



National Child Protection Inspections

West Yorkshire Police
15-29 August 2014

January 2015

© HMIC 2015

ISBN: 978-1-78246-696-3

www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmic

Foreword

All children deserve to grow up in a safe environment, cared for and protected from harm. Most children thrive in loving families and grow to adulthood unharmed. Unfortunately, still too many children are abused or neglected by those responsible for their care; they sometimes need to be protected from other adults with whom they come into contact and some occasionally go missing, or are spending time in environments, or with people, harmful to them.

While it is everyone's responsibility to look out for vulnerable children, police forces, working together and with other agencies, have a particular role in protecting children and ensuring that their needs are met.

Protecting children is one of the most important tasks the police undertake. Only the police can investigate suspected crimes and arrest perpetrators, and they have a significant role in monitoring sex offenders. Police officers have the power to take a child who is in danger to a place of safety, or to seek an order to restrict an offender's contact with children. The police service also has a significant role working with other agencies to ensure the child's protection and well-being, longer term.

Police officers are often the eyes and ears of the community as they go about their daily tasks and come across children who may be neglected or abused. They must be alert to, and identify, children who may be at risk.

To protect children well, the police service must undertake all its core duties to a high standard. Police officers must talk with children, listen to them and understand their fears and concerns. The police must also work well with other agencies to ensure that no child slips through the net and that over-intrusion and duplication of effort are avoided.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) is inspecting the child protection work of every police force in England and Wales. The reports are intended to provide information for the police, the police and crime commissioner (PCC) and the public on how well children are protected and their needs are met, and to secure improvements for the future.

Contents

Foreword	2
1. Introduction	4
2. Background	4
3. Context for the force	5
4. The police role in child protection	7
5. Findings: the experiences, progress and outcomes for children who need help and protection	9
Initial contact.....	9
Assessment and help	10
Investigation	14
Decision making	16
Trusted adults.....	18
Managing those posing a risk to children.....	19
Police detention	20
6. Findings: leadership, management and governance	22
7. Findings: The overall effectiveness of the force and its response to children who need help and protection	26
8. Recommendations	28
9. Next steps	30
Annex A Child protection inspection methodology	31
Annex B Glossary	34

1. Introduction

This report is a summary of the findings of an inspection of child protection services in West Yorkshire Police, which took place in August 2014. The report comprises nine chapters in three main parts. The first part provides information on the background to the inspection and to West Yorkshire Police. The second part focuses on the inspection findings, and the third part looks to the future and makes recommendations for improvement.

2. Background

Between October 2011 and March 2013, HMIC was involved, on a multi-agency basis, in a number of child protection inspections. Along with evidence of strengths and effective practice, these inspections highlighted areas for improvement, in particular: the quality of joint investigations; the identification of risk; dealing with domestic abuse; and the detention of children in custody.

To address these issues, HMIC decided to conduct a programme of single agency inspections of all police forces in England and Wales. The aims of the inspection programme are to:

- assess how effectively police forces safeguard children at risk;
- make recommendations to police forces for improving child protection practice;
- highlight effective practice in child protection work; and
- drive improvements in forces' child protection practices.

The focus of the inspection is on the outcomes for, and experiences of, children who come into contact with the police when there are concerns about their safety or well-being.

The inspection methodology builds on the earlier multi-agency inspections. It comprises self-assessment and case audits carried out by the force, and case audits and interviews with police officers and staff and representatives from partner agencies, conducted by HMIC.¹

¹ Details of how we conduct these inspections can be found at Annex A.

3. Context for the force

West Yorkshire Police has approximately 9,054 staff. The work force is made up of:

- 4,857 police officers;
- 2,802 police staff; and
- 679 police and community support officers.²

The force provides policing services to a population of around 2.2 million and covers an area of 783 square miles across five local authority areas.

West Yorkshire Police is divided into five geographically based districts, each of which shares a boundary with a local authority. The local authorities are:

- Bradford;
- Calderdale;
- Kirklees;
- Leeds; and
- Wakefield.

Leeds is the major city in the force area with a population of approximately 757,700. The other districts within the force area cover Bradford with a population of 522,500, Kirklees with a population of 423,000, Wakefield with a population of 325,800 and Calderdale with a population of 203,800.

The five local authorities are responsible for child protection within their boundaries. There are five separate local safeguarding children boards (LSCB)³ in the force area, one in each local authority administrative area.

The most recent Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills judgments for each of the local authorities are set out below.

² *Police workforce, England and Wales, 31 March 2014*. Home Office, www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-workforce-england-and-wales-31-march-2014

³ LSCBs have a statutory duty, under the Children Act 2004, to co-ordinate how agencies work together to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and ensure that safeguarding arrangements are effective.

Local authority	Judgment	Date
Bradford	Requires improvement	February 2014
Calderdale	Inadequate	June 2013
Kirklees	Good	October 2011
Leeds	Adequate	September 2011
Wakefield	Adequate	November 2012

In West Yorkshire Police, the safeguarding central governance unit (SCGU) oversees safeguarding across the force, including child and adult protection.

The unit also has responsibility for:

- the ViSOR⁴ unit;
- the serious case review team;
- the alarms department⁵; and
- the serious offences review team⁶.

Public protection services as a whole are led by an assistant chief constable. The SGCU is led by a detective chief inspector, supported by a detective inspector, who reports directly to a superintendent in the performance improvement unit.

Operational delivery of child protection is the responsibility of the chief superintendent (district commander) in the five districts. The district commander is supported by a superintendent (child protection lead) and a detective chief inspector who has management responsibility for the district safeguarding unit.

At the time of the inspection, in August 2014, the force was actively negotiating with its partner agencies to establish multi-agency safeguarding hubs (MASHs) across the force area. Wakefield established a MASH in January 2014.

⁴ The Violent and Sex Offender Register (ViSOR) is a national information technology system for managing people who pose a serious risk of harm to the public.

⁵ This department is responsible for installing alarms in homes of vulnerable people to protect them from harm.

⁶ This team conducts risk assessment on individuals who are of concern but do not meet the level of ViSOR.

4. The police role in child protection

Under the Children Act 1989, the police service, working with partner agencies such as local authority children's social care services, health services and education services, is responsible for making enquiries to safeguard and secure the welfare of any child within their area who is suffering (or is likely to suffer) significant harm.⁷ The police are duty-bound to refer to the local authority those children in need they find in the course of their work.⁸ Government guidance⁹ outlines how these duties and responsibilities should be exercised.

The specified police roles set out in the guidance relate to:

- the identification of children who might be at risk from abuse and neglect;
- the investigation of alleged offences against children;
- their work with other agencies, particularly the requirement to share information that is relevant to child protection issues; and
- the exercise of emergency powers to protect children.

Every officer and member of police staff should understand their duty to protect children as part of their day-to-day business. It is essential that officers going into people's homes on any policing matter recognise the needs of children they may encounter. This is particularly important when they are dealing with domestic abuse and other incidents where violence may be a factor. The duty to protect children extends to children detained in police custody.

⁷ Section 47 of the Children Act 1989.

⁸ Section 17 of the Children Act 1989 places a general duty on the local authority to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in their area who are believed to be 'in need'. Police may find children who are 'in need' when they attend incidents and should refer these cases to the local authority. A child is 'in need' if he or she is disabled, unlikely to achieve or have the opportunity to achieve a reasonable standard of health or development, or if their health and development is likely to be impaired without local authority service provision.

⁹ *Working Together to Safeguard Children: a guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*, HM Government, March 2013.

Many teams throughout police forces perform important roles in protecting children from harm, including those who analyse computers to establish whether they hold indecent images of children and others who manage registered sex offenders and dangerous people living in communities. They must visit sex offenders regularly, establish the nature of risk these offenders currently pose and put in place any necessary measures to mitigate that risk.

To ensure that agencies co-operate to keep children safe and look after their welfare, each local authority must establish an LSCB. The five LSCBs in the West Yorkshire Police area are made up of senior representatives from all agencies (including the police). They promote safeguarding activities, ensure that the protection of children remains a high priority across their area and hold each other to account.

5. Findings: the experiences, progress and outcomes for children who need help and protection

During the course of the inspection, West Yorkshire Police audited 33 cases in accordance with criteria provided by HMIC. Although the force was not asked to rate each of the 33 self-assessed cases individually, practice was viewed as good by the force assessors in 17 of the cases, adequate in 7, inadequate in 3 and the remaining 5 were assessed as requiring improvement. Inspectors reviewed all 33 cases that had been self-assessed. They found 9 cases to be good, 7 adequate, 7 requiring improvement and 10 inadequate.¹⁰ Inspectors identified more weaknesses in practice than the self-assessors. Inspectors selected and examined a further 64 cases where children were identified as being at risk. Seventeen were assessed as good, 20 adequate, 12 requiring improvement and 15 inadequate.

Initial contact

Across the range of child protection cases we examined, officers responded quickly to clear and specific concerns about the immediate safety of children, such as sexual abuse and neglect. Officers often undertook prompt and thorough enquiries, searched for suspects and used their power to arrest when necessary. In most of the cases, they checked on the immediate safety of the children and gathered relevant information before making an assessment about how best to proceed. For example:

- a mother reported her two children, aged four and seven, missing from home. Officers responded immediately and found that the home was in a terrible condition and there was little food. The children were found wandering the streets wearing scant clothing and were taken into police protection out of concern for their safety¹¹. Medical examinations were sensitive to the children's needs. The mother was arrested for neglect and the children placed with foster parents;
- a 14-year-old girl told her teacher that her father had assaulted her with a bat. Police and social workers carefully considered the best approach to gain her confidence and prevent further harm. An interview and medical examination were promptly arranged, and her father was arrested. Careful work with the

¹⁰ The case types and inspection methodology are set out in Annex A

¹¹ Section 46(1) of the Children Act 1989 empowers a police officer, who has reasonable cause to believe that a child would otherwise be likely to suffer significant harm, to (a) remove the child to suitable accommodation and keep him/her there or (b) take such steps as are reasonable to ensure that the child's removal from any hospital, or other place, in which he/she is then being accommodated is prevented.

girl at this early stage exposed a history of chronic domestic abuse within the family.

When further input was necessary – for example, a joint visit with children’s social care services or a medical examination – this was organised promptly. Officers were sensitive when undertaking initial contact and interviews with children who had been sexually abused.

In all 17 of the sexual abuse cases examined, inspectors found that the initial contact was good. Police investigations usually involved prior discussions with other people in the child’s network, such as a parent or social worker, to determine the best approach. The officers considered the age and development of the child plus any special needs. Officers engaged well with the children, sometimes taking the first steps through an intermediary and gaining the support of the parents. Careful attention to this first stage was successful in building a rapport with children and obtaining good evidence to support prosecutions.

Generally, police attending an incident of domestic abuse checked that a child was safe and well and ensured their immediate safety. However, the behaviour of a child was often not recorded. A child’s demeanour, especially in those cases where he or she is too young to speak to officers or where to do so with a parent present might present a risk, provides important information about the effect of an incident on the child. This should inform the initial assessment of the child’s needs and whether a referral to children’s social care services is necessary.

We recommend that, within three months, West Yorkshire Police improves staff awareness of the importance of understanding and assessing a child’s demeanour; ensures that a child’s demeanour is recorded in domestic abuse incidents; and ensures that this is used to assess the risks to the child and his needs.

Assessment and help

In most of the cases examined by inspectors, some follow-up action was taken. In those cases where there was clear evidence of abuse or neglect of a child, contact with children’s social care services was good.

There were many examples of agencies working well together – identifying risks, making plans to reduce these risks and supporting children and families. Inspectors found good practice in co-located multi-agency teams, such as the Wakefield MASH. This environment enables officers, social workers and health professionals quickly to discuss a case and determine the best approach. In one case, an eight-year-old boy told his parents that he had been sexually abused by a fourteen-year-old neighbour.

A strategy discussion¹² immediately took place and the boy was interviewed that evening by specially-trained officers. Officers assessed the risk posed by the suspect and his family were involved with officers at an early stage. With the family's full support, a management plan was agreed to prevent further harm to other children.

However, some multi-agency teams were less developed, for example in Leeds, and this led to inconsistencies in practice across the force area. Police officers in the Leeds partnership vulnerability unit found it difficult to cope with the high volume of referrals. Discussions with social workers were delayed on occasions, particularly after a weekend. There were also delays in assessing the needs of children involved in domestic abuse incidents – delays of two weeks in some cases.

Although initial assessments and immediate protective measures were often good, inspectors had significant concerns about how little the police were involved in longer-term plans for children who were most at risk. If a child is considered to be at risk of significant harm there may be a need for a child protection plan and an initial case conference¹³ will be arranged. In Calderdale, police attended most case conferences (30 out of 38 in a three-month period). However, in Leeds, police attended just 8 of 160 conferences, in Bradford 3 of 66, in Kirklees 13 of 45 and in Wakefield 10 of 59. Although written reports (of varying quality) were often submitted, this is no substitute for the presence of police officers at discussions about those children in West Yorkshire who are most at risk and in need of help and protection.

Inspectors found senior officers and operational officers provided a mixed, and often confused, explanation for this poor attendance. For example, some said that national police guidance stated that they did not have to attend. However, this guidance is out dated and no longer in circulation.¹⁴

¹² Whenever there is reasonable cause to suspect a child is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm there should be a strategy discussion involving local authority children's social care, the police, health and other bodies such as the referring agency. This might take the form of a multi-agency meeting or phone calls and more than one discussion may be necessary. A strategy discussion can take place following a referral or at any other time, including during the assessment process. *Working Together to Safeguard Children: a guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*, HM Government, March 2013, chapter 1, page 32.

¹³ Following section 47 enquiries (see chapter 4 above), an initial child protection conference brings together family members (and the child where appropriate) with the supporters, advocates and professionals most involved with the child and family, to make decisions about the child's future safety, health and development. *Working Together to Safeguard Children: a guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*, HM Government, March 2013, chapter 1, page 40.

¹⁴ ACPO guidance from 2009 on 'investigating child abuse and safeguarding children' has now been replaced by the National College of Police Authorised Professional Practice (APP) on investigating child abuse. This is available at: <http://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/major-investigation-and-public-protection/child-abuse/>

Others told inspectors that officers were not always available to attend; that they were not given sufficient notice to make arrangements to attend; and that families would not talk openly if a police officer was present.

Inspectors found that police in Calderdale took an approach that centred on the child and recognised those cases that would benefit from police attendance. In Calderdale, a seven-year-old girl had been struck by her mother. Several agencies had significant involvement in the case and it was necessary to use an interpreter for communicating with the mother and an intermediary for the girl. On this occasion the police did attend the case conference. They recognised that a report would not adequately provide a full picture of the situation or the views of the police and that important decisions would be made that would affect the child in the long-term.

However, we were concerned about the engagement of police in other districts. For example, in similar circumstances in Bradford, a father had physically harmed his seven-year-old daughter and police proceeded with a criminal investigation. There was much police contact with the child, her siblings and family, and a plan was put in place to prevent any further harm from the father. The police had a wealth of information that should have informed the work of all agencies but they did not attend when a case conference was held.

Inspectors concluded that West Yorkshire Police did not always fulfil its responsibilities under the statutory guidance *Working Together to Safeguard Children*¹⁵ to attend initial case conferences when required to do so.

Inspectors also found that there were delays in recording the outcomes of case conferences on police records. Although there was a police 'flag' on records for children at risk of child sexual exploitation (CSE), there was no flag for those who had a child protection plan in place. As a result, frontline police officers responding to incidents were not immediately aware if a child protection plan was in place.

The police response to children who were reported as missing from home was mixed. In cases where the risk was assessed as high, the response was invariably good. For example, a 15-year-old girl was reported missing and believed to be with a much older man. She had been missing on 15 previous occasions and was known to be at risk of CSE. Following a risk assessment, the girl was considered to be at high risk of harm and the police quickly located her by tracking her mobile phone signal. She was found with two older men, who were arrested for child abduction. She was taken into police protection, a multi-agency meeting was arranged and protective measures were put in place.

However, inspectors found cases that were a cause for concern. If a child was assessed as being at a low risk of harm, a police officer would not be sent to

¹⁵ See footnote 9 above.

investigate the report (although this was reviewed after 72 hours). In one case, a father reported his 15-year-old son missing after he failed to return overnight from a carnival. This was completely out of character. Frustrated by the police response, his father eventually attended the police station because he did not get the support he needed to find his son.

The force self-assessed three cases involving missing children. Two of these cases were found to be inadequate by inspectors, and one required improvement. In two of these cases, a 13-year-old and a 15-year-old had been missing on numerous occasions. The younger girl was known to be at risk of child sexual exploitation. Poor practice included: lack of information-sharing between children's social care services and the police officers who undertook checks to make sure the girls were safe and well on their return; failure to send referrals to children's social care services; longer-term plans that were inadequate or not followed-up; and a lack of action against the adults identified as a risk to the girls.

The force refers all domestic abuse cases that are assessed as 'high risk' to a multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC)¹⁶ for longer-term safeguarding plans to be put in place. Inspectors examined minutes of MARACs and assessed six high risk cases referred to a MARAC and involving children. Four were judged adequate and two required improvement. Inspectors found that police did not always share information prior to the MARAC. For example, in one case, police had not passed to children's social care services information about a child involved in a high risk domestic abuse case (a serious assault against the mother had occurred a month earlier). In some areas, protective measures relied solely on children's social care services rather than all relevant agencies making a contribution, such as police officers undertaking joint home visits (with children's social care services) to check on the welfare and safety of children.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police immediately undertakes a review, together with children's social care services and other relevant agencies, to ensure that the police are fulfilling their statutory responsibilities set out in *Working Together to Safeguard Children*. As a minimum this should cover:

- **attendance at and contribution to initial child protection conferences; and**
- **recording and communicating decisions reached at meetings.**

¹⁶ This is a locally-held meeting where statutory and voluntary agency representatives come together and share information about high-risk victims of domestic abuse. Any agency can refer an adult or child whom they believe to be at risk of harm; the aim of the meeting is to produce a co-ordinated action plan to increase an adult or child's safety, health and well-being. The agencies that attend will vary but are likely to include, for example: the police, probation, children's, health and housing services. There are over 250 currently in operation across England and Wales.

We recommend that, within three months, West Yorkshire Police:

- **identifies the range of responses and actions that the police can contribute to multi-agency plans for protecting victims and children in high-risk domestic abuse cases; and**
- **provides information (e.g., history of abuse, number of children in the family) to other agencies before a multi-agency risk assessment conference takes place.**

We recommend that, within three months, West Yorkshire Police takes steps to improve practice in cases of children who go missing from home, as a minimum, this should include:

- **improving staff awareness of their responsibilities for protecting children who are reported missing from home and, in particular, those cases where absences are a regular occurrence;**
- **improving staff awareness of the significance of drawing together all available information from police systems, including information about those who pose a risk to children, to better inform risk assessments;**
- **ensuring that staff are aware of the need to pass this information on to other agencies; and**
- **identifying the range of responses and actions that the police can contribute to multi-agency plans for protecting children in these cases.**

Investigation

Inspectors found examples of very good investigations involving sensitive interviewing of children, pursuit of evidence from a range of sources and attention to detail when searching homes and computers.

Inspectors also found good examples of work by multi-agency joint investigation teams. In these teams, the police and children's social care services routinely held discussions and took prompt action to protect children. For example, a 10-year-old boy was threatened with death if he did not send images of his genitals to a user on a chat room website. A discussion took place within two hours of the referral and the agencies agreed that there would be a joint visit by police and social workers. Efforts were made quickly to identify the offender and the boy was supported by a cyber-crime trauma expert.

In most of the cases examined, the initial investigation was good. However, inspectors found that in some cases there was significant drift if the investigation required more to be done, such as gathering further evidence and interviewing other witnesses. This was particularly noticeable when an officer had a high workload.

Inspectors examined eight physical assault cases and found three to be inadequate and one requiring improvement; only one was assessed as good. Police officers recorded in the reports that delays were caused by excessive workloads. Record-keeping was poor in most cases and it was not clear what action had been taken. For example, a one-year-old child was found to have numerous injuries, including a fractured skull and ribs, which were believed to have been deliberately inflicted. Police officers attended the hospital to interview the parents but records were not updated for over a month, so it was not clear what action had been taken to protect the child or what progress had been made with the investigation. Inspectors found a lack of supervision in some areas, largely due to the supervisors' own high workloads.

There were other causes of delays in investigations.

- Police officers reported that analysis of computers and other media submitted to the high-tech crime unit (HTCU) took too long to complete. Inspectors found some cases that had significant delays; eight months or more was not unusual. For example, a man who had been assessed as high risk was arrested in January 2014 for possessing indecent images of children. His computer was submitted for analysis and he was released on bail. In June 2014, while still on bail (due to the delay in the analysis of the computer), he was arrested for sexually abusing a six-year-old girl who had been playing in the street.
- There were also delays in some cases that were sent to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) for review, sometimes of three months or more. For example, a 13-year-old girl was allegedly raped by her older boyfriend. The police submitted the case file to the CPS in March 2014, but it was not reviewed by lawyers until June, when further police action was requested. The explanation for the delay (as stated on the police record) was that there had been a 'move round with staff' in the CPS. The suspect was eventually charged in August 2014. Inspectors acknowledge the efforts made by senior officers who have intervened directly with the CPS to seek to resolve these problems and address the delays.

Inspectors also found that the standard of CSE investigations was mixed. Inspectors examined 15 cases and found 9 to be inadequate. In some cases, the response was good. For example, when a 14-year-old girl was raped by 4 men, the CSE team (in this instance a co-located, multi-agency team) quickly provided support for the girl and pursued those responsible. Immediate and ongoing protective measures were put in place to safeguard the vulnerable girl. However, most of the cases assessed as inadequate were because of delays in holding discussions, drift in investigations (including delays in computer analysis) and failure to consider the wider risk posed by offenders to other children. Examples included:

- a case involving a 15-year-old girl who was being groomed by an older man. Although a strategy meeting was quickly arranged, there was a delay before officers arrested the offender. There was no record that support measures had been put in place for the girl, nor was the offence recorded as a crime; and
- a case relating to a 15-year-old girl who told her teacher that she had been coerced into sending indecent photos of herself to older men and that she felt pressurised to meet them in a hotel. It took two months for a discussion to take place and three months to submit her mobile phone for analysis. Delays in the investigation may have meant that she (or other children) were not sufficiently protected from the men.

Overall, inspectors were concerned about the standard of the CSE investigations they examined, particularly as all police districts had specialist CSE teams.

We recommend that, within three months, West Yorkshire Police:

- **improves the standards of investigation to include: staff awareness, knowledge and skills; supervision; and regular auditing of investigations, (particularly for cases relating to child sexual exploitation), to ensure that these standards are being met;**
- **takes steps to reduce the delays in analysis of material sent to the high-tech crime unit;**
- **identifies and reviews all child abuse investigation cases that have taken more than three months to investigate from the first report, and ensures that each child is supported and safeguarded, and that appropriate measures are in place to manage the risk posed by suspects; and**
- **continues to monitor and improve the timeliness of case reviews and charging decisions with the CPS.**

Decision making

The police response was good when the case was clearly defined as a child protection matter from the beginning. Referrals from other agencies were assessed promptly, with consideration given to the support other agencies could provide.

It is a very serious step to remove a child from his or her family and into police protection¹⁷. Inspectors found that officers were prompt in attending incidents where there were significant concerns about the safety of children, such as parents leaving

¹⁷ This power is contained in section 46(1) of the Children Act 1989 (see footnote 11 above).

children alone at home. There was a good response to a 12-year-old girl who attended hospital with injuries caused by her father. Police officers and social workers considered the best interests of the child and decided that placing her in police protection was necessary to prevent further harm from her father. The police also took decisive action against those identified as posing a risk to children, for example by immediately arresting alleged offenders for child neglect or assault.

There were cases where frontline officers demonstrated good awareness of CSE, resulting in decisive action to protect children from harm. For example, a shopkeeper called police about two young girls who had left his store with older men. Police officers immediately responded, found the girls with the men and, concerned for the safety of the girls, arrested the men for child abduction. Specialist officers carried out a thorough investigation, including sensitive interviewing of the girls and analysis of their phones. Although this case did not result in a prosecution, the men were served with child abduction notices¹⁸ to prevent further contact with the girls.

However, Inspectors were very concerned about the poor standard of recording on police systems across the force. Accurate and timely recording of information is essential for good decision-making in child protection matters. Important information was missing or there were delays in recording it on the system. This included: delays in recording the outcome of strategy meetings (minutes were often not taken); updating records about the progress of an investigation; and details about contact with children and families. In 18 of 44 investigations examined, inspectors found significant failings to record information. In many of these cases, there was a lack of supervision. For example, a six-year-old boy disclosed to his teacher that he had been punched by his step-father on the car journey to school. The initial police response was good and the child and his siblings were protected from immediate harm. The police record provided some details about the initial investigation and protective measures. However, the record had not been updated for two months and the outcome of a risk assessment, decisions from a case conference and progress on the investigation were unknown.

Inspectors also found a lack of both understanding by and guidance for police officers about how information should be recorded where there was concern for a child. When officers attend an incident where such a concern is identified, as well as taking any necessary action to protect the child, they should pass information to safeguarding units or partner agencies. Information sharing is important because it enables patterns of abuse to be identified. West Yorkshire Police did not have a

¹⁸ A non-statutory notice issued when the police become aware of a child spending time with an adult who they believe could be harmful to them. A notice is used to disrupt the adult's association with the child or young person, as well as warning the adult that the association could result in arrest and prosecution.

standard way of assessing risk or a procedure for frontline officers to pass on concerns. Neither did the force have a consistent way of referring incidents to partner agencies. In light of this, inspectors could not determine whether information had been passed on or whether risks had been identified and action taken.

We recommend that, within three months, West Yorkshire Police takes steps to ensure that all relevant information is properly recorded and is readily accessible in all cases where there are concerns about the welfare of children. Guidance to staff should include:

- **what information should be recorded (and in what form) on systems to enable good quality decisions;**
- **the importance of sending the information to the correct police department and/or relevant partner agency; and**
- **the importance of ensuring that records are made promptly and kept up to date.**

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police takes immediate steps to ensure that managers quality assure records and provide feedback to police officers and staff.

Trusted adults

In investigations where police officers had serious concerns for children and immediately recognised child protection issues, processes were carefully considered. This led to stronger relationships between the child and the police. In most cases, officers consulted with the parents (or the social worker when the parent was a suspect) on how best to engage with the child. Social workers and police officers determined together how best to communicate with the family throughout the case; in cases involving young children, where the parents were the principal means of communication between the police and the child, police engagement with the family was very good.

However, some police officers and staff were concerned about delays in investigations, which they attributed to shortfalls in operational staffing levels and backlogs in the HTCUC and the CPS. In these cases it was difficult to manage expectations and give families and children guidance on what would happen next. Officers told inspectors that delays had a negative effect on the confidence of families and children in the police. In one case, an 18-year-old woman reported that she had been raped by her brother, 5 years earlier. She was concerned that he was still living with their younger brother. There were significant delays in this investigation, including in arranging a medical examination. There was little activity or contact with her in five months, which might well have contributed to her withdrawal of the allegation.

Inspectors also considered that there was more to be done to demonstrate that staff were listening to children. In most of the cases assessed, police officers recorded very little about the views of the child, the effect of an offender's behaviour on the child or the outcomes for the child.

We recommend that, within six months, West Yorkshire Police ensures that:

- **staff record the views and concerns of children;**
- **staff record the outcome for the child at the end of police involvement in a case;**
- **staff inform children, as appropriate, of any decisions that have been made about them; and**
- **information about children's needs and views is made available, on a regular basis, for consideration by the police and crime commissioner.**

Managing those posing a risk to children

Those working with sex offenders were clear about their responsibilities, assessed risks and took action to reduce them. Inspectors found good examples of single and multi-agency working. For example, in one case, a specialist officer made an unannounced visit to a registered sex offender who had been assessed as posing a high risk. The officer found a partially naked 14-year-old boy with 2 older men: both suspects were arrested. The boy initially told police that nothing had happened, but soon after began to display problems in managing his anger. Support was provided by a specialist service 'Safehands'¹⁹ and he told them that he had been sexually assaulted. Not only did the police work well with other agencies in this case, they successfully challenged a decision not to prosecute the alleged offenders.

Officers in Kirklees had nearly double the volume of sex offenders to manage compared with officers in Calderdale (one officer is responsible for 100 sex offenders in Kirklees, compared with 58 in Calderdale). In one of the three cases relating to registered sex offenders and assessed by the force, there were delays in conducting reviews, poor record-keeping and lack of supervisory oversight. Although the force has recently recruited police staff to support officers, capacity across the force remains a problem.

Inspectors found an inconsistent approach to CSE across the force. We saw good examples where police responded well to the risks posed by those who sexually exploit children. This was evident particularly where there were mature and established partnership arrangements, and when agencies were co-located (for example, in Bradford). However, in less well-developed, single-agency teams, such

¹⁹ An organisation providing an independent support service to children.

as in Leeds, the service was largely reactive. A reactive approach limits police capability to gather intelligence and to deter and apprehend suspects.

Response and neighbourhood officers in West Yorkshire Police had good awareness of CSE. The 'know the signs' campaign (delivered to police staff to raise awareness of how to identify the signs of CSE and act upon concerns) had been well received by police officers and staff.

Police detention

Inspectors examined 16 cases of children in detention. The youngest was 13 years old and the oldest 17. All of the detainees were boys and four of them were in the care of the local authority. They had been detained on suspicion of offences which included robbery, breach of an anti-social behaviour order, assault and breach of bail conditions. Inspectors judged that only six of these cases had been handled adequately. West Yorkshire Police carried out self-assessments in three cases: one was assessed as adequate and two inadequate.

In all 16 cases examined by inspectors, the children involved had been charged and refused bail by the custody sergeant. In 11 cases, the children were under 17 years old. In these circumstances, the local authority is responsible for providing appropriate accommodation if the child is to be detained²⁰. It should only be in exceptional circumstances (such as during extreme weather) that transfer of the child to alternative accommodation would not be in his best interests.

In the cases examined by inspectors, none of the children were transferred into the care of the local authority. It was apparent that custody officers did not always contact social services. In four of the cases, custody records showed that no request was made to the local authority for accommodation after a decision to refuse bail. In all other cases examined, custody officers made a request to the local authority for alternative accommodation, but no accommodation was made available. In one case, a 16-year-old boy who had been arrested for robbery had been bailed several times during the investigation, but when charged was kept in custody over a weekend, resulting in over 41 hours in police detention.

Inspectors were told that efforts were being made with local authorities to resolve the lack of alternative accommodation, but found no evidence of progress.

In rare cases, secure accommodation might be needed if the child poses a high risk of serious harm to others. There appeared to be a lack of knowledge by custody staff about when secure accommodation might be required. Inspectors found that secure

²⁰ Under section 38(6) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 a custody officer must secure the move of a child to local authority accommodation unless he certifies it is impracticable to do so or, for those aged 12 or over, no secure accommodation is available and local authority accommodation would not be adequate to protect the public from serious harm from him.

accommodation had been requested in 10 of the cases examined when the threshold had not been met. In one case, this contributed to a 13-year-old boy being detained for over 23 hours for a burglary offence.

When a child is held in a police cell having been charged with an offence and refused bail, the custody officer should complete a certificate to present to court, explaining the reasons for his detention in custody²¹. Inspectors found that in six of the cases they examined this certificate had not been completed.

Inspectors found that awareness of and knowledge about child protection amongst custody staff varied. While there was an online custody website offering advice and support, some staff told inspectors that they had not received any specific training.

Inspectors found good practice in the care of children detained for their own protection. Section 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983 allows a police officer to remove an apparently mentally disordered person from a public place to a place of safety. Although a place of safety can include a police custody suite, it is preferable for the person to be taken directly to health facilities, such as a hospital²². In the cases we examined, children in West Yorkshire who were detained under this power were taken to health facilities for an assessment.

We recommend that, within three months, West Yorkshire Police undertakes a review (jointly with children’s social care services and other relevant agencies) of how it manages the detention of children. This review should include, as a minimum, how best to:

- **ensure that all children are only detained when absolutely necessary and for the absolute minimum amount of time;**
- **assess, at an early stage, the need for alternative accommodation (secure or otherwise) and work with children’s social care services to achieve the best option for the child;**
- **ensure that custody staff comply with their statutory duties to complete detention certificates if a child is detained for any reason in police custody following charge; and**
- **ensure that custody staff make a record of all actions taken and decisions made on the relevant documentation.**

²¹ Section 38(6) and (7) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.

²² Code of Practice: Mental Health Act 1983, Department of Health, 2008, paragraph 10.21.
http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130123193537/http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_084597

6. Findings: leadership, management and governance

The strategic priorities set by the West Yorkshire PCC for the force²³ refer specifically to protecting children from those who exploit them. They also include encouraging people suffering domestic abuse to come forward and supporting them; making sure that the right support is available for victims of sexual violence; and supporting a campaign to raise awareness of forced marriage and 'so-called' honour based violence. The force has action plans to meet these priorities.

The chief constable and her command team are committed to improving services for children. Inspectors found good examples of intervention by senior leaders to resolve problems (such as delays with the CPS). We also found examples of visible leadership such as the CSE campaign for frontline staff: 'know the signs'.

Most of the senior officers responsible for policing the five districts told inspectors that child protection was a priority. Although there is a general understanding, among police officers and staff, that protection of children is important, this message is felt to varying degrees across the force. Inspectors found that acquisitive crimes (such as burglary, car crime and robbery) frequently featured in operational briefings, much more so than the safeguarding of children.

Throughout the inspection, it was apparent that most staff responsible for managing child abuse investigations were knowledgeable, committed and dedicated to providing the best service for the child. Inspectors witnessed good examples of child protection work by police officers who displayed a mix of investigative and protective approaches. This ensured that safeguarding children remained central to their efforts while all criminal investigative opportunities were pursued. However, in some areas, workloads and delays in investigations prevented a consistently high standard of service.

At the time of the inspection, the force had recently commissioned a review of all district safeguarding units (including child protection). Inspectors considered this to be a positive step to enable the force to better understand and improve services to protect children. The review's report provided a good overview and assessment of the current arrangements across the force but did not make recommendations on how to improve the service, which needs to be addressed.

²³ The West Yorkshire police and crime for 2013-18 can be accessed at: <http://www.westyorkshire-pcc.gov.uk/our-business/the-police-crime-plan.aspx>

The force has devolved responsibility for child protection to the five police districts, rather than managing it centrally. This localised model has resulted in inconsistent practice across the force and very different working arrangements within each policing area. Inspectors acknowledge that services should meet the needs of the community and be sufficiently flexible to work with the procedures used by partner-agencies. However, inspectors concluded that the current structure could result in a different level of service, and potentially different outcomes for children, across the force area. Differences included:

- the number of officers in safeguarding units. There appeared to be little consideration of or rationale for the number of staff required to meet demand and, as a consequence, officers had different workloads. Delays in progressing investigations were more evident in Leeds than in Calderdale. Inspectors examined 13 cases in both areas: in Leeds, six were found to be inadequate due to delays and poor recording practice; in Calderdale, two were assessed as inadequate;
- inconsistency in the supervision of staff. In some districts, inspectors found little evidence of workload monitoring or supervision of investigations by senior officers;
- differences in how child protection was managed. Some areas (for example, Wakefield) had dedicated child protection teams with trained specialist officers. In other districts, such as Bradford and Leeds, child protection was included within the remit of large public protection teams. Although there were specialist officers in child protection in these areas too, there was insufficient capacity to deal with the volume of work and staff were often not on duty at the right time to attend multi-agency meetings;
- differences in CSE teams. In Bradford, there was an established and mature multi-agency team. In Leeds, there was a police-led team and although there were partnership arrangements in place with other agencies (for example, a weekly meeting), the team provided a primarily reactive service, with less capability to disrupt suspects actively;
- different routes across the five districts for referring child protection concerns for both the police and partner agencies; it could prove difficult to draw important information together, particularly for identifying cumulative risk; and
- significant differences in multi-agency arrangements and police input and contribution to them. For example, in Calderdale, police officers were more likely to attend an initial child protection conference than in the other districts.

Inspectors had significant concerns about the extent to which West Yorkshire Police fulfilled its statutory responsibilities, as set out in *Working Together to Safeguard*

*Children*²⁴. Police attendance at initial child protection conferences was unsatisfactory. Moreover, there were serious concerns about the failure of some staff to appreciate the value of police contribution in child protection cases. Although it is not for inspectors to determine how a force best configures its resources, no child should receive a poor service as a result of where they live.

Although the SGCU is responsible for developing policies and procedures on public protection and monitoring their implementation, this has not resulted in effective, consistent practices across the force area. A force-wide quarterly safeguarding meeting provides an opportunity for managers across the districts to discuss child protection matters, such as the force's response to CSE. However, this does not provide the oversight and direction required to drive the improvements needed across the force area.

West Yorkshire Police serves diverse, multi-cultural communities (which include a number of black and ethnic minority victims and offenders). However, data on ethnicity does not appear to be used to inform service delivery. The force does collate some data (such as the age and gender of children who are victims of assault) and has an objective to improve service delivery to vulnerable children in its annual equality report, but inspectors found limited evidence of action to achieve this.

The force had recognised that good analysis could provide a better understanding of problems and had produced profiles identifying the risk of CSE at force level. However, there was insufficient capacity to provide more detailed analysis in the policing districts. Inspectors were told that there were few submissions of intelligence reports concerning child protection. Intelligence, research and analysis are essential to understand the wider implications of child abuse (for example, identifying an organised network or group of offenders who sexually exploit children).

The force measures the volume of incidents and types of cases, rather than the quality of outcomes. Performance measures could be improved by highlighting positive outcomes for children and areas for improvement. Inspectors saw no evidence that demonstrated that the force conducted internal reviews and audits of child protection matters. Senior officers told inspectors that they did not have the capacity routinely to conduct their own audits or self-assessments. Inspectors found little evidence that police provided qualitative information to LSCBs.

HMIC is concerned that some of the findings from this child protection inspection (for example, poor recording of information and attendance at initial child protection case conferences) are areas that have previously been identified through serious case reviews as requiring improvement. Many of problems remain and the force needs to demonstrate that it has learned from, and acted upon, failures to protect children.

²⁴ See footnote 9, above.

LSCBs (and their sub-groups) in West Yorkshire have a strong record of senior police officer attendance and involvement. The chairs of LSCBs and directors of children's services were appreciative of the commitment of West Yorkshire Police to child protection at both strategic and operational levels. These close working relationships mean that problems can be discussed early and addressed quickly between agencies. Inspectors found good evidence of professional challenge and the escalation of concerns about other agencies' practice in all districts. Positive comments were received about the CSE forum, which brings together the police and the independent chairs of the five LSCBs to share good practice across the local authority areas.

West Yorkshire Police has good working relationships with local authorities and other agencies across the force area. There is evidence of joint working to improve services and there is some multi-agency co-location which is improving communication and the speed of response. Good examples include the MASH in Wakefield and the Bradford CSE team.

For the most part, staff were well trained for their roles and the force had recognised that new staff working in child protection required appropriate training. However, the force needs to review and prioritise specialist child protection training and increase the number of officers trained in child protection in order to meet the demand of work in district safeguarding units.

We recommend that, within six months, West Yorkshire Police develops a force-wide good practice regime that builds on these recommendations and improves its response to child protection issues, so that no child receives a poor service by reason of the place where they live.

7. Findings: The overall effectiveness of the force and its response to children who need help and protection

West Yorkshire Police and its PCC have demonstrated a commitment to improving child protection services and have a set of clear priorities for safeguarding children. This is supported by action plans to improve practice for specific child protection concerns, such as CSE.

Although the force has conducted a review of the structure of district safeguarding units, at the time of the inspection, there were no plans to improve services or to improve consistency of practice across the West Yorkshire Police area. Inspectors consider that consistency is crucial to ensure that a high quality of service is provided in all cases, no matter where a child lives.

Inspectors found a mixture of good and poorer practice across the force area. When the matter was clearly one of child protection, West Yorkshire Police often responded well. In difficult, complex or prolonged cases the response was often much weaker.

It was apparent that most staff responsible for managing child abuse investigations were knowledgeable, committed and dedicated to providing the best outcomes for the child. However, the response to CSE was inconsistent across the force area. Inspectors saw some good practice, particularly in well established multi-agency teams. Responses were weaker in less well-developed teams, such as in Leeds.

Performance information for child protection was underdeveloped. West Yorkshire Police needs to do more to understand and record outcomes of cases in order to improve and develop services. More supervision of day-to-day work is needed, especially of investigations. The force would benefit from undertaking regular reviews and audits in order to improve performance.

The force had good relationships with partner agencies and LSCBs. Co-located multi-agency working was paying dividends and there was a desire to develop these arrangements further and establish MASHs across all local authority areas.

The focus now needs to be on achieving consistently high standards across the whole force area. This should include:

- ensuring that the force fulfils its statutory responsibilities to work with partner agencies by attending relevant multi-agency meetings and to children who are detained in police custody;

- reducing delays in investigations, in particular, reducing backlogs in the high-tech crime unit and ensuring that there are sufficient numbers of trained child protection specialists in safeguarding units;
- ensuring that there is a standard risk assessment for child protection cases and that staff are provided with clear guidance about how and when it needs to be carried out;
- maintaining accurate and up-to-date recording of, and access to, information and information exchange with partner agencies; and
- developing a force-wide good practice regime in order to improve its response to child protection issues.

8. Recommendations

Immediately

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police undertakes a review, together with children's social care services and other relevant agencies, to ensure that the police are fulfilling their statutory responsibilities set out in *Working Together to Safeguard Children*. As a minimum this should cover:

- attendance at and contribution to initial child protection conferences; and
- recording and communicating decisions reached at meetings.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police takes steps to ensure that managers quality assure records and provide feedback to police officers and staff.

Within three months

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police improves staff awareness of the importance of understanding and assessing a child's demeanour; ensures that a child's demeanour is recorded in domestic abuse incidents; and ensures that this is used to assess the risks to the child and his needs.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police:

- identifies the range of responses and actions that the police can contribute to multi-agency plans for protecting victims and children in high-risk domestic abuse cases; and
- provides information (e.g., history of abuse, number of children in the family) to other agencies before a multi-agency risk assessment conference takes place.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police take steps to improve practice in cases of children who go missing from home, as a minimum, this should include:

- improving staff awareness of their responsibilities for protecting children who are reported missing from home and, in particular, those cases where absences are a regular occurrence;
- improving staff awareness of the significance of drawing together all available information from police systems, including information about those who pose a risk to children, to better inform risk assessments;
- ensuring that staff are aware of the need to pass this information on to other agencies; and

- identifying the range of responses and actions that the police can contribute to multi-agency plans for protecting children in these cases.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police:

- improves the standards of investigation to include: staff awareness, knowledge and skills; supervision; and regular auditing of investigations, (particularly for cases relating to child sexual exploitation), to ensure that these standards are being met;
- takes steps to reduce the delays in analysis of material sent to the high-tech crime unit;
- identifies and reviews all child abuse investigation cases that have taken more than three months to investigate from the first report, and ensures that each child is supported and safeguarded, and that appropriate measures are in place to manage the risk posed by suspects; and
- continues to monitor and improve the timeliness of case reviews and charging decisions with the Crown Prosecution Service.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police takes steps to ensure that all relevant information is properly recorded and is readily accessible in all cases where there are concerns about the welfare of children. Guidance to staff should include:

- what information should be recorded (and in what form) on systems to enable good quality decisions;
- the importance of sending the information to the correct police department and/or relevant partner agency; and
- the importance of ensuring that records are made promptly and kept up to date.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police undertakes a review (jointly with children's social care services and other relevant agencies) of how it manages the detention of children. This review should include, as a minimum, how best to:

- ensure that all children are only detained when absolutely necessary and for the absolute minimum amount of time;
- assess, at an early stage, the need for alternative accommodation (secure or otherwise) and work with children's social care services to achieve the best option for the child;
- ensure that custody staff comply with their statutory duties to complete detention certificates if a child is detained for any reason in police custody following charge; and

- ensure that custody staff make a record of all actions taken and decisions made on the relevant documentation.

Within six months

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police ensures that:

- staff record the views and concerns of children;
- staff record the outcome for the child at the end of police involvement in a case;
- staff inform children, as appropriate, of any decisions that have been made about them; and
- information about children's needs and views is made available, on a regular basis, for consideration by the police and crime commissioner.

We recommend that West Yorkshire Police develops a force-wide good practice regime that builds on these recommendations and improves its response to child protection issues, so that no child receives a poor service by reason of the place where they live.

9. Next steps

Within six weeks of the publication of this report, HMIC will require an update of the action being taken to respond to the recommendations that should be acted upon immediately.

West Yorkshire Police should also provide an action plan within six weeks to specify how it intends to respond to the other recommendations made in this report.

Subject to the responses received, HMIC will revisit the force no later than six months after the publication of this report to assess how it is managing the implementation of all of the recommendations.

Annex A

Child protection inspection methodology

Objectives

The objectives of the inspection are:

- to assess how effectively police forces safeguard children at risk;
- to make recommendations to police forces for improving child protection practice;
- to highlight effective practice in child protection work; and
- to drive improvements in forces' child protection practices.

The expectations of agencies are set out in the statutory guidance *Working Together to Safeguard Children: a guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of Children*²⁵, published in March 2013. The specific police roles set out in the guidance are:

- the identification of children who might be at risk from abuse and neglect;
- investigation of alleged offences against children;
- inter-agency working and information-sharing to protect children; and
- the exercise of emergency powers to protect children.

These areas of practice are the focus of the inspection.

Inspection approach

Inspections focused on the experience of, and outcomes for, the child following its journey through child protection and criminal investigation processes. They assessed how well the service has helped and protected children and investigated alleged criminal acts, taking account of, but not measuring compliance with, policies and guidance.

²⁵ *Working Together to Safeguard Children: A guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*, HM Government, March 2013. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/281368/Working_together_to_safeguard_children.pdf

The inspections considered how the arrangements for protecting children, and the leadership and management of the police service, contributed to and supported effective practice on the ground. The team considered how well management responsibilities for child protection, as set out in the statutory guidance, were met.

Methods

- Self-assessment – practice, and management and leadership.
- Case inspections.
- Discussions with staff from within the police and from other agencies.
- Examination of reports on significant case reviews or other serious cases.
- Examination of service statistics, reports, policies and other relevant written materials.

The purpose of the self-assessment is to:

- raise awareness within the service about the strengths and weaknesses of current practice (this formed the basis for discussions with HMIC); and
- serve as a driver and benchmark for future service improvements.

Self-assessment and case inspection

In consultation with police services the following areas of practice have been identified for scrutiny:

- domestic abuse;
- incidents where police officers and staff identify children in need of help and protection, e.g. children being neglected;
- information-sharing and discussions regarding children potentially at risk of harm;
- the exercising of powers of police protection under section 46 of the Children Act 1989 (taking children into a 'place of safety');
- the completion of Section 47 Children Act 1989 enquiries, including both those of a criminal nature and those of a non-criminal nature (Section 47 enquiries are those relating to a child 'in need' rather than a 'child at risk');
- sex offender management;
- the management of missing children;

- child sexual exploitation; and
- the detention of children in police custody.

Below is a breakdown of the type of self-assessed cases we examined in West Yorkshire Police.

Type of case	Number of cases
Child protection enquiry (s. 47)	5
Domestic abuse	5
General concerns with a child where a referral to children's social care services was made	5
Sex offender enquiry	3
Missing children	3
Police protection	3
At risk of sexual exploitation	3
On-line sexual abuse	3
Child in custody	3

Annex B Glossary

child	person under the age of 18
child protection plan	a written record for parents, carers and professionals which identifies specific concerns about a child and assesses the likelihood of a child suffering harm; sets out what work needs to be done to protect a child from harm, by when and who is responsible for that work; a child is no longer subject to a protection plan when it is judged that he or she is not believed to be suffering or at risk of suffering harm
Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)	established in 1986 as an independent body and the principal prosecuting authority in England and Wales; responsible for advising the police on cases for possible prosecution; reviewing cases submitted by the police; determining any charges in more serious or complex cases and preparing and presenting cases for both magistrates and the high courts, including Crown Court and the Court of Appeal
high-tech crime unit (HTCU)	police computer crimes unit that undertakes examination and retrieval of evidence or intelligence from computers, computer-related media and other digital devices
local safeguarding children board (LSCB)	established under the Children Act 2004, and set up in each local authority area to; develop local safeguarding policy and procedure; co-ordinate how agencies work together to safeguard and promote the welfare of children; and ensure that safeguarding arrangements are effective

multi-agency safeguarding hub
(MASH)

entity in which public sector organisations with common or aligned responsibilities in relation to the safety of vulnerable people work; the hubs comprise staff from organisations such as the police and local authority social services; they work alongside one another, sharing information and co-ordinating activities to help protect the most vulnerable children and adults from harm, neglect and abuse

Office for Standards in Education,
Children's Services and Skills
(Ofsted)

a non-ministerial department, independent of government, that regulates and inspects schools, colleges, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, education and training in prisons and other secure establishments, and the Children and Family Court Advisory Support Service; assesses children's services in local areas, and inspects services for looked-after children, safeguarding and child protection; reports directly to Parliament

police and crime commissioner
(PCC)

elected entity for a police area, established under section 1, Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, responsible for securing the maintenance of the police force for that area and securing that the police force is efficient and effective; holds the relevant chief constable to account for the policing of the area; establishes the budget and police and crime plan for the police force; appoints and may, after due process, remove the chief constable from office

registered sex offender

a person required to provide his details to the police because he has been convicted or cautioned for a sexual offence as set out in Schedule 3 to the Sexual Offences Act 2003, or because he has otherwise triggered the notification requirements (for example, by being made subject to a sexual offences prevention order); as well as personal details, a registered individual must provide the police with details about his movements, for example he must tell the police if he is going abroad and, if homeless, where he can be found; registered details may be accessed by the police, probation and prison service