



Review of Practice for

Sexual Exploitation of Vulnerable Adolescents in Auckland

Report from:

Chief Social Worker
Office of the Chief Social Worker
Child, Youth and Family
Ministry of Social Development

Report Date:

August 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Terms of reference	4
Review methodology	4
Child, Youth and Family involvement with the Young People.....	6
Emerging Themes	24
1. The way in which the service identifies and responds to potential risks for adolescents	24
2. The role of Child, Youth and Family in care and protection work	33
3. Partnership Working across agencies and with young people and families.....	38
4. Recording.....	41
Conclusion and Key Findings	42
Recommendations.....	43
Appendix A – Terms of Reference	46
Appendix B – Schedule of interviews.....	48
Appendix B – Time line of involvement	49

Introduction

Over the course of almost two years from February 2011 till December 2012 a range of concerns were raised about the sexual activities of a number of individual young people in the Auckland area. Police and Child, Youth and Family were involved in responding to these concerns. In October 2013, the media began reporting on a group of young men calling themselves 'Roastbusters' who used their Facebook page to recruit members and to write about their sexual exploits with young girls whom they met at parties. In November 2013, Minister Tolley asked the Independent Police Conduct Authority to report on the Police's handling of the investigations and to undertake a thorough investigation into the alleged offending. This investigation subsequently became known as Operation Clover and a redacted report of this investigation was released in October 2014. Following the release of the Independent Police Conduct Authority (IPCA) report in March 2015 on the Police's handling of the alleged offending, Deputy Chief Executive Bernadine Mackenzie commissioned a review of Child, Youth and Family's involvement in this investigation. This review has been undertaken by the Office of the Chief Social Worker.

The primary objective of the review has been to consider Child, Youth and Family's involvement with the young people identified as part of the original concerns. The focus of this review has primarily been on the period of activity between February 2011 and December 2012 and as such, the subsequent investigation by Police, in conjunction with Child, Youth and Family known as Operation Clover has not been within the review's remit. However, in considering the responses to the young people involved in that earlier period, many of these same young people were re-approached as part of Operation Clover and the review has considered the on-going needs of the young people identified from the earlier phase.

It is important to consider the context within which this review has been carried out. To date, despite there being substantial Police investigation, no criminal charges have been pressed against any of the young people involved, and it is clear from interviews undertaken with some of the young girls, that not all of them perceived themselves as victims. This review has therefore attempted to reflect this by avoiding the use of terms such as perpetrator; victim etc. unless it reflects the terminology used at the time of the responses and gives some insight into how agencies understood the concerns. However, the review team is very clear that the descriptions of the behaviours the young people were involved in were not safe and fell outside the bounds of 'normal' teenage experimentation. The review team have also made a deliberate attempt to move away from the phrase "Roastbusters" a term that featured heavily in the media coverage and one which we feel has some quite negative connotations.

This review has been set up to consider how well Child, Youth and Family responded to the individual needs of the young people known to them through the range of referrals during this period. It is not the remit of this review to

investigate what did or did not happen to the young people, but rather to consider what was known by Child, Youth and Family at the time, what could have been known, and to consider whether Child, Youth and Family responded appropriately within this context. In undertaking the review, it became clear that certain information identified subsequently, for example through the IPCA review or the Auckland Regional review was not known to Child, Youth and Family at the time of the original concerns. Therefore this review was also designed to consider the learning around the inter-agency mechanisms within which Child, Youth and Family and other agencies operated and to identify areas of learning around these key processes.

In writing the review we have identified areas where we found the practice to be limited, both in relation to Child, Youth and Family and in respect of the inter-agency processes. The main objective of the review has been to better understand what happened and to identify any necessary lessons so as to better protect and support young people in the future. To that end, we have made a number of recommendations and these are summarised at the end of the report.

Terms of Reference

The review's terms of reference are attached as Appendix 1. In brief, these were to consider Child, Youth and Family's involvement in the investigation and in addition to consider this in the context of interagency practices and processes.

As part of the review, the review team explored the context in which practice occurred to identify any gaps and learning including;

- social work decision making and judgements around levels of risk
- application of child protection policy and procedures
- recording of information
- information sharing both internally and with other agencies
- meeting the needs of the young people, both victims and the young men alleged to have perpetrated against them

Review methodology

The review team has had the advantage of seeing the reports of the reviews that have already been undertaken in respect of the concerns. These have assisted in informing our understanding of the context in which practice took place and in considering our own findings and recommendations against those already identified. The review team were also conscious that a number of staff had already been interviewed as part of earlier reviews and we were keen therefore to avoid unnecessary duplication of this. Instead we wanted to concentrate on considering the underlying themes that appeared to influence practice decisions and responses. It is also acknowledged that reviews are inevitably undertaken with the benefit of hindsight and are conducted away from

the pressures of day to day practice demands and workload. As noted earlier, information that has emerged since the original referrals was not known by Child, Youth and Family staff at the time. It is also acknowledged that practice reviews are invariably undertaken when potential concerns arise around an area of practice and this inevitably becomes the focus of the review – however it is important to recognise that all the services considered in this review operate within a broader context and way of working than will have been captured in this review as it fell outside our remit.

Information from Child, Youth and Family's computerised case management system (CYRAS) were interrogated in conducting this review. Interviews have been undertaken with Child, Youth and Family staff, Health and Education professionals, and specialist child protection services. Interviews with members of staff as part of the regional review were also scrutinised. Invitations were extended to the young people and their families who were involved in the concerns during the period under review and one parent responded to this. A number of focus groups were held with staff from three Child, Youth and Family sites, two of whom were directly involved in responding to concerns. The membership of the focus groups was deliberately opened up to include staff who had not been directly involved in the referrals as the review team were interested in exploring the practice themes more broadly. Those interviewed are detailed in Appendix B. A number of reports and practice guidelines were also considered and these included

Reports

- The 'Report on Police's handling of the alleged offending by 'Roastbusters' released in March 2015 by the Independent Police Conduct Authority
- 'Operation Clover – Investigation Overview' released by New Zealand Police in October 2014 – a redacted document outlining the Operation Clover investigation
- Review of practice by Child, Youth and Family Auckland region released in draft form in May 2014.
- Improving the Transition- Reducing Social and Psychological Morbidity During Adolescence - A report from the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, May 2011
- Workload and Casework Review Office of the Chief of Social Work 2014

Interagency agreement

- The Child Protection Protocol between New Zealand Police and Child, Youth and Family – 2010 version and 2012 version

Child, Youth and Family practice guidelines located on the Practice Centre Website

- Intake Decision Response Tool
- Working safely with young people who display harmful sexual behaviour
- Working safely with families/whānau where children are displaying concerning sexual behaviour
- Undertaking a care and protection assessment
- Potential Mass Allegations Investigation (MAI) protocol developed by Northern Region in January 2012

Child, Youth and Family involvement with the young people

The period covered by the review features a total of 14 young people, some of whom were subject to individual referrals to Child, Youth and Family, whilst others were mentioned as involved but not specifically referred. Referrals were dealt with individually by the relevant site and the review will consider what connections could potentially have been made. For the purpose of this review, each individual incident will be considered within its own right, however consideration will also be given to the possible connections, and where relevant, known history of that young person, to explore the appropriateness of the response given.

s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons

Pages 7-23 withheld under section 9(2)(a)

Emerging Themes

The internal regional review and the IPCA report provided a significant amount of detail around what activity had, or had not, taken place and this review has benefitted from that scrutiny of practice. Having described the practice that occurred, and where appropriate offering some comment, the review team were focussed on exploring the systemic issues that underpinned the decisions and activities of Child, Youth and Family in response to the concerns raised. There were a number of recurring issues emerging from the practice and the review team undertook several focus groups with social work sites to consider some of these further. The themes identified were

1. The way in which the service identifies and responds to potential risks for adolescents,
2. The role of Child, Youth and Family in care and protection work, with a particular focus on the Child Protection Protocol and in Mass Allegation Investigations,
3. Partnership working across agencies and with young people and families
4. Recording

1. The way in which the service identifies and responds to potential risks for adolescents:

The decisions taken around the potential risks and needs of the young people identified in the referrals appeared to have been influenced by a number of factors, one of which was the age range of the young people involved. With this in mind the review team asked the focus groups to consider how they identified and responded to risks involving adolescents. All of the focus groups identified that risks experienced by adolescents had some distinctive features; these included issues such as peer pressure and the possible tension with cultural norms and expectations; how young people articulated themselves; how young people themselves took risks in their own behaviours and the skills and capacity workers required to respond to such risks. In turn, this had some bearing on how professionals identified risks and vulnerabilities, as well as the service's role in addressing those issues.

From the focus group discussions a number of factors that shaped responses to working with adolescents were identified.

Values and attitudes

The focus groups identified a range of differing attitudes and values towards working with adolescents and for some it was clear this was not an area they held a preference for. This appeared to be influenced by their perceptions that

adolescents were more difficult to engage, were more “manipulative’, voted with their feet, and as a result of understanding consequences more, less likely to agree to engage in key processes such as evidential interviews. Adolescents were seen to require much more time and effort to engage and maintain relationships with. Managers were equally clear that a particular interest in working with this age group was essential, along with the required skills and knowledge.

The review team would acknowledge that inevitably staff will have particular strengths and areas of skills in their professional practice and that sites tend to arrange their teams and workload accordingly which is an appropriate way to manage these skills and strengths in a way that is client focussed. However regardless of personal preferences, all social workers and managers should be able to respond appropriately and effectively to situations they encounter as part of their day to day practice, particularly when involved in the initial intake decision about responses. They should be supported to recognise when personal values or attitudes might impact interfere with this.

Early decision making and assessment must be underpinned by a child centred approach that encourages staff to consider each young person’s unique circumstances, the impact of such circumstances, and where these result, or are likely to, result in risk for that young person and require some form of intervention. In the focus groups there was evidence of some insightful and motivated practice in relation to working with adolescents, however equally there was evidence in others of a reluctance to engage with this age group. All of the focus groups were able to identify some of the challenges of working with adolescents. For some participants this appeared to be translated into a rationalisation for not doing so. This is a concern and underpins the need for high quality reflective supervision and a comprehensive learning and development framework which enhances continued professional development.

Understanding risks for adolescents and when Child, Youth and Family have a responsibility to take action

Adolescence is generally recognised as a period of experimentation and testing of boundaries, as young people begin to manoeuvre the transition from childhood to adulthood¹⁴ and social work staff were able to identify this. However there was much less agreement within the groups as to what constituted ‘normal’ teenage behaviour, and a number of staff appeared to hold the view that behaviours such as regular drug and alcohol consumption and under age sexual activity fell into this category. In 2011, the report from the Prime Minister’s Chief Science Advisor noted that

“brain maturation is not complete until well into the third decade of life and that the last functions to mature are those of impulse

¹⁴ Improving the Transition - Reducing Social and Psychological Morbidity During Adolescence - A report from the Prime Minister’s Chief Science Advisor, May 2011

control and judgement. It is therefore inevitable that adolescence is a period of risk-taking and impulsivity. For many children these are basically healthy and transient behaviours, but for too many there are long-term negative consequences.”¹⁵

The review team felt strongly that further guidance is required to assist staff in determining when such behaviours fall outside the realms of experimentation and into the area of risk. This is not to suggest that all incidences of underage sexual activity, for example, should be considered a care and protection issue for Child, Youth and Family. Research tell us

“there is a mismatch or maturity gap between the age of sexual maturation, with its associated changes in brain function leading to greater reward-seeking and sensation-seeking, and the level of brain maturation that is required to navigate the risks that come with additional freedom. Greater risk taking is a normal part of that process and that can involve testing the boundaries of the group norms. When the group norms are not well established, or are characterised largely by risky behaviours, exceeding the boundaries may result in transient or permanent harm.”¹⁶

It was evident from the review team’s discussion with external agencies that there is already some excellent work being undertaken in working with young people who are sexually active, often adopting a harm reduction model of intervention. However, all services involved with supporting young people would benefit from shared guidance on when such behaviours require a more formal response. Decisions made about a young person’s ability to make safe choices or ‘self-protect’ (a term that appeared repeatedly in this review) should be based on robust assessment, and not be dependent on the chronological age of an individual.

Eleven of the 14 young people referred over the review period were known to have had some previous Child, Youth and Family involvement, some to a greater degree than others. This should in itself have been a factor in considering the individual resilience and possible vulnerabilities of those young people but the review team found little evidence of this. This is a recurring challenge in care and protection practice and not just in New Zealand;

“Research suggests that assessment can be rather too focused on the content of the referral – the immediate issues – while failing to consider a case history. Incidents need to be considered on context; concerns need to be connected in order to build up a fuller picture of a child’s life”¹⁷

¹⁵ Ibid p 11

¹⁶ Improving the Transition - Reducing Social and Psychological Morbidity During Adolescence - A report from the Prime Minister’s Chief Science Advisor, May 2011 p6

¹⁷ Ten pitfalls and how to avoid them: What research tells us, Broadhurst et al, NSPCC 2010 p14

Work is currently underway within Child, Youth and Family to address this issue with the introduction of chronologies which can greatly aid case analysis and encourage staff to consider presenting issues in the broader child and family history.

At the core of this review was the issue of risk taking behaviours amongst teenagers and attitudes towards this. Ignoring for the moment the legal parameters around this, it was clear that there were a range of views towards underage sexual activity that influenced practice decisions. When referrals were identified as rape, or sexual assault, Child, Youth and Family responded robustly in the first instance. However where perceptions of events began to shift (often at times due to miscommunication or misinformation), so too did the language used by Child, Youth and Family staff and attitudes towards the vulnerability of the young people involved. Events began to be described as consensual and not requiring Child, Youth and Family response because it was 'not abuse'. This 'all or nothing' approach will be discussed further in the next section, however it was noted that some staff raised the issue of a young person's rights to make risky decisions. The review team believes strongly whilst a young person does have such a right, and this is in fact a key stage in their developmental stage, Child, Youth and Family, and indeed wider society, has a responsibility to support them to make better choices or intervene when such choices place them or others at risk. A children's rights approach in this area of work is essential to help facilitate the developing critical thinking of the young person. However some young people also require support to understand consequences and risk, self-regulation and choice; thus allowing them to make more informed choices and help the transition from dependence to independence. In the majority of cases, this responsibility falls to and is managed by the family - in situations where families are unwilling or unable to respond effectively, services should be offered to support them, particularly when to do otherwise could result in harm for that young person.

The review team found that the impact of leadership on site culture was significant. Where a management team questioned the role of Child, Youth and Family to be responsible for responding to concerns to adolescent risk taking behaviour, there was a corresponding view within the practitioner group. Similarly, where managers were clear about the role of Child, Youth and Family to partake in such work, there was a greater recognition from social workers that they had a role to play. This was found to be true in a number of the areas explored within the focus groups and clearly highlighted the influence of management's leadership within sites. A finding of the review team was that one specific site had some strongly held views about the role of Child, Youth and Family particularly in working with adolescents, and discussions are being progressed with that site.

The role of social media was a key feature in the media coverage of the investigation and the focus groups had mixed views how this impacted on the behaviours of young people.

“The nature of peer pressure and role models has been radically altered by exposure to electronically connected social networks and to very different media content. Young people have far greater freedom, engendered by more ready access to funds. While the exact impact of these changes is difficult to ascertain, it is clear that they have radically affected the social pressures that influence adolescent behaviour.”¹⁸

Further understanding is required on the role social media plays in being a causal factor in risk taking behaviour. The impact of the ‘public shaming’ of some of the young people involved in this case and the subsequent media attention was clear in this review but the review team would concur with the reminder that the “complex relation between opportunity and risk is not distinctive to the internet, rather it is a feature of adolescence;”¹⁹ The use of social media did not cause these behaviours but the impact of social media needs to be better understood. Child, Youth and Family staff require greater training to explore some of current research in this area.

Another feature of the responses to the referrals was the lack of formal consideration of the needs of the young men. As noted already, there was only one occasion when one of the young men – Male A – was made the subject of a report of concern and no action was taken by the site at the request of the Police. It is recognised that had charges been brought against any of the young men at the time of the original referrals, this would have prompted a response under the youth justice system. In this instance though, no charges were brought against the young men and the Police during the review period were clear about their lack of intention to bring charges. As such, intervention with the young men did not meet the criteria for intervention from a youth justice perspective. There was however scope for Child, Youth and Family to intervene from a care and protection perspective and as the regional review alluded to, the legislation allows for this response under section 14(1)(d)(i) of the Children Young Persons and their Families Act, 1989 which states “*the young person has behaved or is behaving in a manner that is or is likely to be harmful to the physical or mental or emotional wellbeing of the child or young person or to others*”.

The fact that this did not occur is concerning. It is possible this was for a number of reasons, including the failure to identify a cumulative picture of the young men’s behaviours until the meeting in December 2012. It is also possible that the perceptions of vulnerability and risk affected the responses; whilst the young women were initially considered as ‘victims’ this threw a different light on the behaviour of the young males as ‘perpetrators’. However if the understanding of the young girls experiences shifted, as it seemed to do in

¹⁸ Improving the Transition - Reducing Social and Psychological Morbidity During Adolescence - A report from the Prime Minister’s Chief Science Advisor, May 2011 p2

¹⁹ Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: teenagers’ use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression., Sonia Livingston, 2008 p 397

many of these referrals, to seeing the events as consensual and therefore 'behavioural' then there is less clarity for services in how to define the actions of the young men.

It would appear that the Police decision not to press forward with investigations or charges, impacted on how Child, Youth and Family understood the young men's' behaviours. As explored earlier, their actions should have been considered in their own right and the review would concur with the regional review's finding that "there is confusion in recognising harmful sexualised behaviour as a potential care and protection concern, particularly where it has yet to be established whether or not a young person has committed an offence."

Capacity and Capability of Child, Youth and Family to respond

In exploring with social work staff the role of Child, Youth and Family to respond to concerns about adolescent risk taking behaviour two very distinct views emerged – firstly whether there was in fact a role for Child, Youth and Family as discussed above, and secondly, whether the service is in fact equipped to respond effectively to such concerns.

Responding to challenging or risk taking behaviours in adolescents requires skill, knowledge, patience and time. All the staff spoken to as part of this review acknowledged the benefits of building a relationship with the young person and equally the challenge in doing so. In part, this was explained by pressures of work, competing priorities and timescales for processes that did not necessarily respond to the time required to effectively engage with a young person. However a lack of skill in communicating with teenagers was also identified as a contributory factor, as well as a lack of specialist knowledge and professional confidence. It is these two issues of capacity and capability that this report will explore further.

Capacity

The rising demands on Child, Youth and Family social workers is well documented and the Workload and Casework Review in 2014 noted that Child, Youth and Family has dealt with a six-fold increase in its reported number of notifications over the past 15 years. In the period 2011 - 2012 Child, Youth and Family received over 90000 reports of concern that required some form of further assessment. This accounts for over 66% of all reports of concern. Approximately 80% of these involved concerns about children under 12 years, whilst the remaining 20% related to young people over the age of 12. The sheer volume of referrals resulted in a call for Child, Youth and Family to clarify its core business and much activity has taken place over the past twelve months in an attempt to do this. At the time of these referrals this debate had not yet commenced but it is recognised that sites were dealing with a significant

volume of referrals, the sheer scale of which impacted on Child, Youth and Family's ability to identify where they were most needed.²⁰

The focus groups generally all expressed some reservations about the effectiveness of Child, Youth and Family to effect change for young people engaged in risk taking behaviour, some more strongly than others. Interestingly, when asked to consider the role of the service to assess the needs and risks of young people and their families, the conversation very quickly turned to the lack of availability of suitable placements. It was striking to the review team that conversations about assessing need and possible vulnerability quickly turned into conversations about resources. This is not to negate the concerns about the appropriateness of placements for young people, and it is clear this was a very real concern expressed by the focus groups. However robust assessment and decision making must be informed by the needs of the young person and the capacity of the Child, Youth and Family to meet needs can only be understood and addressed more effectively if the need is clearly identified. Where unmet needs are identified, this should form part of the strategic leadership around resource matching, yet the Workload review found that

“Organisational risks and issues around capacity and capability were being managed as they arose. However, they were not always formally escalated and quantified, which created challenges in understanding, tracking and identifying patterns and themes at a strategic level”²¹

The review team noted how little the young people were directly involved in Child, Youth and Family's responses to the referrals. Only three of all the young people identified were seen directly by a Child, Youth and Family social worker. (Female J was also understood to have been seen but there is no record of this contact and a telephone conversation took place with Female D). Whilst a key objective of Child, Youth and Family is to support the family in building safety for a young person, this should be inclusive of the young person themselves and they should have a voice in their own assessment and any subsequent planning. The need to spend time with young people, to build relationships and seek their views and perceptions of their experiences, cannot be underestimated. Research has found that a “continuity of care to form trusting relationships” can be essential in assisting with information on sexually healthy development.²² In the Workload and Casework Review the actual time social workers spend in contact with young people and their families was found to amount to only 25% and only 6.1% was in direct face to face contact with young people for care and protection social workers. The same review identified that:

²⁰ Workload and Casework Review Office of the Chief of Social Work 2014

²¹ Ibid p106

²² Auslander et al as cited in Improving the Transition - Reducing Social and Psychological Morbidity During Adolescence - A report from the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, May 2011 p 138

“More priority needs to be given to quality, professional engagement with children, young people and their families. Child, Youth and Family needs to ensure children, young people and families are always seen, engaged with, listened to, and fully involved in decisions about their own lives.”²³

The review would concur with this view.

The review team were able to speak with Female H's mother about the family's involvement with Child, Youth and Family and she expressed the view that Female H appeared to have a good relationship with a youth justice social worker assigned to Female H. Female H's mother expressed some frustration that despite this positive relationship, Female H was referred to a number of other services who were unable to establish working relationship with Female H. This resulted in Female H refusing to engage with those services. Instead of enhancing the capacity of Female H's social worker to build on the relationship she had with Female H, Child, Youth and Family continued to refer Female H to other services, despite the growing evidence that this was not working. This point underlies the fundamental importance of relationship building in work with adolescence and also the apparent inflexibility of services in developing a response that is adapted to the young person's requirements. The review team suggest that further consideration needs to be given to developing specialist integrated services to work with adolescents and their families which would build both capacity and capability. This needs to be undertaken in conjunction with partner agencies and non-government organisations.

Capability

As already mentioned, assessing the needs and risks of young people involved in unsafe behaviours requires a knowledge of adolescent (and lifelong) development, core engagement skills, the need for a holistic response and a clear understanding of Child, Youth and Family responsibilities to support young people and their families where there are concerns about risk. Staff also need to be skilled in considering when a young person's behaviours deviate 'outside the norm' of adolescent experimentation and be able to recognise the actual or potential impact of such behaviour. The impact of peer pressure and cultural expectations as well as disadvantages for specific cultural groups can also play a significant role in adolescent behaviours. To undertake such work in a culturally sensitive way requires a skilled, competent and confident work force that is motivated to engage with young people and their families, and see the potential for change.

²³ Workload and Casework Review Office of the Chief of Social Work 2014 p8

It is recognised that not all staff will have a particular interest or skill in working with adolescents but those that do should be encouraged and supported to do so. Whilst training on adolescent brain development is currently available as part of Child, Youth and Family's practice curriculum, the review team recommends this be supplemented by more in-depth training in this area, including engagement skills and evidenced based intervention strategies. Any training and staff development in this area should be framed within a multi-agency and multi-dimensional approach. Child, Youth and Family need to understand their own roles and responsibilities in working with adolescents, as well as equipped to do this. However they also need to understand their role in conjunction with partner agencies and inter-agency frameworks of interventions.

Recommendation 1 of the Workload and Casework Review highlighted the need for Child, Youth and Family to work with partner agencies to:

“provide clarity for both Child, Youth and Family social workers and partner agencies, enhancing the ability to work collaboratively and provide a range of services around children with multiple and varying levels of need”²⁴

One approach suggested by a site was a harm reduction response which recognises the choices that young people will make and endeavours to assist the young person to make informed choices and build capacity to make safer choices. The approach focuses on engagement, building strengths, and assisting young people in developing life skills and requires social workers who are equipped and supported to undertake such work. Members of the review team met with the Engaging Challenging Youth team (a specialist Child, Youth and Family service based in Auckland) and were impressed by their knowledge and level of experience in this area and we recommend further consideration is given to identifying evidence based intervention strategies on working with adolescents.

Identifying what works with adolescents and risk taking behaviours is an area that will require further consideration. The report from the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor in 2011 identified a gap in the research of evidenced based intervention strategies but suggested that relationship focused, multi-agency coordinated interventions can improve outcomes for some of our most vulnerable adolescents.

Findings from the New Zealand Pathways to Resilience research project indicate that for young people (who experience multiple concurrent service system involvement), consistent service quality from each service is a critical factor for reducing harm (risk reduction, resilience enhancement and improved wellbeing outcomes). Services that demonstrate positive youth development

²⁴ Workload and Casework Review Office of the Chief of Social Work 2014 Rec 1, p 12

practices, in particular youth engagement and decision-making; working in respectful ways with youth; and taking account of their circumstances, improves wellbeing outcomes.²⁵ This is an area that the review team recommends be explored further with partner agencies.

On a more generic point, all Child, Youth and Family staff should be equipped to identify risk and vulnerability with this age group so that the need for intervention is understood and recognised. The review will consider how Child, Youth and Family staff understand the need for care and protection in the next section.

Overall, concerns emerged that vulnerable adolescents in many ways fell into a gap between care and protection services and youth justice services. The review team believe that this gap is twofold; firstly in how services are organised and equipped to respond to young people, and secondly about how risks and needs of that age group are perceived and understood. This is an area that requires further consideration both in terms of service design and learning and development, but also how potential risks to young people are articulated in national guidance and policy.

2. The role of Child, Youth and Family in care and protection work, with a particular focus on the Child Protection Protocol and in Mass Allegation Investigations:

In considering the responses of Child, Youth and Family in responding to the concerns about the young people, the review team were struck by how often the decision to take some form of intervention appeared to be based on whether the referral was believed to fit the criteria of the Child Protection Protocol. This raised a number of questions for the review team as to how the protocol was being understood and applied, and what social worker staff understood their role to be within a care and protection context.

The Child Protection Protocol (CPP) is a joint policy between Child, Youth and Family and New Zealand Police and sets out the criteria for how the agencies “will work alongside each other in situations of serious child abuse”.²⁶ The version of the protocol that would have applied in responding to the referrals was developed in April 2010, with an update provided in 2012. However, both versions share many similarities and outline key steps that both agencies must undertake when a care and protection concern is raised. These include an

²⁵ Sander, J., Munford, R., Thimasarn-Anwar, T., Liebenberg, L. & Ungar, M (2015). The role of positive youth development practices in building resilience and enhancing wellbeing for at-risk youth, *Child Abuse & Neglect* 42, 40-53.

²⁶ Child Protection Protocol between New Zealand Police and Child, Youth and Family

early consult, agreeing an investigation plan, implementing said plan, and continuing regular liaison throughout the duration of the process.

The role of Child, Youth and Family as defined within the protocol

“includes keeping the children safe and planning with the family and other services to improve wellbeing. It’s Child, Youth and Family’s job to do what’s best for children, and to keep them at the centre of decision making at all times.”²⁷

The scope of the protocol applies to serious child abuse including sexual abuse, serious physical abuse and serious neglect, as well as other scenarios. It does not apply to reports of concern where “Police request for a child forensic interview where there are no care and protection concerns.”²⁸ What became apparent during the focus groups is that there is some disparity in how sites understood the term ‘care and protection’ in the context of the unsafe behaviours described in the referrals and Child, Youth and Family guidance needs to be revisited to address this. For some, the lack of familial responsibility for the abuse or harm meant that the concerns did not fall under the definition of care and protection, and a distinction was clearly made between choices adolescents make about putting themselves at risk and younger children where “the risks are put on them by others.” As noted already, the status of the young men as ‘perpetrators’ was not established through any criminal convictions and the Police indicated they were unable to progress this in a number of the referrals. However the review team are in no doubt that the events experienced by the young females, and indeed the behaviour of the young men, indicated a level of harm or likelihood of harm that required some form of assessment and intervention and the definitions currently described on Child, Youth and Family’s Practice Centre require clarification, including the guidance on harmful sexual behaviour.

The Child, Youth and Family Practice Centre details the types of concerns that may be raised about harm to children and young people and the formal interventions that should be considered. These include a response under the child protection protocol, a child and family assessment, or a partnered response and various timescales are to be applied depending on the considered urgency of the situation. Whilst such frameworks are well established across international boundaries, the review team were concerned that an unintended consequence of such ‘pathways’ is that staff became focused on defining the criteria of response, and not the needs of the young person. Processes can assist social workers to articulate their practice but ultimately, it is the practice with the young person and their family that will effect change.

An overly prescriptive approach to understanding risk and the impact of this such as the intake decision response tool, can advertently result in a lack of

²⁷ Child Protection Protocol between New Zealand Police and Child, Youth and Family sec 1

²⁸ Child Protection Protocol between New Zealand Police and Child, Youth and Family sec 5

professional judgement that fails to consider the particular circumstances of the individual young person. This, in the view of the review team, is not safe practice and further consideration should be given to how pathways of response are articulated. Sound professional judgement is an essential component when assessing risks and needs to young people. Whilst research can assist practitioners in identifying risk indicators, understanding when a young person may require a response under care and protection will be determined by a thorough consideration of the motivations of that young person, the impact on their emotional well-being and physical safety, and the obstacles they may face in altering their behaviours.

Section 14 of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 defines a child or young person being in need of care and protection where “a child or young person has behaved, or is behaving, in a manner that – (i) is, or is likely to be harmful to the physical or mental or emotional well-being of the child or young person or to others”.²⁹ This definition could have been applied to all of the referrals that Child, Youth and Family considered and it is this that should have informed the practice, rather than the suitability of the process. Therefore whilst the review team recognises the possible ‘confusion’ resulting from criteria laid out within the Child Protection Protocol and Intake Decision Making Response Tool, fundamentally Child, Youth and Family had a duty of care to consider the young people’s care and protection needs under the legislative framework by which the service operates.

Although not a feature at the time of the original referrals, an issue that was raised by site leadership teams was the impact of the debate in the past 12 months for Child, Youth and Family to define its core business and how this had potentially resulted in some uncertainty about who is best placed to respond to vulnerable young people. One site reflected that the debate about the thresholds for statutory intervention and the incremental roll out of Children’s Teams had resulted in some lack of clarity about the point at which concerns become a Child, Youth and Family responsibility. They felt there had been a change in how Child, Youth and Family responded to particular concerns.

It should be noted that a new Intake Decision Response tool has been developed in the past year to assist sites to determine their responses and this view about the apparent ‘exclusion’ of adolescents from Child, Youth and Family’s work was not consistent across the three sites the review team visited. Nor does it account for the decisions taken at the time of the referrals involving the young people featured in this review, but it does suggest the need for a clearer articulation about the role of Child, Youth and Family in responding to concerns about care and protection for all children and young people.

The language of the Child Protection Protocol which applies the criteria of ‘serious abuse’ inadvertently infers that other types of harm are ‘less serious’.

²⁹ Consolidated Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 Sec 14 (1) (d)

Whilst the review team would accept that the ‘criminality’ of different types of acts perpetrated are defined in legislation and can carry differing sentences, from a care and protection perspective, the level of ‘seriousness’ to a young person ultimately has to be measured in terms of impact for that individual. In the Intake Decision Response tool, there is a clear emphasis on the particular vulnerabilities of children under the age of five. Whilst it is not the intention of this review to challenge the veracity of this, there is some evidence to suggest that an unintended consequence of such an emphasis is that the particular risks and vulnerabilities of older children and young people are, to a certain extent, seen as less of a priority. This is clearly not the case and further work needs to be done to ensure decision making at the early intervention stage is robust and considers the actual or potential impact on the individual child or young person, regardless of age or ‘type’ of abuse.

Another key feature of the discussions around working jointly within the Child Protection Protocol with the Police was the level of frustration at times voiced about the apparent lack of parity within the process in general. Child, Youth and Family staff raised concerns about the at times “directive nature of discussions with their colleagues from the Police.” A view frequently expressed was that Child, Youth and Family were “doing the ‘leg work’ for the Police” in a criminal investigation that they felt did not always relate to the objective of Child, Youth and Family in building safety around the child or young person³⁰.

Concerns included the lack of reciprocal information sharing, with Child, Youth and Family staff often finding out about the progress of a Police investigation via the family, or conversely Child, Youth and Family being the point of contact for families looking for updates on the progress of a Police investigation. By contrast, some social workers shared very positive examples of good joint working, where information was shared and considered collectively and the Police were involved in feedback to the family at the end of the investigation.

A variation in operational experiences is not uncommon and how things ‘work on the ground’ can often vary, however a recurring feature of the discussions with all levels of Child, Youth and Family staff was that this was often dependent on the individuals involved and the quality of relationship with that individual. Whilst the review team recognise and acknowledge the importance of good working relationships, the roles and responsibilities of both services should be clearly understood and based on best practice standards, not on personal relationships.

One site in particular felt that their relationship with the Police had changed significantly in the past few years and felt that this was due largely to a change in personnel, describing a previous officer as ‘being on the same page’. The danger with such an approach is that where both agencies are on the wrong page this can be difficult to recognise. The role of leadership to develop good

³⁰ Quotes from various Focus Groups

communication and foster an understanding of where roles both overlap and diverge, is crucial.

The review team did find evidence of examples where Child, Youth and Family were robust in establishing clear roles with the Police and this was felt to be a positive. The Child Protection Protocol clearly identifies the need for annual training between Child, Youth and Family and Police “to develop an understanding of each other’s roles and responsibilities...further professional development may occur more frequently as locally identified and agreed”.³¹ In one site, there was no evidence of local training having taken place since the cases were highlighted in the media.

There was some discussion about whether a response under the Child Protection Protocol was in fact the best response for some young people, and it was noted that in the referrals outlined earlier, only one of the young females agreed to undertake the evidential interview (it should be noted that not all the young people were approached at the time in respect of this). The review team recognise that the right to choose to participate in the process is fundamental; however it is less clear whether this lack of participation in the evidential interview process subsequently influenced the assessment and response of Child, Youth and Family to some young people.

A number of the same issues could be said to apply about the meeting that took place in December 2012 which considered whether a response under the Mass Allegation investigation (MAI) was required. We know that the decision not to proceed under MAI was largely influenced by misinformation that was provided at the meeting about the status of previous Police investigations. In the referral from s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons there was clear evidence of harm to a number of the young girls and this was not addressed, either within a collective response such as the MAI, or individually, though it is understood that there was some discussion around this. It is clear that there was also discussion about the young men’s behaviour and whether anything could be done to address this. The MAI protocol that existed at the time is currently under review and the review team recommend that a much clearer emphasis needs to be placed on the element of well-being and safety of young people as well as clear processes for considering the individual needs of young people where a response under MAI is not required.

Ultimately, the review team found that in discussions around the care and protection responsibilities of Child, Youth and Family staff, the debate very quickly became about process and definitions, and not risk or need. There is a danger that Child, Youth and Family have become too ‘process driven.’ The review recommends that our current guidance in this area is revisited and strengthened to ensure that the overall objectives to fulfil our care and

³¹ Child Protection Protocol between New Zealand Police and Child, Youth and Family sec 11

protection responsibilities and keep the focus on the young persons' needs, have not been inadvertently 'lost' in the detail of the process.

3. Partnership working across agencies and with young people and families

As stated earlier, the purpose of this review is to consider Child, Youth and Family's involvement in these cases and, in addition, to consider this in the context of interagency practices and processes. The report has highlighted areas where inter-agency communication, decision making and practice fell short of acceptable standards and the following key events are summarised here as a reminder:

s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons

- no further discussion with [redacted] about their referral
- no invitation to the [redacted] or the nurse specialist to the meeting in December to discuss the concerns s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons
- lack of feedback to [redacted] following on from the meeting in December 2012 s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons
- limited information sharing from medicals to Child, Youth and Family
- lack of follow up information sharing between Police and Child, Youth and Family and from the medical examination in response to the additional information in respect of Female B which would have shed new light on the understanding about the consensual nature of her experience
- conflicting expectations between Police and Child, Youth and Family about who, if anyone, was considering the young men's' needs and behaviours
- differing expectations in referrals involving underage sex, particularly when that behaviour might be considered harmful
- little evidence of strategies to build a community response to the needs of young people and differing expectations about roles and responsibilities in the area of underage sexual activity and risk taking behaviour

As well as the above areas of inter-agency practice, there was limited evidence of partnership working with the young people and their families. As noted earlier, safety assessments were often undertaken without the young person or family being seen, and decisions were often taken about the need for Child, Youth and Family involvement (or indeed other supports), without any discussion with the people who would have potentially been in the best position to have a view around this, i.e. the young person or family. This was also a finding of the broader Workload and Caseload Review and work has been taken forward to address this (such as the Tuituia assessment framework), as well as on-going monitoring and quality assurance of the implementation of this.

Having identified the areas of practice where inter-agency information sharing, communication and liaison could have been improved upon, the review team were keen to explore with the focus groups what influenced this and whether these same challenges continue to occur. A recurring feature in the review team's discussion with focus groups and with partner agencies was the issue of service entry level criteria – i.e. who should do what and when? Child, Youth and Family managers acknowledged the very real frustrations of other agencies, and sometimes families, who felt that 'more should be done' in situations where they felt themselves to be unequipped to respond or have no legal basis for involvement. The review team are conscious that there has been active debate in recent times about what constitutes Child, Youth and Family's 'core business' and there is much work going on elsewhere to address this, including the formation of Children's Teams, the Expert Advisory Panel etc. However it was evident from discussions with all the agencies consulted with that a key frustration was the lack of joint localised debate and agreement about local responses. If Child, Youth and Family do not have a role to play, then who does and what should a service do if they feel their own response is not sufficient to meet the needs of that child or young person? This is not a question that can be answered by this review and the review team are aware that a number of forums exist currently at both a local and national level around specific governance issues, for example Gateway Assessments, memorandums of understanding, to name just a few. However we would comment that each of these forums has an individual focus and purpose, thus narrowing the opportunity for broader localised consideration of possible responses and strategies to meet local needs.

There were complaints about services becoming entrenched in their positions and feeling isolated and overwhelmed in dealing with concerns. The debate about thresholds for intervention and 'core business' cannot take place in isolation from partner agencies. The Workload and Casework Review recommended that Child, Youth and Family

“...needs to strengthen its ability to build relationships, gather information and work inclusively and collaboratively alongside other agencies”

Earlier, the review commented on the concern that Child, Youth and Family's responses to some of the concerns was driven by process and not needs. In a similar vein, there was clear evidence on occasions that Child, Youth and Family approached referrals to their agency with a primary question of 'does our service need to do anything' rather than 'what does this young person need?' Whether this approach is as a result of the need to define our core business is unclear, and ultimately both questions could result in a similar answer; however there is a fundamental difference between a response that can look holistically at a young person's needs as opposed to a service led one which defines responses on service criteria. This is a debate that the review team felt extended beyond the three sites visited as part of the focus groups.

A recurring theme in this review has been the frustrations that Child, Youth and Family and partner agencies have vocalised about role expectations, service entry criteria and lack of communication across the services. Most services will, by default, have criteria for intervention and a range of intervention strategies at their disposal. A frustration voiced by social work staff interviewed was where the young person did not 'fit' the service or the response offered. If agencies or services are to meaningfully engage with young people, they need to have interventions that respond to the needs of the young person and not expect the young person to 'fit the service'. This requires a holistic approach to young people and a shared understanding of the needs, knowledge and skills required to deliver such a response.

The first three recommendations of the Workload and Casework Review all placed strong emphasis on a new set of expectations, guidelines and processes and structures about how government and non-government agencies work together around the needs of children and young people. The review team would concur with this and recommend that in addition to any national developments in this area, consideration should be given to the introduction of local community partnership forums, where local trends can be identified and considered, as well as local strategic responses and planning developed. This would also allow the local collective implementation of any national policies and guidance.

The creation of such a forum requires a structure for governance and accountability, as well as resources to deliver services to meet local needs and could also have a role in developing workforce capability at a local level. The development of such a forum would obviously need to be considered within the context of already existing mechanisms and partnerships but the primary focus would be to respond to the most vulnerable children and young people where there are care and protection concerns.

With the exception of the joint consults between Police and Child, Youth and Family in response to the referrals, there was little evidence of a co-ordinated multi agency approach to dealing with the concerns. The failure to include

s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons

or the nurse specialist in the meeting in December 2012 meant that potentially some information was 'lost' as was the potential role that the school or Health might have had in supporting the young people. Both Health and Education in our discussions were able to provide good examples of positive liaisons with Child, Youth and Family and other services, including Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services however there was a sense that local consults or forums with Child, Youth and Family had not taken place for a significant period of time and this resulted in increasing frustration. This was not necessarily true for all the sites visited and the review cannot comment on the details of each site's local community liaison arrangements; however it was evident that there was some frustration being expressed at a local level that did not appear to have an avenue for further discussion or resolution.

As part of the discussions within the focus groups, the review team queried whether Child, Youth and Family would receive or ask for the detail of a young person's evidential interview, or medical examination. It was clear that this was not common practice, and instead Child, Youth and Family would receive a summarised account or report. The review team had some concerns about this as it could, and in these cases did, result in potentially important and new information not being conveyed to Child, Youth and Family or indeed other partner agencies. The issue of information sharing is an area that needs to be explored further across the partner agencies, particularly in relation to instances where care and protection concerns exist.

Mechanisms for sharing information across all the relevant services need to be in place to ensure that crucial information is not lost. Whilst the Child Protection Protocol stipulates that Police and Child, Youth and Family consult regularly, this is not inclusive of other agencies or services and this can be a limitation. The review team were interested to hear about the practice within the non-accidental injury protocol where a multi-agency meeting is arranged within 24 hours of a referral. Whilst accepting this timescale may not be required in every report of concern, there is some merit in allowing for such a forum within the existing Child Protection Protocol to ensure the full extent of the concerns, as well as strengths can be considered.

The review team recommend that consideration is given to developing guidance on inter-agency information sharing for practitioners across all agencies working with children and young people where possible risks are identified. This could perhaps build on some of the discussions that are currently underway in the development of ViKI – the electronic information system for vulnerable children – but would be more explicit about the need to share information where child protection concerns exist.

Recording

Poor recording was found to be a recurring issue in this review. In particular, two key areas resulted in a more limited response – the first area was in the linking of young people as participants on CYRAS. The failure to do this robustly and consistently meant that it was difficult to identify an emerging picture of concerning, unsafe behaviour. Secondly, the recording around the concerns raised by s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons especially poor. As already noted, some of this was due to an existing policy of not entering individual young people's details where a possible MAI is being considered. The review team believe this practice is inadequate and is aware this issue is currently being addressed in the review of the MAI protocol. It is also of note however that the site manager who responded initially to the concerns clearly expected reports of concern to be made in respect of the individual young people but this did not occur and was never followed up. Of further concern is the fact that the contact

record containing the referral from _____ was not linked to all of the individual participants and was essentially lost within the system for a significant period.

A lack of a formal record from the meeting in December 2012 meant that there was confusion about what was discussed and what if any tasks, were agreed or monitored and reviewed. The review team recommend that the need for robust recording of participants in referrals to Child, Youth and Family is restated to the National Contact Centre, and that the MAI protocol is revisited as a matter of some urgency to ensure better recording of concerns and responses. Clearer accountability is also required around the roles and responsibilities of the senior manager from either Child, Youth and Family or the Police to ensure accurate records are kept and shared.

Conclusion and Key Findings

Between February 2011 and December 2012, Child, Youth and Family received six referrals involving a total of 14 young people, a number of whom were named repeatedly. At the outset of this review it was recognised that the behaviours described in the referrals have never resulted in criminal charges or prosecutions, but that as a review team we were satisfied that the behaviours described were not safe for the young people involved, nor did they fall within the realm of 'normal teenage experimentation'. Instead, these were behaviours that often occurred in conjunction with the misuse of alcohol and drugs, peer pressure, public 'shaming' and boasting on social media.

The review team found that the responses by Child, Youth and Family were influenced by a number of contributory factors, including miscommunication and misinformation, but also at times, a lack of clarity of the role of Child, Youth and Family in responding to vulnerable young people. This lack of clarity in turn appeared to be influenced by issues around capacity and capability. Overall, concerns emerged that vulnerable adolescents in many ways fall into a gap between care and protection services and youth justice services. The review team found that this gap is twofold; firstly in how risks and needs of that age group are perceived and understood, and secondly about how services are organised and equipped to respond to young people. This is an area that requires further consideration both in terms of service design and learning and development, and also how potential risks to young people are articulated in national guidance and policy.

Decisions around interventions often appeared process driven and not needs led; discussions around whether the behaviours constituted acts of abuse appear to have detracted from the broader question of the young person's need for care and protection. In the thematic discussions with the focus groups, the review team found evidence of insightful and reflective consideration of adolescent behaviours and needs, as well as strategies to work with

adolescents and their families in such situations. However, there was also evidence of a lack of understanding about Child, Youth and Family's responsibilities towards vulnerable adolescents and in one particular site, a view emerged that this sometimes fell outside the remit of Child, Youth and Family.

There was limited evidence of effective partnership working across the services or indeed with the young people and families involved. Information was often not shared appropriately, key agencies were not included in discussions, and young people and their families were not always directly seen. Expectations in particular between Child, Youth and Family and the Police of what agencies could or should do were either often not made explicit or agreed, and as a result, there was no intervention, particularly with regards to the young men involved. The issues around partnership working requires a more strategic response, both in how information is shared and considered on a case by case level but also how resources and unmet need are identified and considered at a local community level. More generally, it was found that debates about thresholds and joint working arrangements need to take place at a local as well as a national level with partner agencies to ensure the protection of our most vulnerable young people.

Poor recording resulted in a missed opportunity to identify patterns of behaviour though it is not clear whether given the observations above, whether in fact this would have made a difference to the responses of the service. Of particular note, the lack of minutes from the meeting in December 2012 and how the concerns were logged but not linked to the individual young people, meant that the review team found no evidence of consideration of the individual young people's needs or any agreed actions arising from that meeting.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this review, the review team make the following recommendations:

1. The way in which the service identifies and responds to potential risks for adolescents

- Further consideration needs to be given to developing integrated, multi-agency services at a local level to work with adolescents and their families from a holistic, needs led and children's rights perspective which would build both capacity and capability
- Additional capability development and learning should be implemented to all practitioners about adolescents, specifically their cognitive, emotional and social development and the impact of this on their understanding and actions, how to engage, build and maintain relationships with them, and evidenced based intervention strategies.

- Further work should take place on a multi-agency basis to consider effective and evidence based intervention strategies in the area of risk taking behaviour
- Multi-agency guidance should be developed to consider the circumstances where agencies may need to consider a more formal response to concerns about harmful sexual behaviour, including risk management, well-being and harm reduction strategies

2. The role of Child, Youth and Family in care and protection work, with a particular focus on the Child Protection Protocol and in mass allegation investigations

- Current guidance and policies on Child, Youth and Family practice centre should be revisited to ensure that key messages about risk and vulnerability are clearly articulated, aligned to legislative responsibilities, recognise the importance of professional judgement and the overall objectives to maintain a child centred, outcome focused approach are prioritised
- There is a need for a strong positional statement about Child, Youth and Family's need to consider risk from the perspective of the child, not the process. This should include revisiting the definitions we currently use and criteria for identifying harm.
- The MAI protocol, currently under review, requires significant change to ensure more emphasis is placed on well-being and safety of young people as well as clear processes for considering the individual needs of young people where such needs arise.

3. Partnership working across agencies and with young people and families

- In order to build a culture of information sharing when there are risks to children and young people, guidance on information sharing for practitioners should be developed across *all* agencies working with children and young people where possible risks are identified.
- Practice around working with and assessing needs and risk to adolescents should be developed from a multi-agency perspective
- Care and protection protocols should be revisited to ensure there is an opportunity for multi-agency discussions where required, and should not just be limited to Police and Child, Youth and Family.
- The review team recommend the introduction of Local Community Partnership Forums, where local trends and needs can be identified and considered, as well as local strategic responses and planning developed.
- The creation of such a forum would require a structure for governance and accountability, as well as resources to deliver services to meet local needs and could also have a role in developing workforce capability at a local level. The development of such a forum would obviously need to be considered within the context of already existing mechanisms and partnerships but the primary focus would be to respond to the most vulnerable children and young people.

4. Recording

- Roles and responsibilities for recording and linking individuals as participants on CYRAS needs to be reiterated, both to the National Contact Centre and sites as additional information may come to light
- The details of young people involved in potential MAI and any interventions or decisions in respect of this should be recorded on CYRAS

Office of the Chief Social Worker Practice Review – Terms of Reference

Following the release of the Independent Police Conduct Authority report on the Police's handling of the alleged offending by a group of young men who call themselves the 'Roastbusters', Deputy Chief Executive Bernadine Mackenzie has commissioned a review of Child, Youth and Family's involvement in this investigation to be completed. This review will be undertaken by the Office of the Chief Social Worker.

Purpose of Review

The purpose of this review is to consider Child, Youth and Family's involvement in the investigation and in addition to consider this in the context of interagency practices and processes.

Scope

The review team will objectively consider the context in which this practice occurred and identify any gaps and learnings including

-
- social work decision making and judgements around levels of risk
- application of child protection policy and procedures
- recording and planning of information
- information sharing both internally and with other agencies
- meeting the needs of the young people, both victims and alleged offenders.
-

The team will consider the key practice issues and recommendations made by the Auckland Region in their May 2014 report '*review of practice regarding reports of concern for the young people now known as being part of Roastbusters*' and any subsequent actions taken.

The team will consider the findings from the IPCA 'Report of Police's handling of the alleged offending by Roastbusters' and in particular feedback provided to Child, Youth and Family by IPCA

Methodology

The review team will

- read, examine and analyse electronic and paper based records

- interview Child, Youth and Family staff involved with this investigation, where clarification or further information is required.
- interview external stakeholders as required- preliminary list to include: Education, Health, Police.
- invite young people and their families to participate in this review, where appropriate.

Resources Required

To complete the review within the requested timeframe the following assistance is required

- youth justice advisor - national or local to Auckland
- practice leader/senior advisor from Auckland
- independent social worker (NGO)

Timeframe

Report to the Chief Social Worker for sign off by end of June 2015

Schedule of interviews/consultations undertaken

MAI Coordinator

Exploratory interview with Operational Manager and Regional Practice Advisor
(authors of regional review)

s 9(2)(a) Privacy of Natural Persons

Guidance Counsellor and School Nurse from

National Contact Centre

Nurse Specialist Puawaitahi

Child, Youth and Family Lead for Operational Clover

Manager for Engaging Challenging Youth Team

Manager for SAFE

Focus Group with Youth Justice Waitakere Leadership Team

Focus Group x 2 with Care and Protection Waitakere social workers

Focus Group with Care and Protection Waitakere Leadership Team

Focus Group x 2 with Care and Protection Grey Lynn social workers

Focus Group with Care and Protection Grey Lynn Leadership Team

Focus Group x 2 with Care and Protection Panmure social workers

Focus Group with Care and Protection Panmure Leadership Team

Telephone interview with parent of young person

s 9(2)(f)(iv) Active Consideration