and many partner organisations have recognised in the evidence that further work needs to be undertaken to identify, educate and improve awareness of the risks of online exploitation. Through oral evidence it was considered that child/youth councils and the youth commission could help to bridge the gap in this understanding, and that this was an area in which the Commissioner could lend his support.

2.5.5 Members were informed that a key area for delivery by the OPCC for 2015/16 was the introduction of a ‘Sexual Crime Strategy’ and that this would be published by the Autumn of 2015, with the intention that the document would identify the support needs of victims of sexual crime, including victims of child sexual exploitation, aiding them in their recovery. In the development of this strategy the OPCC had consulted with a number of partners, including CIS'ters and NOMS (National Offender Management Service), and had been recognised as being open to feedback and input on the strategy.

2.5.6 Until March 2015 Barnardos were running an early intervention outreach service called FCASE (Families and Communities Against Sexual Exploitation). Utilising a holistic approach the service focussed on building
protective factors around the young person identified at risk to prevent them from being exploited, and engaged both their families and the wider community where they lived. Winchester CSP stated that that they had recommended the FCASE service to referrers, when it was available; however Hampshire Constabulary explained that the service did not have sustainable funding and therefore had ended. The FCASE model was evaluated by the University of Bedfordshire and they will be utilising their findings to develop a toolkit, which Barnardos hopes to be embedded within future practice by the LSCB’s across both counties.

2.5.7 Additionally the Commissioner has recognised that the effect on the support network of a young victim, including parents, carers and the wider family, when a child is sexually exploited is not yet fully recognised and that in order to aid the recovery of the victim their support network also needs access to relevant support. The OPCC are currently supporting the development of a parent support group, on the Isle of Wight, which looks to provide parents of children who are victims of CSE with a forum to come together and support one another.

2.5.8 NOMS, have been supported by the Commissioner to provide the Invisible Walls project, which works with men in prison to promote positive parenting and the importance of teaching children to keep themselves safe. NOMS have identified the need for greater support to be given to families with complex situations who, as a result have, extremely high support needs. They have identified a need for more information regarding how to access bespoke services, which may be available to provide support to such families.

2.5.9 Evidence to the Panel also provided examples of local strategies to detect and prevent CSE, including Gosport and Fareham CSP’s linked work with Hampshire Constabulary’s Force and District Risk trackers, which enabled young people at risk to be discussed at the monthly partnership action groups (PAG), raising awareness with local partners and allowing the young people to be diverted away from risk behaviours and referred to local youth support and diversionary services. A further example was raised by Hampshire Constabulary who, recognising that offending behaviour can sometime be a risk indicator for CSE, are conducting a pilot in Portsmouth with all detainees under the age of 18, giving them an opportunity to discuss any CSE concerns.

2.5.10 The OPCC highlight the work of Independent Sexual Violence Advocates (ISVAs) who support victims of sexual abuse, including victims of CSE.
Currently there are only two ISVAs operating across the Hampshire Policing area, with plans for this number to increase.

2.5.11 The APCC IOW has also conducted research into programmes which are currently being delivered within other parts of the UK with a view to potentially introducing them across Hampshire and the IOW, following evaluation of their success measures. Schemes currently under consideration include:

2.5.11.1 ‘CSE Angels’ a scheme which, similar to the street pastor scheme already in operation across Hampshire and the IOW, would target known CSE hotspots engaging with young people informing them of the risks of CSE and referring anyone considered vulnerable to a relevant support service.

2.5.11.2 ‘DePaul Night Stop Project’ which is a service that provides safe emergency accommodation for vulnerable young people aged 16-25 who are homeless or have run away from home keeping them away from the risk of CSE through sleeping ‘rough’ on the streets.

2.5.11.3 A day refuge for young people, offering them a place of safety and access to GP and counselling services. In the areas where these day refugees operate nationally there has been a noted reduction in the number of young people reported as missing, which is a known risk indicator of CSE.

2.6 With regard to what improvements could be made, if any, to ensure individuals are referred to appropriate services:

2.6.1 This report has discussed the multi-agency approach and efforts across Hampshire and the IOW, led through the MET Boards, to enable the early identification of those at risk of CSE, as well as highlighting the focus placed on supporting victims to disclose abuse and to provide them with access to support services.

2.6.2 In order for victims and those at risk of CSE to be referred to the appropriate support and intervention services, they must first be identified. This can be challenging when often the victim does not recognise they are in fact a ‘victim’ of CSE, as they may have been groomed to believe that what is happening isn’t wrong or could feel too ashamed to disclose the abuse. It was recognised in the evidence that voluntary and third party services provided key support in building trust and confidence with victims, and those at risk of CSE, to overcome these challenges and that a number of these services relied upon funding from the Commissioner.
2.6.3 The evidence highlights that efforts are being made to raise awareness within the wider community and to encourage members of the public to report concerns, with the OPCC reporting an increase in reports of non-recent CSE cases coming forward.

Post 18 Sexual Exploitation

2.6.4 The OPCC highlights that a child is nationally defined as being under 18 and that resultantly the classification of CSE applies until that age. They however recognise that beyond this age vulnerabilities can remain and whilst not classified under CSE, the vulnerability of an adult should be recognised. In both cases individuals would have access to support services relevant to their needs; however our call out for evidence has not provided detail of the specific support services in place for adults who were victims of childhood abuse, beyond the services and support provided by CIS'ters.

2.6.5 The National Probation Service in Southampton also raised concern that support for victims between the ages of 16 and 25 appeared limited, especially as this group are at higher risk of being further exploited to facilitate CSE with or directed towards younger children. An increase in young convicted sex offenders, who themselves had been victims of exploitation, had been noted and it was considered that these individuals would require more specialised support services to manage both the risk to themselves and that which they may pose to others.

2.6.6 Through their evidence the OPCC have stated that intervention is required in such cases to break the cycle of further CSE occurring, and that awareness needed to be raised around the complexities of situations where victims are also perpetrators. It was specified that this would be looked at by the Anti-Slavery partnership (see paragraph 2.3.19), due to correlations with the identification of trafficked individuals forced to commit crime against their will.

Risk Assessment

2.6.7 Due to the geographical coverage of the Hampshire Policing area, Hampshire and IOW Children’s Services highlight the importance of a ‘consistent tool and risk assessment for all agencies’ to promote consistency in how it is applied and reduce any issues of conflict between the agencies. Both oral and written evidence raised concerns over consistency in the completion of SERAFs (see paragraph 2.3.10) across the different agencies and if there was inconsistent scoring this could affect an individual’s access to support services. It was
hoped that a newly introduced risk assessment process would standardise scoring and the introduction of the ‘Willow Project’ (see paragraph 2.3.9) would increase communication with the front line teams leading to greater consistency identifying victims and those at risk of CSE.

2.6.8 As the Panel have found in a number of previous scrutiny reviews the use of multiple systems within and between agencies impacts on the effectiveness of information sharing and in turn in ensuring that individuals receive timely and appropriate referral to support services. Hampshire Constabulary are focussing on the use of technology to enhance efficiency, but are facing challenges in the automation of the risk assessment process due to the number of different system used by partners making the process labour intensive. This view is supported by Fareham CSP who state that ‘reporting safeguarding issues is an onerous, bureaucratic and time consuming process, which needs to be made easier to encourage reporting’. The Constabulary note that these concerns have been identified and that they have sought assistance from the Commissioner to deliver improvements in this area.

2.6.9 Monitoring of prisoners to identify potential CSE concerns was considered to be undertaken on an ad-hoc and inconsistent basis, rather than through a formal structured process. The National Probation Service within Southampton provided an example of how the monitoring of prisoner’s emails and calls had identified a potential ring of organised exploitation. Whilst an initial meeting with partner agencies lead to a clearer picture of concerns, a response from the MET strategic board on how the concerns would be taken forward was outstanding meaning that the situation had not, at the time of this evidence gathering, been addressed either by the Constabulary or referred to analytical services for further investigation.

2.7 With regard to what best practice exists which could also be considered by the PCC as part of his pledge to safeguard children at risk of sexual exploitation:

2.7.1 In addition to the effective interventions and strategies discussed under section 2.5, evidence received by the Panel has further drawn a number of examples of best practice relating to the prevention and identification of CSE.

2.7.2 A ‘Report of Inspection of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council’ by Louise Casey CB in February 2015 highlighted that there were ‘weak and ineffective’ practises in place for taxi licensing within the Rotherham Borough. The Commissioner has identified an opportunity to work with licencing boards
within Hampshire and the Isle of Wight to ask ‘taxi drivers to complete a CSE awareness course as best practice’ as well further widening this work to engage with operators of the night-time economy and private providers of accommodation such as hotels and guest houses.

2.7.3 Within Southampton local issues of serious youth crime, which includes involvement in gangs, illegal drug distribution and serious violence, are being identified through the use of the Home Office ‘Gang and Youth Violence’ tool and from this a Serious Youth Crime Plan has been implemented. The Southampton Youth Offending Service management board is monitoring this plan, identifying any potential links to exploitation of those young people engaged in serious crime in the city.

2.7.4 Portsmouth City Council, in their evidence to the Panel, noted that they had commissioned Barnardos to offer bespoke and targeted CSE training to a number of relevant agencies including local travel companies. Hampshire and IOW CRC recognise in their evidence the Commissioner’s efforts to support other agencies in training their staff on CSE and suggest this could be expanded further to agencies outside of the ‘usual’ statutory partners who may also be able to contribute to the identification of children at risk of exploitation.

2.7.5 Gosport CSP highlighted that the Commissioners previous conferences on Anti Social Behaviour and Domestic Abuse enabled partners to come together to raise awareness and share best practice, and suggest consideration of CSE as subject for a future conference.

3. Recommendations

3.1 Taking the above discussion and evidence together the Panel have noted that the Commissioner and his Office have taken a proactive approach to work with Hampshire Constabulary and other partners to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded, and welcome his commitment to raise awareness and encourage ‘joined up’ working around CSE.

3.2 Reports to the Rotherham inquiry made reference to children in residential units being targeted and sexually exploited within the Borough from the early nineties. Through this report Members wished to probe further any specific measures in place to ensure that looked after children, particularly those in residential units, were protected from the risk of CSE within Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. Sufficient evidence was not received to make a formal
recommendation through this report, however Members would make suggestion that the Assistant Commissioner for Isle of Wight, through her partnership work with local authority children’s services, ensures focus is placed on looked after children.

3.3 Additionally, the Panel suggests that the below recommendations are made to the Commissioner for consideration and response:

**Legacy Review**

a. Once the outcomes of Hampshire Constabulary’s legacy review of case files are known that they are shared fully and transparently with the Panel, who would seek assurance that a wide spread or unknown issue of exploitation, like that seen in Rotherham, does not exist within the Hampshire policing area.

b. That the outcomes of this review are published and the lessons learnt shared with the public to increase public awareness of CSE and increase confidence in the approaches taken by the Commissioner and Hampshire Constabulary to tackle it.

c. Through liaison with Gold Group partners, that the Commissioner ensures that the six executive commitments set by the group are met, and that any learning from the legacy review is embedded into future practice.

**Multi-agency working**

d. That the Commissioner should take a lead, through the work of the Willow Project, in ensuring pan-Hampshire and IOW consistency in the assessment of children at risk of CSE. This should be complemented by the current work of Hampshire Constabulary in reviewing the risk assessment process/scoring.

e. Through engaging partners, the Commissioner should seek to increase the use of shared technology to support the automation of the risk assessment process and to simplify the process and encourage the reporting of safeguarding concerns.

f. That through work with partners, the Youth Commission and using nationally recognised research, the Commissioner should encourage and increased understanding and awareness of how perpetrators are utilising the internet and smartphone-based technology to facilitate CSE, and use
this increased understanding to inform engagement and prevention strategies.

**Commissioning**

g. That the Commissioner should continue to make commissioning funds available for projects which provide early intervention against and support victims of CSE, utilising an evidence based approach.

h. Further that consideration is given to encourage bids for funding which include provision of support to adult survivors of childhood sexual exploitation or to support those victims who are being used by perpetrators to engage other younger children in further CSE.

i. That following APCC IOW’s review of CSE prevention and support programmes which are being delivered in other parts of the UK, commissioning funds are made available to pilot those programmes which are considered to be effective/successful within Hampshire and IOW.

**Engaging partners and the wider community**

j. That the Commissioner should seek to increase engagement from partners within the public and other industry sectors, including:
   a. health partners, in raising awareness of and encouraging the reporting of CSE concerns, particularly with front line sexual health staff.
   b. education providers, through encouraging primary schools to deliver age-appropriate CSE awareness and ensuring that efforts to raise awareness in secondary schools is delivered consistently pan-Hampshire and the IOW.
   c. Taxi and licensing authorities, supporting the Commissioner’s suggestion that the taxi drivers across Hampshire and the IOW are encouraged to complete a voluntary CSE awareness course. Further that, through liaison with local authority partners, consideration is given to incorporate safeguarding awareness specific to CSE within any briefing provided when licences are to be issued/renewed.
k. That the Commissioner identifies further organisations that may benefit from the expansion of the CSE awareness raising training, in partnership with Hampshire Constabulary, with particular focus on the health and education sectors

l. That the Commissioner encourages and supports Hampshire Constabulary in identifying opportunities to increase engagement with BAME communities and faith group leaders across the two Counties in relation to preventing and identifying CSE.

m. That the Police and Crime Panel is included as a stakeholder in the review of the ‘Sexual Crime Strategy’ before its publication
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Appendix Three: Evidence from Those Responding to the Reviews

Barnardos - U-Turn Service

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

Barnardo’s run child sexual exploitation services (U-Turn) in Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and the IOW and we are very impressed with the PCC’s contribution to help combat the sexual exploitation of young people. The service has had several visits from members of OPCC including Simon Hayes, Mark Hill and Laura Franklin. I formed the impression they were genuinely passionate about child sexual exploitation, and interested in the service and assisting in any way they could.

The service has received OPCC funding for work in residential units for direct work with young people at risk of CSE within the units as well as training and supervision to unit staff around CSE issues. Again, the OPCC showed a genuine interest in the work and carried out visits to the units and talked face to face with young people and staff.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

Laura Franklyn has attended the strategic MET groups in each of the LA areas and the 4LSCB strategic MET. I am the Vice Chair of the strategic IOW MET and Laura’s contribution to those meetings has been informative and relevant. Laura often seeks out and cascades information regarding latest research and information at the meeting as well as in-between meetings to group members. I have had several meetings with Laura as she always wants to catch up with latest developments around both the CSE and Barnardo’s Trafficking services.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

Barnardo’s services use a researched model of practice (The4a’s) which is used by all our CSE services nationally as it has been recognised as a model that works for sexually exploited young people. Additionally, Barnardo’s were running a service called FCASE (Families and Communities Against Sexual Exploitation) which ended...
in March 2015. FCASE was a preventative service working with the young person, their parents and the communities in which they lived. The model was evaluated by the University of Bedfordshire and a toolkit will be available to LSCB’s which includes direct work packages for young people and parents. The FCASE model helps to build the protective factors around young people at risk of CSE to help prevent them from becoming involved in CSE.

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

Raising awareness of CSE to professionals, young people, parents and communities including the on-line risks is key to prevention. Police problem profiles and intelligence gathering is key in helping increase prosecutions. It is essential that there is the provision of services and professionals who can get alongside these very vulnerable young people in order to help them get out of their situation. The FCASE model focussing on the protective factors should be embedded in practice across the LA’s.

5) Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?

It is clear that the OPCC are very proactive in responding to CSE and I would want to thank them for their involvement in our CSE and Trafficking services
How well is the PCC working with partners to encourage a joined up approach in tackling child sexual exploitation?

Statutory services continue to fail to appreciate that sexual abuse, includes sexual exploitation, it is not an exclusive subject. To make it so, means that you limit the scope and exclude the majority of children who have been exposed to any form of sexual abuse. We would request, again please, that statutory sector target ‘sexual abuse of children’ and stop using the description of child sexual exploitation – which is often misused to also mean sexual abuse. CSE is usually regarded as being outside of the familial setting – but the majority of children are abused within the familial setting and are then targeted outside of home. The Office of Childrens Commissioner (OCC) clearly recognised this link when they initiated the interfamilial sexual abuse inquiry last July 2014, resulting as an outcome from their earlier sexual exploitation inquiry i.e. that the victims of sexual exploitation had been earlier victims within the home setting.

So the short answer – is that whilst work is being done to bring a joined up approach to cse, it continues (as elsewhere) to mislead away from the greater problem, which is one of the reasons for abuse outside of the home (too).

How is the PCC engaging with the wider community to raise awareness of, and help safeguard against, child sexual exploitation?

The PCC has helped towards funding CIS’ters to host a two major one day conferences “There is an elephant in the room: let’s talk about childhood sexual abuse and rape”. These are on Thursday 4th June in Southampton, and a second conference in Eastleigh on Friday 4th September. In doing so the Commissioner and his team are lending their voices to this complex area of work, and the many victims it affects (children and adults).

What effective interventions and strategies exist to prevent and intervene against child sexual exploitation?

One of the biggest and most effective strategies is to provide role models for young people/children, to help them better understand that what is happening is not ok, and to seek appropriate help. Many of the existing strategies are built around themes such as ‘if someone touches you in a way you don’t like’ – which are meaningless, because many offenders are able to groom children to the point that the child/YP not only doesn’t appreciate that what is happening is wrong, but if there is an element of
sexual pleasure, it becomes even more difficult. So, how is a child to tell someone if ‘they are touched in a way they don’t like’ – if they did. Are we not just heaping on MORE guilt on the child for later years, in the sense that they were supposed to tell and they didn’t. Plus other campaigns around ‘pants’ – again not all sexual abuse involves the groin, much of it is non-contact or if contact it does not necessarily involve the child’s pants or groin – so again, major campaign which completely misses the point.

Our belief is that we need survivors, like those in CIS’ters – to reach out to children/YP in a co-ordinated way to help them realise what is happening and to seek help. Yes, there are young persons and children workers – but none saying ‘do you know what, this happened to ME and it could be happening to YOU and if it is, we want you to get help, and this is how you do it” That is the moment powerful message.

What improvements could be made, if any, to ensure individuals are referred to appropriate services?

The PCC strategy on sexual violence (including sexual abuse) might help with this, but as we have yet to see the draft cannot comment more than that. BUT what does need to happen is that the strategy needs to be Hampshire/IoW pan wide and cover all sectors, i.e. health, social care, police, voluntary sector. Even today, we are responding to an email from a health professional that is seeking appropriate services for a teen – and didn’t know about some of the services that already exist within Hampshire, let alone those that don’t (yet).

What best practice exists which could also be considered by the PCC as part of his pledge to safeguard children at risk of sexual exploitation?

To change the focus to CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE, which covers familial settings and other settings (e.g. schools, clubs etc). Make sure that the spotlight is on all areas, not just one, which allows the others to fall into the dark and those children remaining or becoming more vulnerable. CSE is a minority of victims and is interpreted by other victims as ‘less important’ or that it isn’t abuse if it’s within the home (which abusers will often say to a child).

We need to ensure that not only do we have appropriate safeguarding actions but that there is appropriate and timely after care for the child and non-abusing (proven to be, not just assumed) carers – such as counselling. We would like adult survivors to be involved in the development of such services, if not co-delivering them.
1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

PCC has responded to requests for meetings and involved us in the current ongoing development of a strategy. We have previously voiced the need to NOT view CSE as an isolated theme, but to wrap it up into a wider theme of childhood sexual abuse. We have not yet seen the draft strategy, so are not sure if this request has been fully heard and acted upon.

What we can also say is that prior to October 2013 the subject of CSE or sexual abuse of children and adult survivors was NOT on the PCC agenda – but following successful lobbying by our agency and others, the PCC is more appreciative of the issue and the need to develop robust strategies etc.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

As yet we are unable to say how effective the PCC has been, in a wider sense, we can only comment on aspects that we are aware of. We do know that a strategy is being developed for sexual violence and abuse, which ought then to contain issues relating to ALL aspects of sexual abuse not just CSE – and also the long term impact of such crimes on adult survivors – and the need for effective and timely services for both child victims as well as adult survivors. Again, we need to be talking not only about the rape of adults, but also the rape of children and not watering it down by only talking about the sexual abuse or sexual exploitation of children/YP. There will, clearly, be opportunities following the publication of the PCC strategy (though we have yet to see a draft) to promote further engagement – and look forward to being part of that process.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

CSE cannot be treated in isolation – nor should the level of sexual abuse of children/YP be underestimated. BUT it needs to pull in many different agencies – for example, sexual health as yet (it is our understanding from recent discussions with workers) do not pursue the issue of whether a YP presenting at a SH clinic might or might not be a victim of sexual abuse – they only have ‘time’ to respond to the
request for sexual health prevention i.e. STDs. Nor do midwives routinely seek opportunities relating to teen pregnancies, preferring to believe the ‘line’ that the pregnancy is as a result of some ‘boy’ rather than perhaps sexual abuse. This is what the YP will have said, because they are either too fearful to say anything else, or because that is what they have been told to say by their abuser. Whilst many YP may be pregnant because of a relationship or failed relationship – amongst their number will be MANY YP who have been sexually abuse.

So – some joined up work with sexual health and midwives – and again, with agencies such as CIS’ers.

The proper officer for access to information has resolved that a paragraph provided here is not disclosed, as it contains information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of a crime.

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

That first the police and society needs to better understand the issue, and how children are targeted and groomed and then sexually abused (which is not just about CSE). You can’t just safeguard one segment CSE without causing problems in the wider areas of sexual abuse of children (i.e. mine is not sexual abuse then, only CSE is sexual abuse, so mine is not or it doesn’t matter what my dad is doing etc). So, we need to, as a priority, please, stop confusing the issue by talking about cse – we should only talk about the sexual abuse, including rape, of children. Then – we need to have a culture of not only being able to understand, and then see, but also believe what the child/YP is saying. We also need to understand that in also asking them ‘what they want to happen next’ will be heard in the context of some children saying that they want the abuse to stop – but for dad to not go to prison. This child is conflicted, that’s how abuse works – it doesn’t mean this abuser shouldn’t go to prison – it does mean that this child needs help and support and appropriate counselling. Authorities would never countenance, for example, the scout leader being reintroduced and part of a family where he has abused a child – but if it’s his son, then, that’s ok – especially if the son is saying (or daughter) I want daddy back. But the child is a child and saying that because it felt safer before all the hiatus that followed the truth. The child wants it to be like it was before, because that was safer than now, especially as mum is upset too. Children will often say, I don’t want this ‘relative’ to go to prison – but that is NOT what they say if you ask them decades later. Then, they can’t understand why social services and the police did what they did i.e. took no action and often allowed the abuser back into the home –
where despite everyone’s belief and assurances to the contrary – the abuse did continue.

5) Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?

I think I would like the opportunity for someone from CIS’ters to come to a Panel to talk about this issue – is that possible?
CSP – Fareham

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

Emphasis on victims like anti-trafficking partnership. Good to have Youth Commission involvement.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

Generally working well to address the issue, including awareness raising through Crimestoppers Conference, CSE Awareness Day etc. Improvement to work with licensing authorities following the outcomes listed in the Casey report to ensure we operate “safe taxi” schemes.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

Monthly Fareham Partnership Action Group meetings are multi agency meetings where we discuss victims, offenders and locations. Also this group holds and discusses nominal and risk trackers and missing persons. Barnardos offer an excellent educational package through schools.

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

Reporting safeguarding issues is an onerous, bureaucratic and time consuming process, which needs to be made easier to encourage reporting. We need to do more to promote the dangers of on-line exploitation or produce an app or internet awareness film.

5) Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?
There needs to be better understanding and information sharing from MASH and HCC services. There are too many systems in place which do not allow easy sharing of information.
CSP – Gosport

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

Following the events in Rotherham awareness of CSE has increased both nationally and locally. This is reflected through the inclusion of this issue within the PCC’s Commissioning Plan and through the work of the Youth Commission.

Gosport CSP was successful in receiving funding from the OPCC through the last commissioning round in relation to targeted youth work with a focus on the emerging use of Mephedrone across the borough and the evidenced links to CSE.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

Awareness of CSE has increased in part due to assigning the Assistant PCC as Safeguarding lead and through the request for Hampshire Constabulary and the Local Children’s Safeguarding Boards to review their historic CSE cases.

Further awareness of CSE issues could be arranged with a CSE Stakeholder Event which has proved successful when organised by the OPCC in relation to Domestic Abuse and Anti-Social Behaviour.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

Gosport CSP has established strong links between Hampshire Constabulary’s Force and District Risk Trackers. This enables young people at risk of CSE to be discussed at the monthly PAG ensuring that support can be offered locally where appropriate through local youth support organisations such as Motiv8 or Y Services. Additionally, this raises awareness with partners at a local level and ensures any young people who are showing signs of being subject to CSE can be referred to the PAG with the appropriate support offered.

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?
Firstly, that awareness is raised amongst partners and all organisations which have contact with young people and that appropriate information is available for parents/carers.

Secondly, one a young person is identified as being at risk of CSE then a clear safeguarding plan is implemented with support offered.

5) Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?

No.
CSP – Winchester

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

In the broadest terms the PCC is very proactive in his approach to partnership working. From a community safety partnership perspective he and his team have developed/supported a number of professional forums to ensure that partnership discussions continue to evolve e.g. Community Safety Alliance group, Strategic and Operational MET (Missing, Exploited & Trafficked) board.

The PCC has funded a CSE team to be based across each authority MASH. This will consist of local authority teams jointly working with police officers and PSIs to target offenders, share information and intelligence and to protect vulnerable children being groomed. The police are currently recruiting to these roles.

West Hampshire CCG / NHSE are members of the gold group. Members of the safeguarding designated professional team are members of various groups as part of the MET agenda (chaired by police).

It is recognised that the police have a wider remit that just Hampshire County Council area and servicing all the MET across Hampshire and the IOW meetings has been an issue in some areas.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

Main method of engagement has been via the Hampshire Safeguarding Children Board with presentations and updates on local data, initiatives and learning lessons from national and local high profile cases. PCC leads on strategic and operational MET board supporting multi agency plans and information sharing. Prevent, CSE and trafficking leads from HCC have provided updates to a variety of forums over the last 12 months e.g. CSPs, NHS England Wessex safeguarding forum.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?
The police have established a team to review and investigate current cases of CSE from across the force. This is not linked to the MASH at this time. Missing persons and those identified as vulnerable due to reported and recorded history, associations with others subject to CSE markers are reviewed and assessed in accordance with Hampshire police risk assessment. The individual is then assigned a plan owner to support and manage them with LA support, public protection teams and safeguarding. Further links to OCGs, drug networks and Offender management in place to identify potential offenders and victims. Further links to probation and YOT due to Offender Management Team.

One of the sub groups of the MET shares information regarding high risk cases to appropriate staff across agencies to ensure a co-ordinated approach. We are aware that there are plans to establish a MET MASH lead by HCC.

We were of FCASE, this is a Barnardos Project, Families and Children Against Sexual Exploitation. They have previously covered Hampshire but I am not sure if there remit has changed.

They also have a Trafficking Service and Hampshire Sexual Exploitation Service. FCASE is the only one we have recommended to referrers.

4) **What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?**

- Children services need to identify children who are at risk of CSE and work with police and partners to decide where they should be placed as a residence. It is apparent that some care homes and foster placements are not suitable and expose greater risk to the child. Often care homes fail to recognise their responsibility and pass this risk to police whilst failing to take action and support children.

- Regular information sharing about victims, perpetrators and emerging risks - When a child is identified as being at high risk of exploitation it is imperative that professional services/groups are made aware, and that those agencies link in with the appropriate frontline services as soon as possible e.g. GP’s, School Nurses and Sexual Health services.

- Consistent and standardised use of the Sexual Exploitation Referral Assessment Framework (SERAf) across all agencies. This will hopefully be addressed through the new Multi -Agency Safeguarding
Hub (MASH) new team specific for METs (the Willow Team which the police have firmly committed to participate in). It is hoped that this new team will disseminate information to front line staff in order to keep them informed.

- Encourage multi-agency contribution to CSE audits e.g. health.

5) Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?

The MASH proposal is a great concept and joins agencies and their response.
Hampshire and IOW CRC

Hampshire & IOW CRC is committed to preventing CSE and is a statutory agency for all 4 Local safeguarding Boards across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. Partnership across all agencies in addressing this area of crime is critical if we are to be successful and the Police and PCC both have a central role to play in supporting all activities within and outside the criminal justice system to address this growing and difficult issue. The police and PCC are unable to undertake this work alone and rely on partners to raise awareness within their of the ways in which CSE can be identified and addressed.

It is clear however that the PCC and the Police have taken a lead, together with LSCBs to pursue this agenda. Example of good practice include the MASH teams, more joined up neighbourhood policing, Integrated Offender Management, effective MAPPA working and joined up strategies, for each LSCB to identify and tackle these areas.

The PPC and Police are contributing to how agencies train their staff in ways to address this issue and in H&IOW we are looking at the best way to do this in conjunction with other safeguarding partners. However more could also be done to ensure agencies outside of the statutory ‘usual’ partners are included in this approach as the identification of children at risk is not the role of statutory agencies alone.
1) *How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?*

Hampshire Children Services believe that there is an effective and well established relationship with the Police and Crime Commissioner. The PCC can be seen to be actively engaged within the Hampshire Local Safeguarding Childrens Board’s (LSCB) Missing, Exploited and Trafficked (MET) action plan and there is evidence of engagement at all levels, from strategic senior managers to operational staff. The same applies for the IOW.

Hampshire Constabulary have committed to providing a chair of the 4 LSCB MET Group and can be seen to actively encourage partners within the 4 LSCB arena to gain consistency in practice in both identification of children deemed to be at risk of CSE and the subsequent responses.

The PCC has committed to support the 4 LSCB partners by using their expertise in intelligence to coordinate the Hampshire-wide Problem Profile. The Problem Profile is a monthly report detailing the children deemed to be at risk of CSE and intelligence around hot spots, missing children and perpetrators which are generated from the intelligence submitted from partner agencies. Whilst the document is evolving, it is key to ensuring all partner agencies are working together to identify, manage and respond to the vulnerable children within Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and the IOW.

Most recently, Hampshire & IOW Children’s Services, with the support and cooperation of the PCC, were successful in a joint bid to the Innovation Fund awarded by the Department for Education, to host and lead a multi agency team specifically aimed to assess and safeguard the needs of children who repeatedly go missing or are exploited/trafficked into and within Hampshire – the Missing, Exploited and Trafficked team (MET) – known as the Willow Project. The team will consist of a Children’s Services team manager, social workers, health workers, Barnardos, police and intelligence officers. The PCC has independently funded their workers within this project which has demonstrated the level of commitment and support to partnership working on the MET agenda.

**Aims of team** - The 4 main aims of the MET Team will be to;
- Understand and identify - strengthen the identification and assessment of children at risk of MET
- Prevent - raise awareness of MET issues across agencies, children/young people and their families and the wider Hampshire community
- Intervene and support - Improve safeguarding of vulnerable children deemed to be at risk of exploitation and trafficking. Reduce incidents of children going missing. Provide direct therapeutic support and access to specialist services
- Disrupt and bring to justice – lead in disrupting perpetrator behaviour and bringing those offenders to justice by building an accurate and clear picture of local trends and networks

The Willow Project will be launched in Aug/Sept 2015, however I am aware that the PCC have already identified and committed the specific workers that will be allocated to this project demonstrating their commitment.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

The office of the PCC has undertaken good work in raising awareness regarding CSE with the use of the Hampshire Constabulary website. The Media Relations Officer undertook a significant amount of work to develop a web page for children, young people and their families, with detailed information concerning CSE. The web page is well linked to web based resources that other agencies host.

The PCC has provided high quality training to professionals at various events regarding CSE and have participated in, and supported, awareness raising events run by Hampshire & IOW Children’s Services. They proactively offer their services to partner agencies for any training events that would benefit from having police representation.

There remains opportunities to increase engagement in this area via the 4 LSCB by having coordinated awareness raising events across Hampshire, Southampton, Portsmouth and the IOW. Such collaboration would allow both for the opportunity to pool resources, and equally importantly to deliver a wider, consistent message that professionals across the 4 LSCBs must prioritise this area of work.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?
As above, the development of the Willow Project is a good example. Furthermore, as part of the Willow Project proactive work is being undertaken by the office of the PCC and Hampshire & IOW Children’s Services to develop a ‘toolkit’ of interventions, which will promote creative methods of intervention to disrupt perpetrators using powers available to Children’s Services, the police and partner agencies.

4) **What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?**

Due to geographical areas that the PCC has to cover it is critical for the office of the PCC that there is a consistent tool and risk assessment for all agencies to identify and agree levels of risk, reducing any issues of conflict between agencies and promoting consistent practice.

In addition, on-going work with the Hampshire & IOW LSCBs regarding development of preventative and therapeutic provisions within the community for children at risk of/ victims of CSE.

5) **Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?**

It would be beneficial to all agencies to have case studies that evidence the impact of current interventions to reduce risk and secure positive outcomes for children who are / have been at risk of exploitation.
Hampshire Constabulary

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

Hampshire Constabulary has effectively strengthened its links with a number of statutory and third party organisations in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation. In relation to the PCC, Laura Franklin, the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for the Isle of Wight attends both the strategic and Operational Missing, Exploited and Trafficking (MET) groups which are attended by a number of agencies working together to safeguard vulnerable children.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

The PCC has commissioned a young care leaver to visit schools and speak to children about the issues of CSE. This person has also attended LSCB events and has provided a different view/attitude as someone who has been able to engage with children on a more direct level. This person has also been available to provide advice/guidance to police officers as to how better approach some of these children. Police officers have also been able to gain the views of children through the PCCs Youth panel.

There are also a number of action plans which are both multi agency and Hampshire Constabulary in relation to CSE, identifying good practice and gaps. This includes:

- 4LSCB Strategic Board with 3 year Strategic and Action plan
- Hampshire Constabulary CSE Action Plan
- Hampshire Constabulary Missing Persons Action Plan
- These plans are shared between partners and discussed at the Strategic MET Groups.

In addition there has been a partnership communications campaign “You Are Not Alone” as well as Multi agency partnership safeguarding training events attended by police staff and partnership staff.

A number of publications have been made available to partners to ensure sharing of information to allow informed risk management, this includes:
- Dare to share – problem profile relating to victims, suspects and locations shared with partners
- Missing persons CYPs shared with partners and 3rd sector (Barnados)
- CSE toolkit identifying disruption tactics for all agencies.

There has also been multi agency training delivered in respect of CSE, including:

- Delivery of Chelsea’s Choice to schools.
- Awareness training to probation staff
- Awareness training delivered to 200 GPs and medical staff.
- Our Neighbourhood and Patrol teams are all safe guarders who will know which children at risk of CSE live on their area. They will also be aware via DMM of recent incidents/locations/suspects
- We have set up The Goldstone Team consisting of officers and staff including an analyst working with our partner agencies within the three MASHs. This team works closely with Children’s Services, Health and other partners such as Barnados to identify and safeguard victims of CSE, identify locations and suspects and make use of criminal and civil remedies to disrupt.

There are a number of multi agency groups relating to CSE. These include:

- The MET (Missing/Exploited/Trafficked) groups (both strategic and operational) co chaired by police and CSD These groups identify and discuss those children at risk, agree actions and plan owners. These meetings are well attended by partner agencies once a month. A problem profile is shared at these meetings.
- There is a CSE team start Finish group chaired by police (DI) and attended by relevant heads of CSD for the three local authority areas, identifying blockers and pockets of excellence.
- In addition there is a CSE innovation group chaired by the Goldstone DI to share pockets of excellence within HC arena.

We are aware the there are a number of risk indicators for CSE; therefore we are currently conducting a pilot within Portsmouth which requires all detainees under 18 to be given the opportunity to talk about any CSE concerns they may have.

We are currently reviewing the process for gathering community/partner agency intelligence to ensure that partners are confident in sharing information provided to them to allow a multi agency risk assessment of that child.
Our Neighbourhood and patrol teams have good links within their communities but there is a greater need for good links within some minority groups to ensure victims are confident to report and parents are aware of the risks.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

Hampshire Constabulary instigated a multi agency Gold Group to review the forces response to current and non recent CSE threats. ACC Glen delivered the TOR set by the PCC and analytical work was commissioned covering the periods of concern raised by the PCC 1997-2013 (16 year period), as well as reviewing the current response to CSE under the CSE action plan. As a result a number of non recent investigations have been instigated

We have obtained a conviction against a male who had sex with a very vulnerable child at risk of CSE. Despite her not being willing to assist, her underwear was seized and as a result of DNA found a male who denied contact with the child was charged and convicted of a sexual offence. This was due to robust response from police whilst the child was supported.

A number of children have been successfully safeguarded by intervention by Police and partner agencies. This includes the case of AF, a vulnerable teenage female at risk of CSE (Record Management System) Police worked together with Barnados and CSD to ensure a more positive role in her management. Intelligence was shared indicating the child was at risk of meeting older men for sex, as a result the child was moved into foster care which in turn has had a dramatic and very positive effect on her lifestyle, eliminating her risk taking behaviours.

(Record Management System) – Relates to 14 and 15 year old girl befriended older male for cigarettes and money. The child attended male’s home address where she was raped. A joint investigation resulted in the suspect being charged on the threshold test and subsequently remanded. The suspect denied offence, forensic submissions made and suspects DNA was found on the child’s underwear. This investigation is ongoing and the child is being supported by police and CSD.

Hampshire has set up a team dedicated to tackling CSE. This consists of police officers and staff assisted by a dedicated analyst. The teams work closely with other agencies such as Children’s Services, Health, Schools and third party sector such as Barnados. The team is located within the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASH) thus allowing for greater joint working, information sharing and greater use of both
criminal and civil remedies to help the victims but also disrupt locations used for CSE and also suspects.

4) **What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?**

Hampshire Constabulary have a CSE Action Plan bases on the ACPO National Action Plan based on Prepare, Prevent, Protect and Pursue. The Plan is “ragged” to identify gaps and risk. This shows that links to minority and faith groups is a priority for Hampshire Constabulary.

In addition our priorities are to provide early and early intervention with our partners to identify children at risk of CSE and to safeguard, educate and support both the child and the family.

Disruption of identified locations using both criminal justice and civil orders

Better gathering and sharing of information within the MASH to ensure that we are working with others to identify the greatest risk.

5) **What reporting mechanisms are used by Hampshire Constabulary to record instances of CSE, and how is this data being reported to, and monitored by, the Police and Crime Commissioner?**

PNC markers are victims to ensure cross border awareness when children are located

Spreadsheets of missing and CSE children are owned by Misper coordinators (and CSE team)

All agencies share their lists of children at risk of CSE – this is shared at the MET operational groups.

We are now able to search RMS and provide numbers of children flagged.

There will be a presentation to the Panel from ACC Sara Glen
Love146

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

The PCC has fully supported the Love146 Safe Accommodation for trafficked children from abroad. Some children who are trafficked to the UK are sexually exploited on their arrival. Love146 have been hugely appreciative of the support from the PCC and grateful that they have acknowledged the importance of the immediate safeguarding of trafficked children.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

The PCC have acknowledged that further training could raise the link with trafficking from abroad and sexual exploitation. It is important this training is delivered to front line services.

As the PCC represent on appropriate boards and strategic groups (MET groups, Hampshire Anti-Slavery Partnership), they are well placed to be able to continue to raise awareness of CSE & child trafficking and promote the need for further essential training.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

Our Safe Accommodation works within the multi-agency arena and immediately safeguards victims of trafficking who can also be victims of sexual exploitation. We apply best practice and adhere to the Hampshire 4LSCB Trafficking Protocol.

Love146 also have representation at the West Yorkshire Anti Trafficking Network, created by anti-human trafficking charity Hope for Justice in conjunction with West Yorkshire’s Police and Crime Commissioner. The network is established to provide a strategic meeting framework on behalf of the statutory, non-statutory and third sector organisations in West Yorkshire who contribute to tackling human trafficking and modern slavery in all its forms.

For further information - please see the following:

4) **What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?**

The immediate priority is to ensure children who are trafficked and victims of CSE are identified and safeguarded.

The PCC could continue to support referrals to Safe Accommodation for immediate safeguarding.

The PCC need to continue to ensure front line staff are trained on signs and indicators of child trafficking / CSE, and aware of the resources available for immediate safeguarding.

5) **Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?**

There are currently 3 protocols in place. Missing, CSE, Trafficking. It would be useful to know how the PCC would challenge agencies who do not adhere to protocols / best practice that have been agreed upon.
**LCSB – Portsmouth Safeguarding Children Board**

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

From my perspective I would say that the PCC has helped to raise the issue strategically by commissioning a review following Rotherham. This has added momentum to the commitment of Hants Constabulary to working with partners and ensures the PSCB has a strong strategic link at ACPO level.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

Establishing and maintaining a clear picture on the scale of the problem in Portsmouth and Hants and how effective the police and others are being in moving high risk victims to low risk and identifying predators and key hotspots.
**LCSB – Southampton**

1) **How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?**

   a. The PCC has provided funding towards the implementation of a Southampton CSE Hub, linked to MASH. This is seen as positive.
   b. Southampton LSCB has a published ‘Missing, Exploited and Trafficked’ Plan (see [www.southamptonlscb.co.uk](http://www.southamptonlscb.co.uk)) which details the local approach and offers opportunities for joint work.

2) **How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?**

   a. The LSCB is not aware of the PCC delivering any awareness raising activities directly regarding CSE.

3) **Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?**

   a. There are many particulary in areas where high profile issues have been apparent (Oxford and Derby) – Southampton LSCB are looking at the Derby approach to identifying risks, this is a model used by Portsmouth currently.

4) **What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?**

   a. Southampton LSCB has a published ‘Missing, Exploited and Trafficked’ Plan (see [www.southamptonlscb.co.uk](http://www.southamptonlscb.co.uk)) which details the local approach and offers opportunities for joint work.

5) **Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?**
a. Again see our planned work on the above link. Please contact myself or the LSCB team with any questions – ls cb@southampton.gov.uk
1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

The PCC has established a MET group that meets every 4 weeks to go through a list of potential CSE victims, offenders and locations, checking that the individuals named have SERAFS completed as well as lead professionals, and checking that there is a risk management plan in place for the offenders identified. I feel this works to a degree but in my assessment it continues to be of limited scope and I am not sure how much value the process adds to the tackling of CSE in the city. However, I am aware that there have been multi agency training sessions delivered recently which is good for raising awareness around the issue, which enables professionals to take a more joined up approach.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

As above, there have been some awareness raising sessions offered to all agencies in the city to raise awareness of CSE. I think there is scope for more schools to be educated in this issue, although this is happening increasingly. I think there is an opportunity for the PCC to engage better with local Black and Minority Ethnic Communities and community leaders in order to raise awareness of CSE in these groups, as I feel that CSE victims in minority ethnic groups, for example Asian groups, are under-represented. I also feel that young people should be better educated to enable them to be aware of what to look out for, and for them to have a greater understand of sexual respect and boundaries. This could be carried out in schools and youth clubs.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

I became aware of a small group of offenders being supervised by my service who, on monitoring their mail and calls from prison, I realised appeared to be part of a ring of organised exploitation. My colleague and I arranged a professionals meeting that was attended by many relevant agencies including the Principal Officer from Children’s Services, the CSE lead from the service, police, education and Barnado’s. This meeting proved very useful in establishing a better picture of the problems and
the Principle Officer took the issue to the MET strategic board where we are still awaiting a response regarding our request for an operation to be mounted around these individuals or a data analyst to be able to organise the vast amount of information that continues to come out of this ongoing monitoring.

4) **What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?**

I think there should be a specific team dedicated to contacting those children identified on the MET list to assess what needs to happen to safeguard these children and improve their lives. This should include a universal risk management plan that deals specifically with the risks they are at of sexual exploitation.

There should also be more work put into identifying the Internet sites, apps etc where CSE is also taking place, and once identified, more should be done to educate professionals and children as to what spaces on the Internet are being used for CSE purposes. The Internet is being used to facilitate CSE but we as professionals don’t really have much understanding of how this works, which prevents effective work in this area.

In addition, I have also noticed that many professionals continue to be unaware of the existence of the SERAF (Sexual Exploitation Risk Assessment Form) and the scoring also appears to be quite inconsistent, which must affect the validity of the tool.

5) **Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?**

I feel that our identification of potential CSE victims and offenders is still relatively hap-hazard, although I am aware that on the Children’s Services Initial Assessment tool they are apparently introducing a part that specifically poses the question of risk of CSE, which should help in terms of children referred to Children’s Services.

Also, given that MET includes young people up to the age of 25, there is little scope for picking up potential victims over the age of 16, and funding for support for such young people appears limited. In some cases, young people may be facilitating CSE but also being victimised themselves, and these individuals may need a very specific approach to manage the risks to themselves and the risks they may pose to others.
National Probation Service (South West and South Central), Winchester Prison and the Contract Management Team for the CRC (South West and Midlands)

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

NOMs believe the PCC has worked very collaboratively on this issue.

The PCC has established local inter agency working around the sexual violence strategy which includes CSE. A survey was undertaken in February 2015 where partners were asked specifically about CSE. The PCC has been very supportive to the Invisible Walls project which supports the families of prisoners in custody. The PCC has provided funding for the initiative which has help to strengthen the family intervention work, especially around child protection. The funding has provided ‘Invisible Walls’ with extra resources to enable much closer collaboration with the public protection departments, allowing issues such as child neglect, sexual exploitation and other areas of child abuse to be identified sooner.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

The PCC has instigated targeted e mail and telephone contacts with both voluntary and statutory organisations to gather information and raise awareness. NPS have been asked to contribute to a profiling exercise undertaken by the police to look at serious organised crime in Hampshire, which includes CSE. NOMS will be providing data to support this exercise.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

The Invisible Walls initiative works with men in prison to promote positive parenting. The offender is given the opportunity to talk about their experiences and their hopes and aspirations for their children. Invisible walls promotes the importance of self-esteem and building resilience and about teaching children to keep themselves safe. The PCC has always demonstrated a willingness to work alongside the Invisible Walls project and provided advice and guidance around other services that would be of support to the service.
4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

NOMs feel the priority needs to go to the more complex families who have extremely high support needs. There is a lack of information with regards to the more bespoke services that may be available and these families need greater support in accessing them. More generally, NOMs would find it helpful to have a directory of services
1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

I have been aware that the PCC has CSE high on the agenda via the media.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

Off The Record was one of three partner from the youth information, advice and counselling services (YIACS) in Hampshire that worked with No Limits to host a project worker for the Right 2B Safe project, which was led by Youth Access and funded by the Department for Education. The project ended in March 2015.

The work aimed to prevent abuse, neglect, domestic violence and sexual exploitation and support young people who have a history of these issues or who are currently affected by them. One to one support was offered to help them develop and sustain safe and healthy relationships. Off The Record volunteers were able to make referrals of young people aged to the project for specific support, and the Right 2B Safe project worker also referred clients to Off The Record. Funding was provided by Department for Education via Youth Access and came to an end in March 2015.

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

Project such as the Right 2B Safe project should be continued.
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Response to Rotherham

On the 26th August 2014, an independent inquiry commissioned by Rotherham council published their initial report into alleged widespread organised child sexual abuse. The report condemned the failure of the authorities in Rotherham to act effectively against the abuse and even, in some cases, to acknowledge that it was taking place. It conservatively estimated that 1,400 children had been sexually abused in the town between 1997 and 2013, predominantly by gangs of British-Pakistani men of Muslim faith. Abuses described by the report included abduction, rape, torture and sex trafficking of children.

In direct response to these alarming revelations the Police and Crime Commissioner, Mr Simon Hayes (hereafter referred to as the Commissioner) met with the Chief Constable of Hampshire Constabulary and commissioned an in-depth review. He subsequently wrote to the Chairs of all Local Safeguarding Children Boards and Chief Executives of the four top tier authorities. In this letter the Commissioner informed the recipients of the review and invited them to assist with this process. In consequence, a multi-agency strategic Gold Group, hosted by Hampshire Constabulary, was established. The Gold Group has met 4 times to date and has included key representatives from the following relevant organisations;

- Assistant Chief Constable – Hampshire Constabulary
- PCC or D/PCC – Office of Police and Crime Commissioner
- Director of People – Southampton City Council
- Head of Children’s Services - Southampton City Council
- Principle Officer – Multi Agency Support Hub Southampton City Council
- Director Children’s Services – Hampshire County Council and IOW (HCC & IOW)
- Deputy Director - Children’s Services & Social Care (HCC & IOW)
- Head of Children’s Social Care – Portsmouth City Council
- Director of Public Health – Portsmouth City Council
- Director of Nursing (Board Nurse) – West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group
- Assistant Director of Nursing (Wessex Area)
- Member – Independent Advisory Group
The Commissioner, or, in his absence his Deputy Commissioner has attended each meeting.

In March 2014, the Chair of the Gold Group confirmed that the group had met the initial Terms of Reference set by the Commissioner. There has been joint multi-agency sharing of information to determine the threat and risk, and resources have been assigned to historic investigations. The group has also collectively agreed a way ahead with the key strategic commitments which include;

Commitment 1 - Executive commitment to provide detailed information sharing and analytical work, to ensure a truly collaborative Partnership Problem Profile that reflects the CSE picture in all agencies relating to victims, suspects and locations.

Commitment 2 – CSE allocated resources and processes within the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASH) Executive commitment to dedicate resources to a Partnership CSE Team in order to build victim confidence and close gaps relating to intelligence.

Commitment 3 – Executive commitment to support proactive investigations identified, utilising all legislation available (including civil & criminal legislation) for children identified as High Risk of CSE by known offenders/gangs. Identify pathways of support for victims, follow on support for those reaching 18 years of age & ensure a robust and timely response to proactive Investigations.

Commitment 4 – Executive commitment to support the legacy investigations team in order to address from historical cases any current identified risk to children, and to ensure effective investigation.

Commitment 5 – Executive Commitment to provide early intervention/rehabilitation programmes for children demonstrating concerning over-sexualised behaviour. In particular those identified from reports of missing from home, domestic violence and troubled families.

Commitment 6 - Executive commitment to deliver joined up communication strategies relating to CSE to ensure that all massages relating to CSE are unified, clear & inclusive of all strategic partners.

These commitments have been progressed and the legacy investigations nearly concluded. The members expressed the need to continue with the Gold Group in order to finalise the review of historic investigations. In addition, it is felt that a process is required to oversee the ongoing
investigations until they are completed and assurance that learning from the non-recent investigations is embedded into current practice.

The Commissioner had already identified tackling Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) as a key priority to be tackled within his term of office. Through the Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan 2013 – 17 and public statements, the Commissioner set out his vision to “Protect People & Places”, by supporting victims of CSE and tackling perpetrators. The Commissioner has made it clear that CSE is child abuse that involves people from a range of backgrounds as both victims and perpetrators and is not gender or religious specific etc.

The majority of the Commissioner’s influence in the area of CSE is through his commissioning strategy.

There are four key elements to the Commissioner’s role,

a) holding the Chief Constable to account to deliver his policing priorities
b) to commission a range of services and interventions to meet the needs of Hampshire’s communities
c) influence the work of partners
d) engage with stakeholders to raise awareness and decision makers to influence

How is the Police and Crime Commissioner working with Hampshire Constabulary to prioritise the response to and the protection of those at risk of child sexual exploitation across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight?

The Commissioner recognises safeguarding children is an important area, as a result of which he has appointed Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for the Isle of Wight (Laura Franklin APCC IOW) as the lead officer for safeguarding within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (Rob Jarman) is a member of Hampshire Constabulary’s CSE Gold Group, which is detailed under the introductory “Response to Rotherham” section above.

How effective do you feel the Police and Crime Commissioner has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

The Commissioner is in a unique position to communicate and work with partners at several different levels. The Commissioner is able to use his
position to both raise awareness of CSE as priority issue and influence how partners formulate their approach to tackling CSE.

The APCC IOW, briefs the Commissioner on all aspects of safeguarding which include CSE, trafficking, slavery, honour based violence, female genital mutilation, child protection and adult / child safeguarding issues. This includes keeping the Commissioner updated on any new academic research or best practice both nationally and internationally. This helps to ensure the Commissioner’s policies drive forward key priorities such as CSE.

The Commissioner uses his publications such as his Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report to raise awareness of CSE as widely as possible both with partners and the public. Last year APCC IOW raised awareness of CSE with community safety partners when she addressed Crimestoppers CSE conference.

The Commissioner has used his commissioning strategy to support projects which raise the profile of CSE, these include:

- Barnardos: A six week programme working with families with a holistic approach to tackling CSE.

- Chelsea’s Choice - An innovative and powerful production highlighting the very serious and emotional issue of child sexual exploitation aimed at young people, parents and professional working with young people. The Commissioner has funded this production which has been delivered to all secondary schools, colleges and academies on the Isle of Wight.

- Love 146 – A project working with trafficked young people who are at risk of exploitation. The project provides safe accommodation to vulnerable young people, creating safety plans to protect them from perpetrators.

- Anti Slavery Partnership - The Commissioner has provided £70k to set up a multi agency forum to tackle both child and adult slavery. There are only two other areas in the country with similar partnerships (Bristol and West Yorkshire). The forum has been endorsed by Kevin Hyland the independent Anti Slavery Commissioner for the U.K. The forum will develop a coordinated approach to respond to all forms of exploitation including sexual abuse. The forum is still in its infancy however it is anticipated the policies which will be developed through the forum will be adopted by both adult and children safeguarding boards.
Leigh Park Project – The Commissioner is jointly working with partners as part of a wider community project to reduce crime and anti social behaviour in the Leigh Park area through diversionary schemes. The diversionary schemes contribute towards raising confidence, self respect and esteem, and access to positive role modelling for young people including opportunities to seek help from trusted adults.

The Commissioner's Police and Crime Reduction and his Community Safety Alliance meetings provide an opportunity for further engagement to raise awareness of CSE with partners at both a strategic and operational level.

The Commissioner's Education Charter, which is due to be formally launched on the Isle of Wight in September, provides another opportunity for greater engagement with schools. It is anticipated that all primary and secondary schools on the island will sign up to the charter, an aspect of which focuses on safeguarding. The charter for secondary schools explicitly names CSE as a priority to deliver on.

**Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?**

The four Local Safeguarding Children’s Boards set up MET (Missing, Exploited and Trafficked) Boards two years ago. Each LSCB is expected to have a local action plan in place concerning CSE. The Boards bring several partners together to focus on vulnerable young people as evidence clearly indicates links between trafficked children, missing children and CSE. The specific aims of the Board are to reduce incidents of MET children. There are many different models of and interpretations of CSE which still exist between agencies.

There are currently five Boards across Hampshire and Isle of Wight. One Board for each upper tier authority, beneath which there are operational groups. An overarching pan Hampshire and Isle of Wight strategic Board sits above the four strategic upper tier authority Boards. The APCC IOW is a member of the IOW Board as well as the strategic pan Hampshire and Isle of Wight Board. Attached is the Tor for the MET strategic Board.
4 LSCB
Missing, Exploited & Trafficked Children Strategic Board

Terms of Reference

1. Background:

1.1 The Chairs of all four individual LSCB’s have agreed that a joint focus on child sexual exploitation (CSE) and where appropriate to also focus on the related issues of missing children and trafficked children. This work will be undertaken within a single Board at ‘4 LSCB’ level.

1.2 As an example, the Board coordinated the drafting of the ‘Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Portsmouth & Southampton 4LSCB Missing, Exploited and Trafficked Children Protocol’ agreed in March 2014.

2. Purpose:

2.1 The specific aims of the Board will be to reduce incidents of Missing, Exploited & Trafficked Children by:

- Improving raising awareness of issues relating to CSE.
- Promoting partnership working to tackle the issues.
- Deliver on national guidance and professional best practice where this would be effective to do pan-Hampshire.
- Deliver a Pan-Hampshire Problem Profile.
- Reduce the risks to children by coordinating multi-agency responses across Hampshire where this would be expedient to do.
- Coordinate plans that ensure good outcomes from children affected by CSE.
- Enable all four LSCB’s to respond to the changing trends and risks based on local and national intelligence, research and best practice.
- To recommend changes via the 4LSCB Procedures Committee.
- Develop Regional and National Networks and seek opportunities to share best practice.

3. Responsibilities:

3.1 Each LSCB is expected to have a local action plan in place concerning Child Sexual Exploitation. The Board will agree elements of the action plans that should be:

- Planned and implemented across all 4 LSCBs (i.e. pan-Hampshire)
• Undertaken by individual LSCBs (but there are opportunities for ensuring consistency across Hampshire through sharing strategic plans and feedback on learning and improvement).

3.2 The Board will consider the following 4 themed areas:

• Prevention - including raising awareness with practitioners and managers, leisure and hotel services, the public and vulnerable children and young people.
• Responses - including processes for ensuring a timely and assured response to any referrals (e.g. multi agency procedures, risk assessments, panels to consider children who are at risk of CSE; gathering intelligence).
• Recovery - help for children, young people and parents/foster carers following trauma.
• Disruption and Prosecution - including supporting victims who are witnesses.

4. Governance:

4.1 The Board acts as a sub Committee under the ‘4 LSCB’ consortium. The Board is effectively accountable to each of the four LSCBs, but with responsibility to carry out work on behalf of all the 4 LSCBs where there is consensus. Some plans and documents will need to be approved by each of the LSCBs.

4.2 There is no expectation of a formal annual report although there is a requirement for outputs & outcomes to be reported to each LSCB for inclusion in their individual annual reports.

5. Membership:

5.1 The membership of this Board will be drawn from across the individual LSCB’s. The Board will have sufficient critical mass to ensure the widest possible partnership inclusion whilst remaining small enough to enable efficiency and best value.

5.2 The strategic lead on CSE for each LSCB is expected to attend. This person should be familiar with the plans for each area and the operational responses.

5.3 The following statutory agencies and organisations should be represented:

• Police.
• Health.
• Education.
• Social Care (Children’s Services)
• Probation.
• Youth Offending Team.
• UKBA.
The College of Policing has recently carried out a Peer Review of the CSE response in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. Feedback is currently awaited. This will aid the Commissioner in assessing success at tackling CSE locally but will also provide an opportunity to identify areas for further development.
What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

The Commissioner has publicly stated his commitment to tackling CSE and supporting vulnerable young people through his Commissioning Strategy. There are four priorities for action in the Commissioner’s opinion to ensure children at risk of sexual exploitation are safeguarded.

Partnerships – Working with partners in the arena of safeguarding to identify vulnerable individuals, who require support to protect them from CSE. It is important partners regularly communicate with each other and share information/data so that no vulnerable individual is missed. It is also important partners provide a joined up approach to supporting victims, so a victim receives the most appropriate support at each stage of their journey. A ‘problem profile’ has been completed relating to victims, suspects and locations, which has been shared with partners to inform joined-up working.

Education – A focus on exploitation is required. It is important to work with young people from a very early age to inform them of the dangers of CSE, how and where to seek help from support agencies. Young people need to be educated about the changing nature of risk. A predominant view still exists that harm is most likely to be perpetrated by strangers. The sad fact is that most perpetrators are more likely to be known to the victim, and initial introductions can be made by members of their own peer group. Sound information regarding healthy relationships needs to be delivered from an early age. It is vital to educate the entire community to ensure they are aware CSE is wider than the model predominately shown in the media (abuse of vulnerable girls in care) there are several other CSE models which the public need to be aware of also e.g. an older boyfriend exploiting his younger girlfriend. There are different groups targeted by perpetrators of CSE including boys, homeless children and those with learning difficulties and disabilities. CSE can be perpetrated with other crimes. This involvement in crime or behaviour that may be considered ‘shameful’ by the victim can then be used as a coercive control over the victim to prevent them from seeking help. Sometimes perpetrators gain financially from the exploitation of victims.’

Communication to increase reporting rates – It is important we continue to openly discuss CSE in a public environment rather than attempting to hide it away under the carpet, this is particularly important when CSE may not be reported as vigorously in the media as is currently observable. By continuing to communicate the dangers of CSE, to raise awareness of the issue in the community and successful prosecutions; in the hope more individuals and victims come forward to report abuse to the authorities.
Identification – risk assessment developed (influenced by the Sexual Exploitation Risk Assessment Framework, developed by Barnardos and University of Bedfordshire) and used to identify potential high risk cases of CSE. This is now a standardised tool for local authority Children’s Services. This information feeds into a dedicated multi-agency team tasked with safeguarding those at risk of CSE, supporting victims and disrupting locations and offenders. This includes a dedicated analyst role.

**What reporting mechanisms are used by Hampshire Constabulary to record instances of CSE, and how is this data being reported to, and monitored by, the Police and Crime Commissioner?**

Hampshire Constabulary has several mechanisms through which to record instances of CSE, these include:

- Referrals through external partners agencies – Assessed by Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs and allocated to appropriate teams. Recorded on RMS (Record Management System) with a CSE flag.

- MISPER (Missing Persons) report conducted on safe and well visit and identifies any potential incidents of CSE which would prompt a CYPR (Child / Young Persons referral) and follow the process as indicated above. CYPR referral by the police will record concerns and prompt grading by MASH and information sharing with other agencies.

- All MISPERS at risk of CSE are recorded onto a spreadsheet which is managed by a MISPER coordinator. The risk is regularly reviewed at MET operational meetings.

- Flagging system – Each child deemed at risk of CSE is flagged on RMS, a risk management plan is put in place

- FIB1 is a form used by other agencies to support information that does not come through the referral process. This is a way of reporting information to police which does not amount to evidence of an offence but will provide useful information on potential victims and offenders for further research.

This data is reported to and monitored by the Commissioner through Hampshire Constabulary’s multi agency CSE Gold Group. The Deputy PCC attends this group on behalf of the Commissioner and reports back to him. The Commissioner is also briefed by the Chief Constable on CSE performance through their regular 1:1 meetings. The Commissioner’s
Progress 21 meetings are also used as a forum to monitor and scrutinise CSE data.

CSE is a recognised national priority however we have only scratched the surface of this subject, our knowledge and understanding is still growing. The collection and recording of CSE data is still in its infancy, it will take several more years before we have a clearer view of CSE in our policing area however this is an important journey.

Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?

The APCC IOW has researched a number of CSE programmes which are currently being delivered in other parts of the country with the intention of introducing them across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight in the near future. The Commissioner is keen to support these programmes but further research and evaluation is required before any decision is made to implement these programmes.

CSE Angels – Similar to the street pastors scheme, CSE Angels are trained volunteers who target known hotspots (such as Children’s Homes and Youth Clubs) to identify vulnerable young people at risk of CSE. The Angels engage with young people to inform them of the dangers of CSE and refer any vulnerable young person(s) to the most appropriate service.

DePaul Night Stop Project – Is a service providing safe emergency accommodation for homeless young people aged 16-25 in the homes of approved volunteer hosts. A placement can be overnight or up to two weeks and can mark the first step out of homelessness for a young person. The service prevents young people ending up sleeping rough on the streets, and is particularly useful in preventing CSE by helping vulnerable youths who have run away from home, remain in a safe environment. In 2014 Night Stop provided 13,500 bed and volunteer hosts gave over 200,000 hours of their time.

Day Refuge – Currently there are only two refuges for young people nationally which offer a place of safety for young people. Young people can get something to eat, wash their clothes and recharge their mobile phones. The refuges also provide young people an opportunity to see a GP and access to a counsellor. The two areas where refuges exist have reported reductions in the number of young people missing.

PACE (Parents Against Sexual Exploitation) - Pace is a unique resource which helps parents to understand what is happening to their child and
how parents are the prime agents in helping their child exit exploitative relationships. The organisation has dedicated parent liaison officers who work directly with parents of children who are victims of CSE. The key message for parents is to continue to engage and communicate with their children to deescalate risk.

Parent Support Group – To create a forum for parents of children who are victims of CSE to come together and support each other. The group is currently being developed on the Isle of Wight and external agencies other than the police are being approached to provide professional input and to coordinate the group.

Independent Sexual Violence Advocate – ISVAs support young victims of sexual abuse including CSE. The intention is to increase the number of ISVAs across the Hampshire policing area, currently there are only two.

Campaigns and Training - “Are you ok?” campaign is a force wide campaign delivered to raise awareness of CSE amongst staff to be able to identify vulnerability. This is accompanied by the “You are not alone” campaign which seeks to raise awareness for professionals, parents, children and victims. CSE training has been delivered to 2,100 frontline policing staff in Hampshire Constabulary. Further training has been delivered to over 200 GPs and 80 Probation staff.
Dear Hampshire Police and Crime Panel

Re: 'Child Sexual Exploitation' Pro-Active Scrutiny 3rd July 2015

I am writing in response to your recent request to Councillor Neil Young, Cabinet Member for Children and Education, to respond to the questions posed by the Hampshire Police and Crime Panel in its scrutiny and support of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire to help ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation (CSE) are being safeguarded and referred to appropriate services.

Within Portsmouth there are clear multi-agency arrangements in place to address Child Sexual Exploitation, including the 4LSCB Missing, Exploited and Trafficked (MET) group, the MET sub-group of the PSCB and a Multi-Agency Operational MET group and it is from this organisational context that this response is made.

1) How well do you feel Portsmouth City Council has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation.

Portsmouth City Council is tackling child sexual exploitation through the following activities:

- The City Council is a signatory to the Gold Group Executive Strategic Command; a collaborative executive response to CSE for 2015.
- The 6 key strategic priorities agreed by the Gold Group support the 4LSCB Missing, Exploited and Trafficked (MET) working group and the Missing, Exploited and Trafficked sub-group of the PSCB.
- The Missing, Exploited and Trafficked Strategy developed by the MET sub-group of the PSCB is being implemented locally. Alongside this strategy, a CSE toolkit has been produced to assist practitioners to identify, assess and safeguard children at risk of sexual exploitation.
- A multi-agency operational MET group meets every month to consider the local profile of children assessed as at risk of CSE, missing or trafficked and to ensure adequate safeguarding arrangements are in place. Professionals from Police,
Children's Social Care and Safeguarding, Youth Offending, Health, Education and Barnardos attend this meeting. This meeting is chaired by a representative from our Children's Social Care and Safeguarding Department. Issues from the operational group are fed into the sub-group of the PSCB and vice versa.

- Risk of sexual exploitation is categorised as high, medium and low. For children categorised as high risk a multi-agency strategy meeting is convened under S47 of the Children's Act 1989 and consideration is given to child protection conferencing.

2) How effective do you feel Portsmouth City Council has been in raising awareness of Child Sexual Exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

- A comprehensive training program, 'Chelsea's Choice', has been offered to all Portsmouth schools.
- Barnardos have been commissioned by Portsmouth City Council to offer bespoke targeted training to relevant agencies - including local travel companies.
- Additional e-learning training has been rolled out by the Portsmouth Safeguarding Children's Board (PSCB) to the children's workforce within the City.
- Representatives from Environmental Health and Licensing within the City have been invited to the monthly operational NET group.
- Taxi companies and security staff have been included in safeguarding arrangements for individual children.
- The PSCB organised two workshops last year to raise the profile of CSE and launch the associated assessment toolkit. Three workshops are planned later this month to launch the Single Assessment Framework and revised Early Help and Safeguarding Protocol and CSE will be highlighted at these events.
- An e-safety sub group of the PSCB is in place and a comprehensive programme of awareness raising has been undertaken in line with this across the City.

3) Are there any examples of successful approach to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

- In Portsmouth, an individual CSE assessment tool is completed for each child where sexual exploitation might be a factor.
- The CSE assessment tool allows practitioners to identify the individual's specific vulnerability factors and to analyse known information about areas frequented and associates so as to formulate an appropriate plan of intervention.
- We have commissioned Barnardos to provide a specific service (U-Turn) to children at risk of exploitation, including independent return interviews for children who go missing.
- Support services in Portsmouth include positive activities, counselling, multi-systematic therapy and foster care.
- There have been a number of successful interventions to tackle sexual exploitation in Portsmouth, individual examples include:
  a) prevention of perpetrators from re-entering the United Kingdom when a
work visa expired, a further visa not being issued as a result of shared local intelligence about exploitative behaviours.

b) Our Barnardos commissioned service have liaised with local agencies regarding identification of children in particular local areas.

c) Work between local schools, Police and Children’s Social Care & Safeguarding to disrupt risk of exploitation

- Manchester has implemented a 'CSE Angel Scheme' whereby specifically trained workers are located in CSE hotspots, such schemes are being considered by Hampshire Constabulary locally.

4) What do you think should be the priority for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

- The MET sub-group of the PSCB has established a relevant action plan to progress our local response in tackling CSE.
- There is a need to improve data co-ordination across Police, Children’s Social Care and Safeguarding and Barnardos. The new CSE Analyst in Hampshire Constabulary will assist with this.
- Portsmouth City Council and partners would seek to continuous improvement in this area as we learn more about children at risk of being sexually exploited and effective practice.
- Activity to continue raising the profile of CSE locally will assist in early identification of children vulnerable to exploitation so as to provide the earliest response to prevent exploitation.
Samaritans – Winchester and District

Samaritans provide confidential listening support to all callers, whether by telephone, email, text or face to face. In general we do not offer advice to callers but in the instance of children, there is a national policy to:

'Provide confidential support to children but refer to an appropriate partner (i.e. ChildLine) with caller consent when callers are experiencing specific situations such as those that can cause them serious harm from themselves or others'.

As a local branch of Samaritans, we work within this policy, and wherever we feel that a child is at risk, we will encourage them, if they have not done so already, to contact ChildLine. We do at the same time ensure that they also understand that contact with ChildLine may not be confidential.

During 2014, Winchester Branch had about 1300 contacts with persons under 16 and there were about 40 referrals to ChildLine.
YOT – Hampshire and Isle of Wight Youth Offending Team

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

I am not aware of specific partnership with YOTs in terms of child sexual exploitation per se, but the OPCC works in partnership with YOTs more widely around the prevention of offending and reoffending of children and young people. OPCC also links in with attending the 4LSCB MET (Missing, Exploited, Trafficked) Group of which YOT is a part.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

The police have been proactive in their social media campaigns directed at young people. Awareness amongst partners is already high currently due to the amount of joint and multi agency work that is going on across organisations and safeguarding boards with regards to CSE and MET.

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

The operational MET group in Hants and the METRAC group in IOW. The Hampshire and IOW Children’s services innovation fund bid and the proposed multi agency Willow Team for CSE based in the MASH (see Children’s Services return for further details in response to this question).

4) What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?

The workforce in all agencies is properly trained and aware, and confident using the existing robust child protection processes, and that perpetrators are brought to justice.

5) Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?

N/A
YOT – Southampton Youth Offending Service

1) How well do you feel the PCC has worked in partnership with you or your organisation to encourage a joined up approach in the prevention of child sexual exploitation?

The PCC has not worked with the YOS specifically on this issue. However, OPCC funding, through the Safer Communities grant stream, has contributed to the development of a Child Sexual Exploitation Hub for Southampton. As a result, staff from the local authority (including an Advanced Practitioner for CSE) and police will work together to respond robustly to CSE.

2) How effective do you feel the PCC has been in raising awareness of child sexual exploitation? What opportunities do you feel exist for greater engagement?

The PCC has been clear that CSE is a priority for him. However, I think that the PCC’s profile creates wider awareness raising opportunities (as his campaign around legal highs has illustrated).

3) Are there any examples of successful approaches to preventing and tackling CSE which you or your organisation are aware of, either within Hampshire or in other areas?

Child Sexual Exploitation should be viewed within the wider context of Missing, Exploited, Trafficked (MET). Southampton has a MET Action Plan, published on its LSCB website.

For YOS, one area of related work has been identifying the prevalence of serious youth crime in Southampton. The definition of serious youth crime is young people’s involvement in drug distribution, gangs / groups and / or serious violence.

Young people involved in serious youth crime can be at risk of Child Sexual Exploitation.

In Southampton, the Home Office Ending Gang and Youth Violence tool has been used to identify local issues (including links to CSE) and a Serious Youth Crime Prevention Plan has been implemented; monitored by the YOS Management Board.
4) **What do you think should be the priorities for action to ensure that children at risk of child sexual exploitation are safeguarded and referred to appropriate services?**

In the past twelve months there has been clear developments in the strategic response to CSE across the county. I think it is important that there is shared understanding of the issues across Missing, Exploited, Trafficked work streams; police-led responses to drug distribution and local commissioning around vulnerable children and substance misuse services. The development of multi-agency responses to CSE via the ‘Hub’ model is a key priority. There needs to be further engagement with young people around their perspectives to inform future service responses (Southampton Safe City Partnership commissioned work in 2014 which contains important learning).

Young people’s positive engagement in education, general youth support and targeted service provision has been identified as a relevant factor to reducing risk in a number of recent studies around CSE.

5) **Is there anything further that you can provide to the Panel that will assist us with our proactive scrutiny of this topic?**

No.
# Appendix Four: Abbreviations in the ‘Child Sexual Exploitation’ report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Assistant Chief Constable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPO</td>
<td>Association of Chief Police Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCC</td>
<td>Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Anti Social Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Black Minority Ethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Companion of the Order of Bath (title)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG</td>
<td>Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEOP</td>
<td>Child Exploitation and Online Protection (centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS'Ters</td>
<td>Child Incest Survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Crown Prosecution Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Community Rehabilitation Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Childrens Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Child Sexual Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Community Safety Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP</td>
<td>Child/Young Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPR</td>
<td>Child/Young Person’s Referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Detective Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMM</td>
<td>Daily Management Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>Deoxyribonucleic Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPCC</td>
<td>Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCASE</td>
<td>Families and Communities Against Sexual Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>General Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Hampshire Constabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>Hampshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOW</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISVA</td>
<td>Independent Sexual Violence Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJB</td>
<td>Local Criminal Justice Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCB</td>
<td>Local Safeguarding Children Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPA</td>
<td>Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASH</td>
<td>Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET</td>
<td>Missing, Exploited and Trafficked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRAC</td>
<td>Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISPER</td>
<td>Missing Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHSE</td>
<td>National Health Service England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMS</td>
<td>National Offender Management Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Probation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>Office of the Children’s Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCG</td>
<td>Organised Crime Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC</td>
<td>Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG</td>
<td>Partnership Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>Police and Crime Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>Police National Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCB</td>
<td>Portsmouth Safeguarding Children Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Records Management System (Police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERAF</td>
<td>Sexual Exploitation Risk Assessment Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Sexual Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>Sexually Transmitted Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYOS/YOS</td>
<td>Southampton Youth Offending Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVBC</td>
<td>Test Valley Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y (services)</td>
<td>Youth (services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIACS</td>
<td>Youth information, Advice and Counselling services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOT</td>
<td>Youth Offending Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YP</td>
<td>Young Person/People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>