

01

**Background**

F20 lived with his family and siblings. He had good school attendance and was described as doing well there. In the last year of F20's life concerns had been raised about his behaviour which could have been consistent with involvement in criminal exploitation.

02

**Safeguarding concerns**

Concerns had been raised about F20's involvement in criminal exploitation. Multi agency support had been offered to the family but this was not accepted. Alternative support which may have been accepted by the family was not pursued. Focus on involvement from agencies appeared to reflect pursuit of a criminal conviction for F20 rather than his behaviours being seen as him being a victim of criminal exploitation. Agencies continued to monitor F20 through observation. Information was not always shared for the purpose of safeguarding.

07

**Implementing Change**

Reflect on the findings and discuss the implications for your service/practice. Identify and outline the steps you and your team will take to improve practice in line with the findings and recommendations

06

**Recommendations**

Agencies should utilise the Early Help Assessment and Team Around the School approach at the earliest opportunity when responding to signs of exploitation.

Agencies should ensure that staff are able to recognise and respond to the early signs of exploitation and promote the complex safeguarding offer.

Facilitation of a Practitioner Forum on 'developing trusted relationships' to share good practice and develop alternative ways to engage families.

Strategic partners (LSCP and Community Safety Partnership) should agree and implement a contextual safeguarding response that will engage and empower members of the community.

F20

03

**The incident**

F20 tragically died in a road traffic incident

04

**The review**

The review considered the following themes:  
Processes in place for gathering, analysing and sharing of multi-agency information.  
Reasons for a delay in offering services to F20 and his family. Agencies' recognition and response to poor engagement with families.  
Practitioner understanding of child criminal exploitation and contextual safeguarding.

05

05

**The findings**

F20 appeared to be viewed by agencies as a criminal rather than as a child who was vulnerable to criminal exploitation. The need for him to be protected from harm appears to have been missed with agencies making referrals to specialist teams at a later stage.

His increasing involvement in criminal activity was not viewed as a safeguarding matter and was not afforded the same level of urgency as intra familial abuse.

There was inconsistency between practitioners of the understanding of F20's behaviours which resulted in an inconsistent view of the risks to his safety.

Practitioners do not necessarily perceive exploitation of children as being synonymous with accepted definitions of child abuse.





Name of Organisation .....

Team Manager .....

Name of Section & Team .....

Contact Details .....

**Identify the learning or recommendations that are relevant to your team and summarise your teams' discussion on those points**

1.
2.
3.



What actions have been agreed to improve practice?

What needs to happen?	Who will do it?	By When?	How will you know when it has been done?	How will you know if it has worked?