



College of
Policing

CONFIDENTIAL

Lancashire Police

Child Sexual Exploitation Review

16–19th March 2015

Contents

	Page No:
Briefing note	3
Methodology	3
Introduction	4
Context	4
Overview	5
Leadership/Governance/Partnership	6
Working	
Communication	9
Training	11
Intelligence	14
Investigation/Prevention and Awareness	19
Victims	35
Appendix 'A' –Biography of Peers	37
Appendix 'B' –Review Schedule	40

Briefing Note

The aim of this review was to assess the capability and capacity of Lancashire Constabulary to deal with the threat of CSE.

The team conducted:

- A review of their current position against the National Action Plan and HMIC Review Criteria.
- A review of the Police response and assessment of how they engage with partners to tackle CSE.
- A review of how Lancashire Police works with partners to tackle the threat of CSE.
- A review of the support provided to victims of CSE.
- A review of processes in place to prevent CSE.

The review will consider and make recommendations about the key issues, including:

- The processes and systems in place in Lancashire Constabulary to allow them to understand the scale and nature of CSE.
- The processes and systems in place to mitigate the threat, risk and harm caused by CSE.
- The level of engagement with children at risk of CSE and the extent to which the 'voice of the child' is heard.
- Strategic plans in place to combat CSE and the leadership and governance arrangements in place to deliver those plans.
- The level of awareness amongst front line staff about the warning signs of CSE and the approach of Lancashire Constabulary towards combatting it.
- The effectiveness of multi-agency arrangements in place to deal with CSE with particular regard to information sharing.
- Action taken by Police and other agencies to combat CSE.
- The level of scrutiny and oversight in place to ensure that objectives are achieved.

Methodology

The review commenced on 16 March 2015, the phases of work were:

- There was a document review prior to the fieldwork.
- The College of Policing (CoP) considered the need for any diagnostic and fieldwork prior to the review.
- The CoP identified individuals with appropriate skill sets to be deployed flexibly to manage focus groups of the attendees and conduct the review with relevant staff.
- The CoP reports back with recommendations to the commissioning officer

with observations and where appropriate, suggested improvements.

The peer team members were (pen pictures at Appendix A):

Mark Lee

David Oakley

Jane Jones

Kathryn Preston

Saima Afzal MBE

Diane Davies

Jackie Smart

Introduction

In 2014, the College of Policing received a request from Lancashire Constabulary to conduct a peer review of their arrangements to manage CSE.

It is important to note that the review was not an inspection. The methodology used was qualitative in nature and was made up of a number of interactive interviews between reviewers and staff. Observations and opinions were captured and aggregated into themes. No review of individual investigations was undertaken.

Reviewers considered a variety of strategies and plans which related to CSE prior to the review commencing. In order to bring consistency to the review process, a similar framework is being used across all of the CSE reviews that are being undertaken.

A hot de-brief was conducted during which timely feedback was provided to the organisation. This briefing paper provides a summary of views and highlights areas of exception.

Context

In 2013, ACPO developed a National Plan for tackling CSE and appointed a National CSE Action Plan coordinator tasked with assisting Forces with developing their response to the threat of CSE. The National coordinator has previously visited each Force to offer guidance and to benchmark their delivery against the action plan. The plan is supported by comprehensive guidance set out within the Responding to CSE Authorised Professional Practice (APP).

This review took place over four days with a hot debrief taking place on the fourth day. During that time there were six peers and one team leader involved in the review.

This review is one of a number taking place in Forces across the country regarding CSE and was conducted at the request of Lancashire Constabulary. Each Force involved has signed up to the Terms of Reference (TOR) before any review has commenced.

As outlined in the TOR, this is a short four-day review aimed at highlighting any areas and opportunities for Lancashire Constabulary to improve and continually develop how they operate in this business area.

The report should be considered in this context and it should be accepted that due to the length of time spent in Forces and the number of people interviewed, there is a limit upon what can be achieved through such a review. That said, it is felt by all the agencies involved, both in the National Reference Group and the organisation itself, that this review will, through an independent multi-agency approach, allow Lancashire Constabulary to reflect upon the systems and processes in place around CSE and provide opportunities to improve their service provision in this area.

During the review, the team was divided into three pairs and each pair conducted interviews with those personnel who carry out key CSE functions within Lancashire Constabulary and partner agencies.

Details of the review schedule are attached at Appendix 'B' of this report, which is taken from the schedule of the interviews, outlining the departments, ranks/job role of those spoken to. Finally, this report does focus on those areas that could be improved. It should be read in this context as there were many areas of good practice that may not have all been reflected.

Overview

Lancashire Constabulary is committed to the CSE National Action Plan and is actively addressing its recommendations internally and with partners.

There is a clear vision and determination to engage with partners at all levels with the aim of focusing on prevention, developing and enhancing confidence within the community to report CSE and a drive to bring offenders to justice.

The Review Team found that the clear message that CSE is a Strategic responsibility has reached staff throughout the organisation. Whilst there is some concern about the challenges and implications of likely budget cuts, this does not appear to be detracting staff from their focus.

The removal of traditional statistical performance measures has empowered staff to prioritise threat, risk and harm.

Lancashire Constabulary has made a significant commitment to tackling the challenge of CSE, focusing upon the delivery of an effective multi-agency safeguarding service for the communities of Lancashire.

Leadership, Governance and Partnership Working

It was clear to the Review Team that CSE is a high priority for not only Lancashire Constabulary but also for its partners. The Constabulary cuts across two unitary Authorities and one County Council, Blackpool Unitary and Blackburn with Darwen and Lancashire County Council, made up of 12 districts. There are three Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCB). These are Lancashire, Blackpool and Blackburn and Darwen. There is not, however a post of CSE Coordinator for Lancashire, despite this being a recommendation from the Rotherham serious case review. This matter is again being raised by the Lancashire Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCB).

The three Chairs are Independent and with their Business Managers all attend the Pan Lancashire Steering Group. This is not a CSE specific group but covers all aspects of safeguarding. However, currently all of the Business Managers are represented on the Police led CSE Steering Group.

The Review Team heard that the Pan Lancashire Steering Group had a grip on the issues and LSCB's felt they were held to account by the Group. The overarching governance and linkage provided by the Pan Lancashire approach may be a model worthy of exploration and consideration for other similar parts of the country. However, the team have been provided with information that the governance structure and attendance for these strategic meetings may shortly be changing.

There was evidence of a clear strategic vision for both police and partners which is defined in the CSE Multi-Agency Strategy 2015–2018.

Specialist Middle managers spoken to know the Force priorities and are clearly working to move to a prevention focus across a multi-agency platform. There was a comfortable articulation by staff when describing the shift from a previous rigid method of performance and accountability, to the more victim centred model. However, officers **were less clear about what success looked like**. They could explain actions taken and work being completed, however, **there was a lack of clarity about how that contributed to the overall delivery of an enhanced service to vulnerable children and young people at risk of CSE**. It is very clear that despite this, they knew their roles and responsibilities and victims received a much improved quality of service.

Many Forces are at the start of the journey in relation to CSE, however, Lancashire Constabulary is clearly well on its way. Since 2003 the Force have been developing and improving partnerships and processes to tackle CSE and the Review Team found a clear organisational vision, drive, determination and understanding of its corporate history.

The Lancashire LSCB

As a result of the identification of areas for improvement, Lancashire LSCB commissioned work to take stock of current arrangements and compare the response to children who live in Lancashire LSCB area and to understand good practice (Child Sexual Exploitation – Diagnostic February 2013). The Review Team found an acknowledgment that, until recently, the Police had been driving the Lancashire LSCB out of necessity. There is now a desire to shift the balance and spread the accountability to all partners and that appears to be the case. The data and recommendations will be shared with the Pan Lancashire Strategic Group to drive any identified activity across Lancashire.

Blackburn and Darwen LSCB

The Review Team was impressed with the knowledge and presentation of information received from the Board. No secret was made of the fact that each Board is faced with different challenges and that they do not operate entirely consistently. However, all Boards are signed up to protocols which endeavour to provide the same standard and consistency of service provision across Lancashire. The Review Team heard that there was a lack of clarity as to whether there is a single Risk Assessment tool across areas or partners.

Blackburn and Darwen use the "Risk Sensible" model and the third sector are using diverse models either specific to CSE or generically themed.

The Review Team consider that the Constabulary may seek reassurance that the risk assessment processes in place consistently provide the most appropriate and effective mechanisms to protect vulnerable children and young persons across Lancashire.

The Review Team heard that the Engage Team located within Blackburn and Darwen bring a range of skills to tackle the issue of safeguarding and CSE. There is significant expectation placed on their role and ability to safeguard young people by the use of the appropriate multi-agency or single agency response. This is the same expectation placed upon other multi-agency responses and the Review Team heard that this approach was perceived to be very effective. It is evident that a co-located model is seen as good practice and enables joined up working and the development of strong relationships.

The Blackburn and Darwen Board reviewed 30 cases per year, however, these were self-selected by each agency and therefore may not identify the true nature of the vulnerability issues which need to be addressed.

The Review Team consider that this review of cases approach to lessons learned and good practice is really promising , however, there should perhaps be a more independent approach to case selection.

Blackpool LSCB

The Blackpool Safeguarding Board were subject of an inspection in 2012 and graded to be "inadequate", this resulted in a change of Chair and other members. In July 2014 the Board was again reviewed and this time received a grade of "requires improvement". Again this resulted in the loss of both the Chair and the Business Manager. The Board has not had a Training Coordinator for almost two years. One has recently been appointed. The Current Chair and Business Manager took up their posts in November 2014. These changes have resulted in a renewed vigour and determination to improve with a real focus upon the process of accountability and scrutiny.

The Review Team found limited evidence of a consistent CSE programme in schools, including faith, academy and independent schools, although the team found pockets of good commissioning across Lancashire. For example, The Drama production Chelsea's Choice is being staged in Blackpool as a one off event for the Blackpool Safeguarding Area.

The Review Team heard that there were real opportunities to increase the level of awareness, contribution and referrals through the Education service. More recently the Director of Children's Services has taken the lead for Education which is perceived to be a step in the right direction.

Data Collection

The Review Team heard that the collection of multi-agency data can be inconsistent. The issue has been raised by the Chairs of the LSCB's and will not come as a surprise to the Constabulary that the quantity and quality of the Data submitted to the Boards is inconsistent. Two of the Boards have recently, or are in the process of setting up new data collection models. One using the

Bedfordshire Model and the other the Greater Manchester Police model. When information is provided it can lack clarity. For example, it is not specific to the LSCB area and gives limited victimology. Furthermore, the grouping of victim's ages is Under 16 and 16-24 with the provision of limited ethnicity data which could assist in directing the commission of support services or training. The Review Team heard that the system has changed from approximately two years ago when the data given was extremely detailed. This issue also includes the CPS data which, although providing information on the prosecution rate of 97%, contains limited detail of the victim numbers, attrition rates etc.

The Review Team found limited examples of commissioning to identify the service provision for BME or LGBT victims. Blackburn and Darwen have commissioned activity with money from the "innovation" bid to extend work started by the Health Service, "Adverse Childhood Experiences" (ACE), which may capture some intelligence and create the opportunity to support those vulnerable young adults with Therapeutic treatment. The same Board were challenged by "Project BME" to consider reviewing and changing some of their policies and procedures to ensure consideration has been given to BME communities. They have agreed to do this and the Review Team consider that this approach should be considered by the three Boards when developing safeguarding policies.

Police and Crime Commissioners Office

The Police and Crime Commissioner's office raised three emerging issues which were seen as significant: Predominance of Asian Offenders in the East of the county, a potential increase in male victims and LGBT males in Blackpool. It was also mentioned that some Asian females could be victims. There was some commissioning of a scope of children and adult sexual health services although little detail on this could be provided. What was described to the team as an "informal" piece of work was to be carried out by "Young Lancashire", looking at young people as victims.

Although the Review Team heard of a real appetite from within the Constabulary to engage with the Education service, there was limited evidence produced to the Review Team of a strategy to consult with Faith Groups, Faith Schools or Independent Schools. There had been some engagement with the Council of Mosques but it was limited.

The Constabulary may wish to revisit and reassess the data provided to partners to reassure themselves that it provides a richer picture and enables the boards to set their priorities and desired direction in line with the most up to date and current data available to them.

Summary

Overall, the Review Team found sound partnership working taking place, particularly within the co-located teams and Hubs. The joined up victim centred approach is a credit to the hard work and willingness to change by all agencies. They have shown their commitment to CSE by resourcing and funding. However, the change from 6 to 3 Policing Areas is proving a challenge and a stretch of Police resources. This will need to be monitored to make sure it doesn't significantly impact on the service standards.

The lack of a performance framework for CSE which would support the concept of what success looks like does not seem to have hindered the activity at local level, although it is not clear to staff what good looks like. The message that CSE is a priority is clear to all staff and has translated into tangible change of working practices and activity. This is a credit to the leadership of the Public Protection department and the strategic partners.

The process around data collection could be refreshed and the Review Team consider that this issue would benefit from further consideration.

Communication

The raising of public awareness and understanding of CSE is key to developing public confidence. Lancashire Constabulary at a senior level has a clear understanding that a dynamic and comprehensive communications strategy is a key part of the mission to reduce and combat CSE. The communications strategy features prominently on the;

'Pan Lancashire CSE Standard Operating Protocol (SOP)' and the Local Safeguarding Children Board CSE action plan 2015-2018.

The Corporate Communications Department prepared the current CSE communications plan in May 2013. It is a comprehensive piece of work and clearly reflects the objectives of the 'Pan Lancashire SOP' aims and objectives. The strategy reflects the organisations desire to adopt a transparent approach to media stories, proactively seeking opportunities to talk about the issue of CSE to educate and inform the community. It was noted as promising practice by the Review Team that the plan provides key findings about CSE across the county, giving the reader a sensible narrative upon which to base press releases or engagement with the media.

The plan has been deliberately written to be user friendly in order to reflect the scale of CSE within the county. The policy is fit for local and national media engagement and this is an overarching theme pulled from the strategic assessment. The department's intention is to re-refresh this policy and update it, reflecting the Constabularies current approach to CSE.

The refreshed Communications plan is currently a work in progress, however, no date has been set for publication. The Constabulary should consider setting a milestone date for completion as the current plan is now nearly 2 years old.

The new plan should be jointly written in partnership with the PCCs office and other relevant partners.

The Constabulary were able to evidence strong partnership links and cited the development of the 'The more you know, the more you see' campaign which has been jointly run and funded with the Police and Crime Commissioners office. It is worthy of note that the cultures of the partners are considered and the Constabulary is moving away from naming initiatives prefixed by the word 'Operation' as it is seen to be Police centred and continues to give the impression of initiatives being Police led. Good links with the local media were also noted and the investment in time, building these partnerships could ultimately prove fruitful should further prominent CSE incidents come to light, when balanced reporting from the media could be anticipated.

The head of the communications department sits on strategic boards and has ensured partners see and assist in the development of the communications strategy. Representation on sub-groups (such as the LSCB) is limited, this is due to a reduction in staff within the department. However, they have taken this challenge as a positive, reorganising the department and splitting the team into two. One is responsible for partnership/community engagement, the other consists of specialists such as 'marketing and media'. The intention of this strategy is to ensure any campaigns are balanced and rich in depth reaching the appropriate communities such as those highlighted in the 'red risk communities' assessment'.

Strong evidence was produced to the Review Team and promising practice was noted in the CSE awareness week communications plan. This plan was also supported by a scaled down version for front-line responders to read and note.

It is worthy of comment that the department has a pro-active and positive approach to sensitive diversity issues such as Asian male and CSE. To ensure staff are confident when talking to the media and stay on message the department have produced a ready-reckoner guide to assist staff in what to say and how to say it – headings include 'Asian grooming, how we tackle CSE and recent case studies'.

The Review Team found a mature and experienced team within the communications department and it is clear all staff understand CSE is a strategic threat to the Force. Partnership links are developing with the PCC's office and despite having to do more with less, the Review Team noted a positive and innovative approach.

A new and refreshed communications plan is being developed with partners. The Force website is also being redeveloped with the intention to be news focused and easier for the user to navigate. The Review Team saw this as a welcome development, which will take the communications department from a firm and effective footing to a stronger and more dynamic department. Specialist crime managers within the Constabulary recognise the effectiveness of the department and the organisation should be proud of the initiatives, community work and safeguarding contribution that staff within the department deliver on a daily basis.

Constabulary Website

The Constabulary has produced an excellent website showing its approach and strategy for tackling CSE. It is informative and easy to understand. The website is complemented by a similar CSE information page on the PCCs website. This demonstrates a joined up approach between the two organisations. However, CSE is difficult to locate on the Constabularies website. Casual browsers would not locate it and the exact words 'CSE Lancashire Police' has to be typed into Google. The Review Team felt this was a missed opportunity as the content was excellent, although the team heard that further enhancements and development of the site are due to go live by the end of April 2015.

Internal Communications

Senior managers were able to demonstrate a good understanding of the communication strategy and initiatives such as 'Operation Toledo' showed excellent community engagement with events at local football clubs, Lancashire

Constabulary branded materials and extensive use of social media featured prominently within the initiative.

Good use is made internally of positive news stories, good practice, new initiatives and lessons learned are disseminate across the Constabulary by a member of the HQ Public Protection strategic team who is ear-marked to complete this role. Rewards and recognition for staff are also highlighted via this medium.

CSE Awareness Week/Day

The Constabulary holds an annual CSE awareness raising week which is Police led, but involves all the relevant partner agencies. The intention of the week is to support operational policing, raise awareness, provide the community with advice and help to prevent CSE. Target audiences are offenders, victims and the wider community. The week is highly regarded by the organisation and partners and can only be viewed as an initiative of promising practice. Whilst the Review Team was on site, it was national CSE awareness day. The Constabulary currently holds two CSE awareness days a year, one is partner focused and the other is for Police staff.

The Review Team was able to reality check the awareness day and witnessed 125 staff consisting of specialists, frontline responders and PCSOs attending the event. Each officer was provided with key hand outs such as the 'Grooming line'. Key note speakers were highly relevant to CSE and this resulted in excellent audience participation. Public Protection senior officers attended, opened the event and the head of profession held an online Google question and answer session with the community to further publicise the day.

The Review Team felt it worthy of note to mention the preparation for the day which included an extensive press release, excellent speakers and a large turnout of staff. An internet search show that the vast majority of Police Forces supported this campaign fronted by an ACPO lead.

Training

The Review Team heard that the Force was in the process of producing a current Training Needs Analysis (TNA).

The Review Team had the opportunity to attend some of the activity around National CSE Awareness Day and read the public facing literature. Unquestionably, the delivery was very well received. There had clearly been a lot of thought, effort and planning to make this a success. Key speakers provided a powerful and motivating message and the victim's voice was loud and clear. It was noted that there was a range of staff in attendance and the event was well supported.

The Review Team heard that Lancashire Constabulary and its partners are committed to ensuring that practitioners across a range of agencies have their awareness, learning and development needs met. Similarly, there is also a clear commitment to raise awareness and harness the power of the public to be effective against CSE.

Dedicated training days are built into rotas and the Review Team found examples of regular peer meetings among specialist staff across the area to promulgate learning and good practice.

Specialist resources are readily available to provide advice and guidance to colleagues across the policing family and the Review Team found a good feel of joined up and collaborative team working.

The Review Team heard that the Lancashire LSCB had a program of training in place and rolled out in a tiered approach.

Tier 1-a mandatory e-learning package for all practitioners, which over 300 practitioners have completed. This package has been developed so that it can be modified and updated as may be appropriate.

Tier 2 will be a series of sessions rolled out face to face with all front line practitioners.

The Review Team heard that there is an evaluation process underway to measure the effectiveness of the training undertaken. The evaluation is very robust and does ask those that have completed the training about the usefulness not just in relation to increasing awareness but also how knowledge has been applied in the workplace.

Although the Review Team heard that the training provided is not always delivered at the right level for some practitioners (they were at a more advanced level), the tier 1 training does assist in raising awareness levels across the organisation.

The Review Team heard that the LSCBs share learning from serious case reviews as they emerge amongst key specialists. The Review Team heard additional evidence that learning and development from local and national reports and serious case reviews is promulgated through emails to front line practitioners.

The Review Team consider that it would be beneficial for learning developed from serious case reviews to be embedded within LSCB Tier 1 or 2 training.

The Review Team heard that the NCALT E-learning package can be ineffective and not engaging to practitioners-to quote 'it's easy to just press 'click and return' and the training is complete.'

The Review Team heard that e-learning provided by the LSCB could be more comprehensive.

Furthermore, the Review Team established that practitioners wanted more interactive and face to face training and awareness.

The team accept that there is always a balance to be struck and heard of training challenges encountered through the considerable scale of Lancashire, i.e. the size and the sheer numbers. Whilst staff across the range of roles expressed a preference for face to face training, it is recognised and understood that e-learning did offer a compromise solution.

The Review Team consider that future CSE learning packages would benefit from more of an emphasis on face to face delivery.

The Review Team heard frustrations with regards to centrally designed bespoke training not being delivered in a timely manner, for example in the wake of the Rotherham findings. Basic Command Unit leaders sought bespoke training from

their local CSE teams, Deter, Engage and Awaken, and to the credit of those teams they delivered.

The Review Team is mindful that the development and delivery of centrally designed training can be challenging, it is advised that where local CSE teams support bespoke training, they inform the centre of training activity undertaken, i.e. numbers, who is trained and to what level when locally bespoke packages are designed and delivered.

CSE awareness is well embedded within the Police and key partner agencies, the agreement by all LSCB contributors to adopt CSE as a Strategic Priority demonstrates a clear commitment and determination to invest in this area. CSE awareness is advanced to such a level that the collective can now afford to be ambitious to identify traditionally marginalised and under-represented groups and communities, and reach out to potentially hidden victims.

The Review Team observe that although the communications strategy with a branded CSE multi agency campaign appears to have been extremely successful, there may now be a real opportunity to focus upon engaging and involving marginalised, emerging and underrepresented communities across the protected characteristics as stated within the Single Equality Act 2010. For example, there is a sizeable, South Asian, Polish, Gypsy Romany and Traveller and Lesbian, Gay Bisexual and Trans community footprint across Lancashire.

The Review Team consider that specific face to face, multi-agency and interactive training courses would be beneficial that explore the issues relating to complex communities, victimology of vulnerable and marginalised victim groups as well as the typology of the CSE related Modus operandi.

Some awareness activity has been commenced within 800 schools, however the Review Team heard this was inconsistent across the area. Explanations for some schools being less engaged with the awareness raising activity with pupils included:

- Pupils may be unduly alarmed.
- The diversity of the school pupils and the perception of whether it is an issue within their community.
- There should be an opt-in/opt-out option for inputs to pupils.

Positive steps have been taken to engage with a head teachers group to move forward any training and awareness activity which may be undertaken with the educational practitioners as well as young people themselves.

The Review Team were made aware that there was a willingness from schools to engage with on-line awareness courses therefore consider that CSE awareness might be delivered via other Personal Social Health & Education tools as opposed to being specifically badged as CSE.

The Review Team heard that not all specialist staff had undertaken specialist training, for example the Investigations Team identified they would benefit from the following specialised training:

- Specialist Child Abuse Investigator Development Programme (SCAIDP), specialist victim/witness interview.

- Open source, specialist suspect and mobile phone download
- Achieving Best Evidence (ABE)

The Review Team consider that it would be beneficial to revisit and refresh the training delivered to specialist staff.

Summary

Lancashire Constabulary has demonstrated a clear commitment to ensure staff, partner agencies and the public have a high level of CSE awareness and can be pleased with its achievements.

Whilst there are some opportunities to ensure that the appropriate level of training is delivered to some specialists, the TNA as a work in progress should assist in moving such issues forward.

There is strong evidence of a range of training and development options being used including e-learning, face to face, bespoke specialist training and peer meetings. Police have trained collaboratively with partnership agencies through LSCBs and have received additional delivered bespoke training in accordance with their needs.

With the clear success in achieving a high level of CSE awareness across the police family, Lancashire Constabulary can afford to be ambitious and move to the next level.

Intelligence

There is a clear message from Police, staff and partners that they are aware of CSE and of the expectations placed upon them to safeguard, prevent and bring offenders to Justice. This commitment was relayed at a strategic level, at a practical level by frontline staff and was also reflected in partner perceptions regarding Police prioritisation.

The Review Team found good data and intelligence capture for a range of issues relating to CSE with MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) being in place pertinent to data and information sharing.

There was positive evidence of the development of the Lancashire LSCB diagnostic tool that seeks to capture information across the multi-agency platform, including quantitative data on rates of prosecution, number of PVP (Protecting Vulnerable People) referrals and sexual health information. Additionally the Review Team heard that the Lancashire LSCB CSE sub group receives data on the number of abduction notices.

There was some evidence that the strategic threat assessment and problem profiles were being utilised by partners to provide data to Ofsted, however, some frustrations were shared that the strategic assessment is almost solely based on police data and very limited partnership data. For example, a wealth of data that is available to health is being shared inconsistently.

The aim of a combined partnership data set is for a community diagnostic tool to be agreed across Lancashire in order to ensure area profiles are further developed.

The Review Team also heard of a desire to ensure that the diagnostic tool captures data that can assist in identifying hidden harm, including information relating to multi-faith groups, licensing and the night time economy.

The team did however hear of potential limitations with the capture of data from Health and Education partners particularly in relation to sexual health, truancy and school absence.

The Review Team consider that the LSCB diagnostic tool is a positive step. Sound leadership and governance based upon key Pan Lancashire outcomes, aims and objectives and supported by consistent data sets will be required to ensure that such data is shared in a timely and efficient manner to support the early identification and prevention of CSE.

The Review Team sought to establish whether a strategic CSE problem profile is in place that seeks to inform Force activity based upon a threat, risk and harm model across the 4 P's (prevent, protect, pursue and prosecution), the most current document being over 12 months old. Whilst there is limited evidence of a current and traditional "problem profile," there is an innovative living document sitting with the CSE portfolio analyst which pulls and networks all Police held data in relation to CSE victims. The CSE database is able to provide indications of multiple victim/ offender CSE as well as assisting the organisation with people management. Elements within this database are being effectively utilised to support Divisions in targeting CSE in their respective areas.

This document has been overlaid against the area Organised Crime Group (OCG) and commonality identified; 33 of the 212 OCG nominals have links to the CSE database. These preliminary findings provide an opportunity for exploration and conclusions and should assist the Constabulary in its vision of getting upstream of CSE criminality.

The Review Team sought to make a distinction between the potential implications of a lack of a strategic and traditional CSE problem profile with any local Divisional based profiling using intelligence to target locations, suspect, victims and other CSE related issues.

The Review Team found considerable evidence that Police across the 3 Divisional areas are fully utilising the intelligence that has been generated through the Force intelligence systems, therefore in essence there is clearly intelligence led targeting of locations, victims and suspects at a local and Divisional level.

The CSE target actions are raised via the National Intelligence Model, daily tasking and coordinating is undertaken to carry out specific activity, such as home visits, PNC checks, stopping vehicles, checking on those issued with S2 abduction notices. There is considerable evidence of intelligence led activity focused around the 'target'. Sleuth supports a focus upon deterring targets, i.e. the early action team identify victims that are identified as at risk of or vulnerable to CSE. In addition to the daily meetings where CSE is discussed, 3 weekly meetings occur whereby senior managers hold local managers to account in ensuring business is driven. Members of the Senior Management Team will discuss CSE generated intelligence as well as discuss the target and associated issues and clear triangulation occurs to ensure that threat, risk and harm including CSE is prioritised.

The CSE intelligence led local tasking and coordinating arrangements are clearly embedded within the local neighbourhood and Divisional processes, there is also a strong and a clear accountability pathway with the Detective Chief Inspector ultimately accountable for both CSE and missing persons.

The Review Team found a positive desire to capture not only quantitative, but also qualitative data as well as a need for consistency of data sharing. Analytical work is demanding and capability to function with shrinking resources is challenging.

The Review Team consider that the capability to develop and maintain an effective problem profile across Police and partners is beneficial when identifying need based upon a threat, risk and harm model. It supports the provision of the right resources being in the right place and the effective commissioning of victim services based upon need. **A comprehensive problem profile would further enable disruption and prevention activity to be undertaken by the appropriate partners and practitioners.**

With the advancements made in relation to CSE the Constabulary can afford to be ambitious in their plan to advance further with seeking the "hidden victim".

An innovative piece of work is being developed in partnership which includes the 3rd sector and for which Lancashire County Council holds the lead. Consultation with a cohort of 200 high risk CSE victims using a multi -agency agreed spreadsheet is work in progress, it is intended that the data set will provide good indicators of CSE vulnerability and also with identifying the "hidden victim" and contribute to the "PREVENT" agenda.

The Review Team heard that most intelligence generated through the Force systems is linked to locations, suspects and victims. A significant proportion of children who are experiencing or have experienced CSE are from 'looked after backgrounds' at risk of CSE who may not be on the 'radar' of the police intelligence systems.

The Review Team heard consistent evidence of a strong commitment to ensure missing from home children are located in an urgent manner. The Missing Person Coordinator ensures a link with partner agencies for intelligence and information capture and to harness their intelligence, capabilities and expertise. There is full and robust scrutiny around all missing children who are at risk of CSE. The systems and processes in place around missing person enquiries ensure a strong emphasis across the Police family including operational and specialist resources.

Missing from Home (MFH) Coordinators routinely prepare a "trigger plan" in relation to the higher risk CSE vulnerable people. The trigger plans are found within different locations in different areas. Whilst there was clear evidence that staff knew how to access information about vulnerable people, there wasn't the same level of knowledge regarding the location of trigger plans.

The Review Team consider that the "trigger plan" could be housed within the Storm command and control system under the address tag. This would ensure consistency across the Constabulary and encourage a higher level of professional curiosity around incidents that may otherwise not in themselves raise CSE concerns.

The Review Team heard of challenges relating to managing CSE risk based on Children's homes in the area. Some providers are marketing themselves as CSE specialists which is attracting children with a high level of complex needs. The team found an awareness of the locations and challenges around these homes from a range of staff, in particular, the Missing from Home Coordinators provided an enhanced level of service to these homes in proactively and reactively visiting and also providing training and awareness to new staff, although a high turnover of staff at those care homes was reported. Similarly, the MFH Coordinators have been undertaking risk assessments considering the impact of dynamics of any new placements.

The Review Team consider that this promising practice should be captured and disseminated across the Force area.

The Review Team could not be assured that return home interviews were being provided following all missing person episodes, or of the level of service that a missing person would consistently receive. The team were informed that all missing children in the Blackburn with Darwen area (a unitary authority) receive a return interview from a Local Authority funded Youth worker, however it was not clear if all children from other parts of Lancashire received such a return interview.

The Review Team consider that it would be beneficial for Missing Children return interviews to be considered by the LSCB for another agency such as the Local Authority to take a lead role consistently across the Lancashire area.

The Review Team heard of the challenges associated with Private Children's Homes in particular; there are over 100 private care homes with a real opportunity for them to fully contribute to the ongoing Force and partnership development of the CSE problem profile.

The Local Authorities do share existing data with the LSCB however the LSCB feel they experience real challenges when trying to hold Private Care Homes to account where CSE risks may be identified due to lack of clarity.

The Review Team acknowledge that there is a limited legal requirement for the Private Children's Care homes to identify themselves, provide data and alert police and partners of their existence, however, this represents a real potential challenge to the joint understanding of risk and vulnerability across the county and as such **The Review Team consider that building upon the excellent local engagement with Children's homes across the county together with further engagement with Ofsted (who will be aware of the locations of the Private Children's Care homes) at a strategic level may well be beneficial.**

The Review Team heard of an inconsistency in advance notification of into county placements of children into Lancashire care homes. Whilst this challenge is one that is not unusual to Lancashire there is the potential for compromising the early assessment of threat, risk and harm as part of the safeguarding process for children and vulnerable young persons.

The Review Team consider that development of a memorandum of understanding with the care homes regarding advance and early

notification of any child placed into the area by an external authority would be beneficial.

The Review Team observed the role of the Intelligence Cell working within the Contact Management Unit (CMU). Officers within that cell proactively monitor ANPR cameras and Storm Command and Control, they support call handlers and operational staff with more detailed research which may be required and have a clear understanding of threat, risk and harm with CSE considered a high priority. They have wider IT access privileges and can also access PVP and PND computer systems.

The Review Team heard that activity and information capture of intelligence had the potential to become inconsistent due to activity in the 3 Divisional areas being conducted 3 different ways.

Whilst different practices occur across the Divisions the Review Team heard that all activity is designed to ensure the safeguarding of children. The Review Team observe much of the latter activity is linked to the total commitment to safeguarding that individual practitioners place around children and it would be advisable to ensure that those key commitments, practices and outcomes be agreed strategically to ensure that the legacy of safeguarding and protecting young people is captured on a formal level and as such key outcomes expectations are made clear to all staff, without removing the capacity to consider innovation when deliver local targeted activity.

The introduction of Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASH) is viewed by staff as a positive development. Although the alignment with different Local Authority areas has meant that there is limited consistency across the Constabulary, each unit is none the less providing a positive contribution. There was clear evidence that close proximity working with key partner agencies ensured early assessment and dissemination of information and also encouraged a more effective and appropriate response to safeguarding issues. The co-location also encouraged a better understanding and awareness of partner roles and cross pollinated skills. The Review Team heard that the inception of the MASH had resulted in a 50% increase in referrals, although this presented challenges, it was regarded in a positive light and reflected a commitment by the workforce to safeguarding.

The Review Team heard evidence of 800 schools across Lancashire County alone, the LSCB has identified the scale of engaging with the schools around CSE as 'a risk', evidence was heard by the Review Team that the LSCB would be establishing the post of a CSE co-ordinator role to assist in capturing all information in relation to CSE.

The Review Team did hear of good practice within some schools particularly in Bispham area whereby schools liaison officers who are part of the Prevent and Deter team are based within schools and conduct a range of activity, including:

- Building trust and confidence amongst young people to report 'low level and risk taking' CSE associated behaviours.
- Deliver the CEOPS awareness package for young people.
- Capture key intelligence and data that can be shared via intelligence or a PVP referral, in relation to truancy, drugs related issues or other bullying,

ASB related behaviours including CSE.

- Proactively identify emerging social media communication.
- Open the school at weekends (Saturdays) and during school holidays (6 days per week) to provide a "drop in" service, pastoral services are available to children and young people during the out of hours opening.

The Review Team advise that the above activity be commended as promising practice. Gaps in information sharing from schools were identified with schools based police staff not being consistently informed of relevant information, for example the schools senior management board dealing with drugs possession which escalated to information of the "suspect" having been coerced into supplying controlled drugs and culminating in a sexual offence allegation before the information crossed agencies. It is perceived that identification of a problem is seen as a "negative indicator" by Ofsted and that may well drives a culture not conducive to transparency.

The Review Team consider that the latter issues are discussed strategically at a Local Authority and/or LSCB level to eradicate practices that may potentially inhibit effective safeguarding of children and vulnerable young people.

Summary

There is clear evidence that Lancashire Constabulary prioritises its resources according to threat, risk and harm.

The message relayed by Constabulary Leaders reaches the ground level unfettered, undiluted and with absolute clarity. There is a belief by staff that they are empowered to prioritise vulnerability.

Whilst the IT systems receive mixed reviews from staff, and there is not consistency on where relevant information may be found across the Constabulary, there is strong evidence from staff that they know where to look to find relevant information.

Missing from home return interviews provide a rich intelligence picture, some work is required to ensure that commissioned services are being delivered.

There is clear evidence of the National Intelligence Model (NIM) driving business and staff are clear on expectations. There is clear evidence of effective and supportive supervision and availability of specialist advice as and when needed.

The MASH enhances collaborative partnership working and prompt and effective information sharing.

The Review Team heard of innovative data collection and analysis to proactively identify multiple victim/ offender CSE. Also partnership collaboration to acquire current and relevant victimology to assist with CSE trigger indicators.

These innovative pieces of work may well assist the Constabulary in its vision of getting upstream of criminality.

Investigation/Prevention and Awareness

1) Contact Management Unit

The majority of CMU staff are omni-competent and work as call takers, facilitators and dispatchers. They appeared very passionate about their role, and wanted guidance and direction in relation to CSE so that they can better serve the communities and their colleagues within the Constabulary. The Review Team heard that they understood their role in an investigation and appreciated that it is paramount that the first contact they have with a potential victim/family member may yield the information essential to a serious and high risk investigation. This said they felt that CSE is not an area which staff receive calls about on a day to day basis. However it was acknowledged that they may actually take more calls than they realise due to their developing knowledge base.

What was very apparent is that staff within the CMU had little knowledge of the three CSE teams across the Force, although some staff had heard of Engage but not the other teams.

The Review Team heard that staff are fully appraised with regards to the incidents which should/would be brought to the attention of Public Protection Unit (PPU), it appeared that they had a good understanding of the PPU and CSE roles and responsibilities, although there was lack of clarity as to the best way to make contact with PPU/CSE teams to discuss or obtain advice.

The Review Team ascertained that there is a system on which resources can be checked to confirm who is on duty at any given time. Whilst this system is in place the team heard that the limitation with regards to making contact with the CSE teams was due to variations of e-mail addresses and contact details, which at times would result in an incident being deferred to the following day. If an incident was deferred it would be handed over to the following shift who would make contact with the relevant CSE team and bring it to their attention. This process provides an audit trail albeit brief.

Contact Management staff discussed the categorising of call logs and it was identified that there is not a specific header for CSE or similar and often staff would be recording as 'Personal' which they did not feel comfortable with, and did not feel that this header reflected what was reported/risk associated with the log. The Review Team heard that this could result in CSE concerns being overlooked by the CSE teams and therefore an investigation and safeguarding may not be initiated. There are risk mitigation procedures in place which would minimise this threat, this includes the Intelligence Team within the Contact Management Unit who monitor logs being created on Storm, the Sgt's within the Unit reviewing logs and the daily meetings which review threat and risk.

The Review Team heard that CMU staff had an awareness of the indicators of CSE however this had come from their interpretation of what is reported in the media, and for those who had children/ interest in safeguarding children who would use their instincts to fact find by asking relevant questions to gather information.

Furthermore, the Review Team heard that staff at times found it uncomfortable asking questions detailed in the MFH risk assessment such as "do you think the child is susceptible to CSE?". As much as this is a question which may identify the necessity for further investigation, they felt that they did not have enough of

an understanding and found it hard to explain further what CSE is when asked – especially by a family member of a child.

The Review Team heard throughout the duration of the review that the Constabulary are working hard to deliver key messages about CSE both internally and externally. Not with standing this activity, the team heard that CMU staff were concerned about the potential links between CSE and media perceptions (Asian male offenders) and whether others may perceive that they were making assumptions about an incident/concern they were dealing with based on this perception.

The Review Team heard about a common theme with partner agencies who will specifically report concerns prior to finishing their shift, particularly on a Friday about a young person who may be vulnerable to CSE but whom they are not going to have contact with for a period of time, and as such appear to pass the responsibility/management/risk assessment to the police.

The Review Team heard that there was limited clarity in respect of information sharing by the Contact Management staff – who can they provide information to and what can they share.

Prevention and Awareness

The Review Team heard that staff from the one CMU within Lancashire identified immediately that they have an awareness of CSE however this is mostly as a result of national and local media. As seen elsewhere within this report the Constabulary have a clear plan aimed at raising the awareness and training of their staff.

The team heard that when a call is received into the CMU which may have CSE connotations they will create a log and pass to the DRU to make an assessment of what action should follow, often resulting in officers being despatched to obtain further details prior to forwarding onto the PPU or CSE teams. The log may be passed directly to the CSE teams for further assessment.

The Review Team heard a clear message from the staff that they wanted to provide the best service possible to the communities in which they lived and worked and also to safeguard children and vulnerable young people.

Review Team Considerations

- The creation of a PPU 'Tag' would ensure that an incident would be raised to the appropriate officer/department, also creating an Audit trail. This would also solve a problem that had been identified in making contact with PPU's/CSE teams.
- Contact Management staff would benefit from further training some of which is role specific in CSE and information sharing. The team heard that this would be very welcomed on their training days which occur every three months and they would prefer to be interactive and not just NCALT/e-learning packages.
- In addition to the above recommendation regarding training the Review Team consider that 'Safeguarding Champions/SPOC' are identified and appointed who would be given a higher level of training and who could then disseminate information in their own department. They would also be able to advice on CSE/safeguarding matters to colleagues within the CMU.

- The organisation should reassure the message to staff that when dealing with matters of CSE they should not be afraid of noting links with CSE and Ethnic minority groups. Guidance could be issued similar to that of the communications strategy.

2) CSE Structure

Overview

The Review Team heard that there are 3 Child Sexual Exploitation Investigation Teams within the Constabulary. They are Awaken, Deter and Engage. They are geographically separated, they have the same processes, however, they work differently which is dependent on the demographics of the Communities which they serve. There is an element of hybrid working to accommodate the geographical issues and also the shift patterns worked by both PPU and CSE officers.

They are located within either Police or Local Authority premises.

There is joined up working between the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and the CSE teams, and weekly meetings are held.

The drive is towards the identification of victims, offenders and locations involved in CSE and there are a variety of strategies used to achieve this, including Neighbourhood Policing Teams being tasked to conduct licensing checks on take away food outlets and taxi companies and the use of level 2 tactics.

The Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) holds the Victim Portfolio and CSE has been identified as a priority.

The Review Team heard that the average case load of officers within the CSE teams could be as high as 25. These were all case management but would include Child in need and concerns raised as well as full scale investigations.

The Review Team heard that there was work ongoing to ensure that the Police were not undertaking other agencies roles, thus allowing officers to concentrate on their own areas and responsibilities.

The Review Team heard that the health and wellbeing of their staff was important and although there was a process in place to monitor the effects of being involved in such investigations a clinical Supervision process is to be implemented.

The Review Team heard that in respect of investigations that the resourcing of the CSE teams was under constant review.

It was identified that there were some blockages to the progress of investigations, these include ensuring that the officers had the appropriate skill set and knowledge and capacity to provide the service required.

In response to this the Review Team heard that the training programme for CSE investigators was under review.

3) CSE Teams

The Constabulary is divided into three areas, each has a PPU & CSE Team. The CSE teams are made up of Detective Sergeants (DS), Detective Constables (DC), Social Workers, Family Support Workers, Sexual Health Nurses and Parent Support. The three areas have their own titles – to the west of the county - Awaken, to the east – Engage and to the south – Deter.

The team heard that there are differences between the three CSE investigation teams and found the following;-

DETER – is made up of 2 DS's, 5DC's a full time support worker and 2 x part time staff. They work predominately Monday-Friday day shifts with weekend cover, two staff, split between two offices, dealing predominantly with CSE investigations. Case load is approximately 15 case management cases per officer. The Deter team meet daily for a PPU briefing, a weekly team meeting, a fortnightly intelligence meeting, monthly case management and two x Integrated working partnership meetings (IWP's), across two locations.

AWAKEN – Is made up of a team of 1 DS, 6 DC's, 1 Children's society worker and 1 social worker. Currently they are 33% below the figures provided for DC's. They work predominately Monday to Friday, day shifts, one in three weekends where they provide a generic PPU investigation function, following on from the weekend, the DS would hand over the supervision of any investigations picked up, however the DC will retain ownership of the investigation. The Awaken team are managing in the region of 20 case management cases per officer, there are approximately 15 cases within the court system, and in respect of referrals it is estimated that in the region of 140 referrals are reviewed per month. The team meet for a weekly 'At Risk' multi-agency meeting, a fortnightly risk meeting (Police only), a fortnightly intelligence meeting and 28 individual clinical supervision (which it is acknowledged often goes over the 28 days)

ENGAGE – Is made up of 1 DS, 8 DC's - currently 2 vacancies which equate to 25% down on staffing. Officers work Monday to Friday day shifts, weekend cover included PPU investigations, and officers retain the investigations. In total there are 21 members of partner agencies working within the Engage team. The DS on the Engage team works a 5 week pattern, the DC's working an 8 week pattern, which presents its own challenges. The Engage team hold approximately 15 – 20 case management cases and approximately 140 referrals per month. The team meet for daily multi-agency briefings, fortnightly for case management and CSE intelligence meetings, fortnightly for multi-agency case management, and monthly for case management (Police only).

In addition it was heard that the DS's meet quarterly to discuss best practice, CSE Trends and other matters.

There is also a Strategic CSE meeting involving key partners which reviews the CSE Action plan.

In the whole the DC's are covering 3 sets of nights per year and this is in a PPU capacity in addition there is a night DC from CID.

The Review Team heard that the impact on staff of retaining PPU investigations is detrimental to their CSE and multi-agency work as it results in a period away from the office during the working week, and when they are back onto their usual shift they then have the follow up investigations other than CSE.

The team heard that the current shifts and cover for PPU hinders the ability to be proactive in respect of multiagency CSE work. This is an area which staff wish to pursue and would welcome consideration being given to a change in shift pattern to enable them to be more proactive in combatting CSE.

The Review Team heard that the three CSE teams acknowledge they differ in work practices across the three areas, however the teams are bespoke to the areas in which they operate, the geographic and partner agency differences dictate the work practices, and it was clear to the Review Team that this is appropriate and works. It is not felt by the CSE teams that one approach to working practice is required. It was also made clear to the Review Team that they are working to the same thresholds so far as reviewing PVP referrals, safeguarding and investigations.

The Review Team found that all three CSE teams are working to achieve the same goal, they are passionate in this and show a high level of commitment to this area of work.

Investigation

The Review Team heard that staff had a clear understanding of the CSE priorities and what they were working to achieve. The investigative structure was clear, and they spoke confidently about their managers and the decisions that were being made by them.

The team found that the staff within the departments were there because they had applied to be, or had shown an interest.

The Review Team were confident that Officers had a clear and precise understanding of their role, albeit there were not clear as to where their roles and responsibilities were documented. They fully appreciated the importance of working with others within the Force and partner agencies and it was clear that the multiagency, in particular the co-location of police and partner agencies works exceptionally well and officers spoke very positively of this.

An area that did raise concern in respect of multiagency working was the process of referrals, and how even when partners are working within the same office as CSE officers a referral (PVP) still has to go through a protracted process whereby the information is passed from partner agency to Police, who submit the referral, which inevitably goes through a process but ends up back with the initial RP/officer/dept. – at times it was stated that this may take up to two weeks, especially when the MASH have a back log to process.

Each team have different meetings scheduled, from daily strategic discussions informing an entire CSE team of referrals, risk, threat and harm and decisions made as to how to progress which therefore has a direct impact on victims. Within other teams, this is done on a monthly basis, which may have a detrimental effect on the victims, evidence gathering and investigations and at

times is felt unnecessary as other discussions and actions have already been implemented.

The Review Team heard Officers identified that their main blockage to effective investigation is a lack of specialist training, and **forensic examination of computer equipment**. It was also identified that there are numerous processes/databases which must be updated which is time consuming and often felt to be unnecessary and repetitive. The time these updates can take can impact on the investigation.

The relationship with CPS was different across the teams, one team engaged with CPS Direct, resulting in positive decisions and charges being brought thus providing victims with expeditious updates and results. Officers felt that CPS lacked an understanding of the vulnerabilities of CSE victims, and at times they felt that CPS were not up to date with the CSE agenda. They felt that often they are fighting for decisions to be made, and having to argue with CPS with regards to the victims credibility, and often a debate surrounding third party material is raised and at what point if any this should be applied for/reviewed/disclosed, to identify anything which may undermine the case. It was mentioned that this 'battle' has been lost at this time, due to a recent ACPO guidance with regards to applying for the material, which previously officers may have felt the CPS were 'fishing for'.

The Review Team heard that roles and responsibilities for all within the CSE teams including partner agencies and those partner agencies outside of the CSE teams were clear on the part they play within an investigation and that this was working well.

The team heard that there has been a complete change to the ethos within specific departments, in that the focus is no longer performance led policing/investigation, but that safeguarding is paramount. There was most definitely an enthusiasm and willingness to use different tactics to protect victims and identify victims. Officers were very positive when discussing this topic area and felt it was a very positive change to attitudes and approach.

As a result of the multi-agency co-locations every opportunity appears to be explored and 'no stone left unturned' and there are various perspectives given to an investigation from the offset.

Officers had a clear awareness of the services which third sector agencies can provide to victims and witnesses/families, and how referrals to these at the earliest opportunity will only enhance their investigations.

Prevention and Awareness

The Review Team heard how CSE teams are taking both a reactive and proactive approach to CSE.

CSE officers are building relationships with multi-agency partners, including education to provide an awareness and prevention strategies to both staff and pupils.

The co-locations of Police and partner agencies is assisting to minimise Threat, Harm and Risk from the outset, implementing safety plans, risk assessments and putting early interventions in place within a very short time frame.

The team heard that officers within the specialist departments are confident in their knowledge of information sharing agreements with partner agencies. This appears to have a large 'buy in' from partner agencies, all of which assists in safeguarding victims at the early stages of agency involvement. It was identified that there were inconsistencies across the force in meeting structures between CSE teams. One office holding daily meetings, the other having monthly meetings. It was apparent to officers involved in the monthly integrated working partnership meetings that there was duplication and repetition in respect of a number of cases.

The team heard that level 2 tactics were implemented to protect and safeguard victims, identify offenders and gather intelligence in relation to CSE.

Review Team Considerations

- Reductions to be made to the duplication and bureaucratic procedures in relation to the submissions of PVP documentation.
- To reduce repetition in order to safeguard victims by implementing a corporate approach to strategy discussions. It is recommended that Daily meetings take place, as this would be good practice to provide the support for victims and families, evidence gathering, and completion of fast track actions in line with an investigative strategy.
- Specialist training programme for officers within CSE teams – to include SCAIDP, Specialist witness/suspect interview training, open source and mobile phone download training. All of which will enhance investigations, and the service provided to victims and witnessed.
- A reduction in timescales for triage and examination of computer and digital media through High Tech crime depts.

4) Custody

Investigation

The Review Team heard that staff within custody suites are aware of the investigation structure within the Divisions. They feel very comfortable speaking with and assisting investigators of any rank and although they are aware of the rank structure this does not get in the way of working practices.

The team heard that one of the main issues for custody which impacts on investigations are the number of detainees that are brought into custody who require assessments of some sort i.e. mental health assessment. There is not a nurse based at each station, and it can take time for the appropriate staff to attend the custody areas. At this time the nurse who works custody between office hours is employed by the local NHS, out of hours assessments would be made through MEDACS. There is a criminal justice team who makes contact with and attends custody every morning and will make assessments, research background information in relation to the detainee and pass information/make an assessment over the phone. The Criminal justice nursing contract is due to change and will mean that nurses will be more widely available.

The Review Team also heard that the provision of appropriate adults may add to delays in the custody process.

In the main the relationship with social services are good and prompt – however when it comes to mental health social workers or anyone who is required to make any assessment in respect of Mental health then there can be challenges which can be further complicated if there are cross border issues with social care.

Prevention and Awareness

With regards to young people in custody the Review Team heard that staff have experienced occasions when disclosures of a CSE nature have been made. Staff have made time for potential victims and listened to what they have had to say, then immediately notified the appropriate teams for further action to be undertaken. Staff are mindful that they have received limited training with regards to initial disclosures and how what is said may impact upon investigations. Staff appreciate that if they do not take the time to listen to young people wanting to make disclosures they may never open up again resulting in a missed opportunity to safeguard a child.

Staff have an awareness of CSE but have received limited formal training in relation to CSE and the majority of their knowledge comes from the media.

The Review Team heard that staff often rely on their own knowledge and experience of dealing with Detained Persons – there is an awareness of indicators (not from training) and if comments were made which do not necessarily amount to disclosures of offences, they would notify their Sergeant who would decide what action to take. It would always be noted on a custody record.

Staff are aware of CAWN notices.

There is also an awareness of appropriate referral agencies who can offer a young person support including street safe.

Staff were extremely knowledgeable and understanding. They were passionate about ensuring that processes were adhered to.

Notice boards are available to Custody staff displaying changes to legislation, relevant policy and processes in relation to children.

Staff are aware of 'Sherlock' an internal communications tool – an awareness of the fact that CSE information will be held on this system and can access this system to enhance their knowledge and understanding.

The Review Team heard that Custody officers will make contact with PPU officers and CSE officers if a young person is wanting to talk or make a disclosure. However they feel that they could be better utilised if they had more knowledge of this subject, as they could be the first person a young person makes a disclosure to, as it may be the first time they feel safe to do so.

Review Team Considerations

- Creation of a booklet which provided information and relevant contact details for organisations who could provide support for young people who

have been/ may be susceptible to any type of abuse, but particularly CSE. This could then be used as a reference point for staff.

- To utilise staff training days to better effect. The G4S Custody staff currently only attend training for Officer Safety Training and First Aid. There may be sufficient time on these days to include other topics including CSE. The training is mandatory and would therefore capture all staff.

5) Neighbourhoods

The Review Team heard that currently there are Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPT) in each area of the Constabulary. The team heard that there is very much a multi-agency working practice across the Constabulary.

Joint visits are carried out to troubled and complex families. Staff attend local CSE multiagency meetings, where there is a cross over with MAPPA for those offenders who have previous involvement identified within the communities as being vulnerable – CSE is included in this.

The Review Team heard that the NPT are paramount in preventing and engaging with victims of CSE.

Investigation

The Review Team heard that although NPT officers do carry an investigation workload it is not significant.

NPT staff do identify the links between troubled families/dysfunctional families/ Missing persons and the risk of CSE within these families.

The victim, offender, location problem solving tool is used regularly within the NPT, and has been used to disrupt potential perpetrators of CSE – locations for example takeaways, taxi ranks, parks etc. Intelligence is disseminated via e-mail to the NPT requesting that this is actioned and as such the teams will target / disrupt / gather further Intelligence and identify immediate risks making dynamic risk assessments and taking appropriate action.

The review Team heard that there are Information sharing protocols/agreements in place which cover most agencies and NPT staff feel confident in sharing information.

Risk/ harm /Threat assessments are carried dynamically and form a basis for everything that the NPT carry out on a daily basis.

Awareness and Prevention

The team heard that the NPT understand that they play an ever increasing part in combating CSE in their areas.

Staff use the NCALT awareness packages. NPT staff have taken part in CSE awareness weeks, getting into the community/schools and posting on internet what actions they were taking.

The Review Team heard that teams have taken a proactive approach to talking about CSE – an example of the approach which has been taken is that a PCSO came to Supervision and asked to carry out Safe use of the internet education to parents, very positive response from the community and asked for another day. This was not in response to an incident/issue.

The team found that there are Transforming lives panels in place – CSE features in this, assessments are made and if CSE is identified then appropriate referrals take place.

HARMAN – This is a system which holds information on identified vulnerable people within the community. Risk assessments are also held on the database. The Review Team heard of a desire to put regular Missing persons or young people who are identified as being susceptible to CSE on this database which will pull together all logs relating to the nominal thus enabling officers to see the 'bigger picture' as to what is going on with the vulnerable person. Tasks can be set from this system, reviews can be completed. The team heard that this system could be better utilised in respect of CSE. The system is accessible to all staff.

The Review Team heard that links between Neighbourhood Policing Teams and schools have been somewhat eroded.

The Review Team Heard that teams are benefiting from the removal of performance targets and felt that this was a huge shift for the better.

Review Team Considerations

- 'Safeguarding Champions/SPOC' are identified and appointed who would be given a higher level of training and who could then disseminate in their own department. They would also be able to advice on CSE/safeguarding matters to colleagues within the NPT.
- HARMEN system to be more effectively utilised in cases of CSE.

6) First Response

The Review Team heard that there are occasions when 'lower level' CSE investigations may be managed by a Response Officer.

A call is received and an officer dispatched, their initial actions will be to obtain an initial account, ensure that all safeguarding measures and safety plans are in place. They will then liaise with the CSE Team. After discussion the CSE Team may leave the investigation with the attending officer.

There was little clarity about how this decision is reached and the rationale behind it.

The Review Team did hear that the staff understood that CSE was of the highest priority and were aware of how seriously the Constabulary dealt with CSE.

The Review Team heard that there are Response Officers who have been trained in ABE and are therefore capable and willing to be involved in this type of investigation.

It was made clear to the Review Team that if the investigation became more complex it would be escalated to the appropriate CSE Team. It was also confirmed that there was a good working relationship between the teams.

Awareness and Prevention

The team heard about the process of handling reports, and how calls are coming in daily which have CSE connotations. Generally Response Officers will attend in the first instance and will take first contact notes/gather initial investigation, and then refer to the relevant departments to progress.

The team heard that there is a sound awareness of the fact that CSE is a priority and how seriously the Constabulary are taking this matter. There is an understanding that this is an area of organisational risk to the Force.

The team heard that staff knowledge of CSE is sound, and NCALT packages have been completed, this contained information in respect of indicators of CSE and how to respond to these indicators. Not all officers have completed this training. It was identified that this is not Police led, and that some training had come from the local authority.

The team heard that in the main there is a very good relationship with children's social care with Policing teams and partner agencies working well together.

It was identified that Schools are not consistently sharing information in a timely manner managing disclosures appropriately and not acting accordingly, i.e. reporting to police and referring to CSE which potentially has an impact on the victim, evidence gathering, and the investigation.

The Review Team heard that staff are very much aware of the CSE teams in Force who they consider to be approachable.

Follow Up Investigation

The Review Team heard that officers within the PPU work towards completing the SCAIDP programme and Tier 3 witness and suspect interviews.

The Specialist Child Abuse Investigator Development Programme (SCAIDP) has been recently offered to some CID officers.

The team heard that relationships on the whole are good between departments who will assist each other to progress an investigation effectively and efficiently. Teams are aware of the importance of working with partner agencies to afford victims the best possible service.

The Review Team heard that blockages to investigations include time restraints and the multi-agency approach not taking such a proactive part in the investigation, with partner agencies on occasion happier to let the police lead and progress.

High Tech crime again featured, with resources, funding and the time it takes for results all cited as challenges, however, at times and with the appropriate authority it can be progressed extremely quickly. The Review Team heard that specialist staff are more than willing to progress, it is the process that delays this.

The Review Team again heard that staff are on occasion frustrated with some of the processes that CPS are implementing. In particular requesting all details in respect of third party material prior to charging decisions

The team heard that the PVP referral process is easy and purposeful, but on occasions bureaucratic.

The Review Team found that departments often obtain more information and intelligence from the Protecting Vulnerable People (PVP) referrals than from their respective Intelligence department. This highlights the importance of PVP referrals being completed fully and in a timely manner. They are a great tool for sharing information and ensuring that concerns are raised. There is absolute confidence in the PVP referral from the teams and direct managers within the three CSE teams. On a whole there is a positive attitude towards the referrals across the Constabulary, and an understanding of why they are necessary.

The team heard that there is **little understanding of role of the MASH**, other than receive and review PVP Referrals. There is a lack of clarity as to what part they play, but it is known that they have involvement with Domestic Violence. The team have heard that the MASH will receive the PVP Referrals in respect of CSE and that these will be reviewed and screened. Checks will then be made on them prior to being forwarded to the CSE Teams.

The Review Team again found a commitment and desire not just to effectively investigate CSE but to also carry out preventative work which is in line with the Strategic Vision of the Constabulary.

Review Team Considerations

- To provide training to First Responders which is interactive and face to face, to include detail of the changes in technology, Social Media streams and how they work.
- Further communication/discussion with schools in respect of timely information sharing, the impact on the victim and the effect on an investigation.

7) CPS

The Review Team heard that there are approximately 300 cases carried by Lancashire and Cumbria CPS.

There are two courts at Preston, a court at Lancaster and one at Burnley. Cases are also committed to Liverpool Crown Court for Ormskirk cases.

The team heard that there is an overall awareness of CSE and the risks involved with these cases. There are specialist lawyers who have received specific training including Rape and Serious Sexual Offences (RASSO) training. They have also received training inputs in respect of national guidance.

Arrangements are in place for early advice to be requested in Rape and serious sexual cases, including CSE. Following an initial review by a lawyer at the early advice stage an advice file would be requested, and would be further reviewed by the same lawyer in order to formulate a charging decision.

There are 18 specialist RASSO lawyers who cover the whole area. As of the 1st April there will be a RASSO unit in which the lawyers will be ring fenced, purely dealing with RASSO Cases.

The team heard that in relation to indecent image cases, lawyers view approximately 16 specimen images for each case prior to a decision being made. A workshop has been held by CPS with police in relation to indecent images.

ABE's/VRI's are sent through with the advice files and viewed. Lawyers would consider a charging decision if it was a custody case, however they would also consider viewing ABEs at the office.

There is an s.28 pilot across the country which is being run locally in Liverpool, this relates to the pre-recording of the cross examination of victims. There is very positive feedback due to the quicker timeframe. Another perceived benefit is that the judges are closely managing the cross examination.

The Review Team also heard about the young witness initiative programme, signed up by Police, CPS and the Court, which means that cases are expedited under the protocol. This refers to cases involving children under 10yrs and results in a turnaround within 7 days for a case decision. The 7 days starts when the RASSO file is received, the cases are then progressed more quickly through the entire process.

The Review Team heard of issues locally with regards to third party material undermining the case prior to charge. CPS have lost cases due to material that then comes out late in the day which significantly undermines the prosecution case. Within the area this has been discussed as a senior level and some progress has now been made.

Alison LEVIT QC produced an interim report which is now National Guidance relating to a merits based approach to CSE investigations. The team heard that reviewing lawyers are now placing less emphasis on any previous convictions of the victim, and their behaviour, removing myths and stereotypes but looking at the wider implications and the **credibility of the complaint rather than the complainant.**

Decision makings follows the National CPS Guidance for charging decisions. The local CPS follow national standard operating procedures.

The Review Team heard about issues relating to the quality, content and inconsistencies with advice files. In response to this CPS managers have and continue to work to improve file submissions. Two local workshops have been held in respect of charging and advice files.

The team heard how the areas CPS and courts are working towards transforming summary justice. This involves getting a case ready from the early stages and is reviewed thoroughly prior to the first appearance at the Magistrate's Court. The intention with this process is to enable CPS Lawyers to have discussions with the defence at the earliest opportunity. There is also less opportunity for the case to fall down, or be delayed. Lawyers who have a better understanding of the case from this early stage may promote an early guilty plea. Thus saving time for Police, CPS and the courts, but more importantly the benefits for the Victim of

an early resolution, are that there is a reduction in the adverse effects on the victim and witnesses.

The Review Team heard that there could be more focus needs to be placed on the importance of victim support throughout the court process, in particular Special Measures. The team further heard that this is one of the CPS Directors priorities and lawyers have been directed to consider special measures at the earliest opportunity. An intensive supervision programme has been implemented within local CPS, focusing more on the victim. Individual Quality Assessments (IQA's) are carried out with each lawyer, to assess their working practises, and to offer guidance and support taking into account Special measures, intermediaries, Independent Sexual Violence Advisors (ISVA), victim and witness care. The IQA process has been completed on one occasion and a further stage of reviews are being carried out and improvements noted.

The team heard that the CPS direction on RASSO advice files is that they should be turned around in 4 weeks. Recently there have delays in this due to back logs, however this should now be back on track for a 28 days turnaround.

The team heard that a CPS representative attends a quarterly multi-agency meetings chaired by Superintendent Murphy. This meeting is specifically in relation to CSE and the RASSO process.

There are clear lines of communication between the CPS and the police, at all levels. Joint working is ongoing to resolve breakdowns in communications that do occur. Already a single point of contact has been appointed by the CPS to provide updates.

The Review team heard that there can be frustrations on both sides, but due to the good working relationship with the Police, from the senior management down they are able to have open and honest discussions, although they may not always agree.

It was apparent that the CPS management felt supported by the Police.

The Review team consider that the appointment of Police RASSO Gatekeepers who will review all RASSO files prior to submission to CPS would be beneficial. Their responsibility would be to raise the standard of files, to ensure the appropriate content, to return the files if not up to the required standard and set action plans for officers. This would ensure that the standard of case files is raised and are submitted to CPS complete, that charging decisions can be made quicker, thus providing a better service to the victim, and offender and potentially reducing bail times.

Furthermore, joint CSE training would be beneficial to enable Police and CPS staff to discuss the complexities of such cases and therefore provide a shared understanding.

8) MARAC and Safe Centre

The Review Team heard from a number of representatives across the partner agencies all of whom have varying levels of awareness and involvement with

CSE. There were differing agendas and priorities between the agencies represented and more so across the differing county areas.

Some of the representatives were lacking in confidence in respect of their agencies priority in relation to CSE. This impacted on knowledge of CSE and understanding of where to access training and information. That said representatives wanted to heighten their awareness and knowledge and were keen to assist in the prevention, information gathering and sharing and identified that their areas of business could positively contribute.

Some of the representatives, from agencies where it would be expected, had completed LSCB Training. Representatives from these areas very aware and knowledgeable of CSE, they were seeing cases presenting themselves on a daily basis. The same representatives were aware of their CSE team within Lancashire Constabulary and were working with them very well, the professionals felt very confident in the Police and their responses.

The team heard that in relation to Safeguarding within Hospitals across East Lancashire staff at all levels in a variety of Departments very aware of CSE, the priority given to it and who Police contacts are within relevant departments. A CSE Hospital GAP analysis has been conducted and the findings of that are now being addressed with gaps starting to be filled.

The Review Team heard that staff across the hospitals are briefed and are aware of the concerns and are engaging in the safeguarding processes. The one area where it is felt there may still be gaps is Accident & Emergency, the concern being that potential victims could be treated and released into the 'care' of the abuser without the appropriate assessments being made. The team heard that this area of risk is being addressed.

The team heard from partner agencies that the Lancashire LSCB website is a good point of reference for training and guidance.

The team are confident in the services provided by the ISVA's to victims of sexual crime, and the work done at the Safe Centre. The team heard that both of these services are provided by the NHS Trust. The two ISVA's have a case load of approximately 150. However the service only see self-referrals over the age of 16 years, but it is clear that any child Under 16 would be entitled to access the service and would be supported through any initial forensic examination, thereafter appropriate referrals would be made to other agencies who would offer the ongoing and necessary support and advice.

The Review Team consider that the continued and enhanced engagement with the health sector in particular would support the Constabularies vision of engaging with children and vulnerable young people and at early stage with a focus firmly upon prevention. Additionally, communicating the roles and contact details of the CSE teams to all relevant agencies would be beneficial.

9) Wellbeing and Welfare

The Review Team heard that there was current provision and improvements being made to ensure the welfare of those staff who were involved managing CSE cases.

The Team heard that there were counselling sessions provided for the CSE Teams on a 12 monthly basis, these were mandatory however there was a lack of clarity as to whether all officers were attending.

Other departments of the Constabulary who may come into contact with this type of case on a regular basis did not appear to have structures in place to ensure the same level of emotional wellbeing support for their staff. However these members of staff did have some confidence that they could speak to their Supervisor/Team leader, but did feel that they were expected just to "deal with it" and also they may be admitting they were a "failure" if they could not.

The Constabulary is about to implement Clinical Supervision for those staff involved in such investigations, to ensure that there is support in place and that officers are equipped to do their job.

There are also Wellbeing Champions and there is an internet based welfare portal available, "The Great White Wall", which allows staff to access support and obtain advice anonymously.

Victim Support

Context

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child highlights the right of every child to be heard in matters that affect them. During the review, the Review Team explored where '**the voice of the child**' might be heard.

Findings

The Review Team considered the victim journey and concluded that the CMU staff were conscientious and committed to obtaining as much information as possible from the initial calls, to enable them to conduct and carry out checks, which is time consuming. There was a real focus placed upon ensuring that nothing was missed that could potentially place children and vulnerable young people at risk. The team heard that CMU staff would at times be 'off line' for up to 40 minutes to complete actions/enquiries relating to calls for service, which impacts on the CMU resilience, and that they were conscious of this, however they were supported by their supervisors.

The team heard that in respect of the sharing of information, the CMU staff were unsure about who they can provide information to and what information they can share.

Neighbourhood teams in areas of the Constabulary work directly within minority communities and the Review Team heard that the relationships and engagement is good.

The team heard that there is a good focus and engagement with local children homes – staff and NP teams will Intelligence gather in respect of this and be involved from the planning application stages onwards.

The team found that there are clear consistencies around working practises across custody suites in the Force and staff are transferable and can work at any

police custody suite dependant on demand and need. Staff are employed by G4S, CDO/Senior CDO (1 at each station) a manager running two custody suite and a contract manager for the Constabulary. Staff feel very much part of the service and more of a Police member of staff rather than G4S staff. They explained that they are continually asked questions about the process by officers and it appears that officers have faith and trust in the custody officers.

The team were given clear messages from officers within the CID, Reactive teams and PPU that the victims are at the forefront of any investigation and that the change from being performance led to Victim led and focused is enhancing the service provided.

The Review Team heard that there was some lack of knowledge and awareness in respect of support for victims and families, however it was confirmed that the CSE teams would be the first point of call in the areas and that these departments are all very approachable.

The Review Team considers that drawing in victim support services further and ensuring they feel valued as partners will improve the overall service and support provided to vulnerable children and young people.

Appendix 'A'

Peer Team: Biography of Peers

Mark Lee FCMI

Mark is a Leadership Consultant and College of Policing Associate who was the Team Leader for the CSE review. As a Greater Manchester Police (GMP) officer he served on seven diverse Metropolitan Boroughs during his extensive career. His roles included Chief Inspector Operations for Manchester City Centre, Intelligence Unit Manager at Bolton and Criminal Justice, Custody and Burglary Lead for the largest Borough in GMP.

Mark performed the role of Superintendent for nearly four years, including that of Force Performance Lead and Neighbourhoods, Criminal Justice, Custody and Detainee Investigation Units Lead at Oldham. As Head of CCTV Operations in GMP he was also the CCTV Key Task Commander during three political party conferences and a member of the ACPO CCTV Working Group.

He successfully represented the City of Manchester before two Parliamentary Select Committee Hearings and was a member of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. One of three National Team Managers for the College of Policing Efficiency and Knowledge Support Unit, he has led critical friend review and inspection activity in over twenty organisations, covering such diverse areas as Counter Terrorism, Serious Acquisitive Crime, CSE and Collaboration Arrangements.

An experienced College of Policing Leadership Tutor he is also an Accredited Peer, a UK representative on a four year EU-China Police Management Forum and has recently returned from a Security and Justice deployment on behalf of Her Majesty's Government Stabilisation Unit supporting the development of Police Leaders in Libya.

Saima Afzal MBE

Saima has worked in the field of research and community development particularly in relation to religion, gender and South Asian culture for the last 15 years. She has led on a variety of projects such as domestic violence, forced marriages, child sexual exploitation and conducted research in areas such as drugs and substance misuse in the South Asian communities, sexuality in Islam, childcare provision for South Asian women, use of stop and search powers by Police Officers against minority communities to name but a few.

Saima served for over 10 years as an Independent Member of the Lancashire Police Authority, and continued to serve as an Assistant Police & Crime Commissioner in Lancashire for 2 years with a key portfolio area to lead on supporting 'Victims' of crime. Saima now is an established trainer and researcher in her own right as well as being an Associate of the College of Policing.

Saima was recognised for her work when she received the MBE for her Services to Policing and Community Relations in June 2010. Saima was also awarded an Honorary Fellowship in Oct 2013 by Blackburn College in recognition of her academic contributions as well as her campaigning activity in the fight against discrimination and violations of Human Rights.

Dave Oakley

Dave is a serving Detective Chief Inspector with over 29 years service in Sussex Police and is currently working in the specialist crime command branch in Public Protection. He has the force lead for Domestic Abuse and Harmful Traditional Practices. This entails working at a strategic level within the force and with partners. He has recently completed a 3 year secondment to the States of Jersey police as a temporary Superintendent where he was involved in designing and delivering a Criminal Justice Department and led a force review which delivered a parish policing model.

He currently assists the Prince's Trust with the mentoring and placing of young persons on the 'Talent Match' programme into employment, training and education.

Jane Taylor

Jane retired from policing in March, 2014 after serving 30 years with Devon and Cornwall Constabulary. Jane served in across Devon during her many and varied roles but her interest lay in the safeguarding and she became the head of profession for the force in 2007. In 2003 she developed an awareness scheme after the Murder of Janine Mundy (J9). The scheme rolled out both within the area and many other local authorities across the country. In 2011 it was the preferred awareness scheme in the government's strategy, 'Violence Against Women and Girls'. The accompany DVD is used to train Family Liaison Officers and has been translated into several languages and viewed across the commonwealth and Croatia and Serbia.

Jane has been a Peer for the college of Policing for a number of years and has conducted many reviews both as a police officer and an Associate of the College. Jane also trains awareness and investigation of Honour Based Abuse and Forced Marriage and works in intervention with young people excluded from mainstream education.

She is the mother of two boys, 21 and 14 and when not committed with all of the above Jane is a Registrar and enjoys her weddings most weekends.

Kathryn Preston

Kathryn is a serving Detective constable within North Yorkshire Police. Kathryn currently works within the Protection of Vulnerable Persons unit based at York, investigating Child abuse, domestic abuse and vulnerable adult cases.

Kathryn has experience in working within neighbourhood policing teams, priority crime teams and more recently has working as a Domestic Abuse officer for the last 3 years, risk assessing domestic abuse, dealing with the child protection, working daily with partner agencies to reduce risk and involved in the safeguard processes.

Diane Davies

Diane is a serving Detective Inspector within Dyfed Powys Police. Diane has over 20 years Operational experience predominantly within CID and PPU

environments. Diane is currently assisting her own Force in reviewing the response to CSE.

Jackie Smart

Jackie has worked for North Yorkshire Police for the whole of her 23 years Police service. She was fortunate very early in her career to be part of the implementation of the Force Crime Support Unit. She spent 8 years with the team before being promoted and returning to a uniform role. This was as the supervisor of teams covering the largest most rural area in the Force.

The Public Protection Unit, which later became MAPPa, was her next move in 2004, and since then she have worked within this sort of arena to the present day. Jackie is currently the T/DI of the Protecting Vulnerable Persons Unit at York. She finds this work challenging but hopes that her commitment to the members of the public she have served and the teams she has worked with has been apparent. It is something very close to her heart.

Appendix 'B'



CSE Review draft schedule:

College SPOC: Niel Cuzen; T: 0772 575 7794, email:

niel.cuzen@college.pnn.police.uk

Monday: 16th March

09.00hrs	Peer team meeting at HQ		
10.00hrs	Presentation on Force's CSE – CSE Lead- ACC Mark Bates / Det Supt Sue Cawley		
	CoP Team 1	CoP Team 2	CoP Team 3
11.00hrs	Head of Crime/ Head of PPU	LSCB Chair	LSCB Business Manager
12.30hrs	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
13.30hrs	DCI's/DI's PPU	Focus group PPU DS's	Focus group-FCR/call handlers
15.00hrs	Break	Break	Break
15.15hrs	Focus group PPU DC's/PC's	Tasking/briefing /Intel Units	PCC's office staff member
16.30hrs	Peer team de-briefing	Peer team de-briefing	Peer team de-briefing

Tuesday: 17th March

	CoP Team 1	CoP Team 2	CoP Team 3
09.00hrs	Focus group- Missing persons coordinator	Custody Focus group	Focus group Children's Society/PACE
10.15	Break	Break	
10.30hrs	Focus group Response/NPT PC's	Focus group Response/NPT Sgts	LSCB Chair LSCB Business Manager
11.00	Governance/Performance Manager		
11.30hrs	break	Break	Break
11.45hrs	Governance/Performance Manager	Focus group Schools officers/liaison officers	Focus group SOTI/First responder
13.00hrs	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch

13.45hrs	Focus group- Safeguarding staff	CPS	Focus group YOT's etc.
14.15hrs			LSCB Business Manager Blackpool
15.00hrs	Break	Break	Break
15.30	Focus group Operational Social Work Managers & partner equivalents	Focus group Response Insp's	Focus group- Safe Centre/MARAC
16.45hrs	Peer team de- briefing	Peer team de-briefing	Peer team de-briefing

Wednesday: 18th March

	CoP Team 1	CoP Team 2	CoP Team 3
09.00hrs	Time for any other brush up Interviews/debr iefing	Time for any other brush up Interviews/d ebriefing	Time for any other brush up Interviews /debriefing
10.30hrs			
11.30hrs	break	Break	Break
11.45hrs	Poss. Visit to MASH/ CSE team		

Thursday 19th March

- Full debrief and feedback to the Police Force on findings and recommendations. **DCC Rhodes'** office 11-12