

## Advancing the Whole System Approach

Date: Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2024

Time: 1pm - 3pm

Online Teams Meeting

### In Attendance:

Adele Hill (CJVSF),  
Cheryl Clark (COPFS)  
Deborah Nolan (SG)  
Gill Mccallum (CYCJ)  
Karen Suzeck (CYCJ)  
Leanne Blacklaw (Police Scotland)  
Lisa Hay (SG)  
Neil Hunter - chair (SCRA)  
Ranald McTaggart (NYJAG)  
Ross Gibson – project lead (CYCJ),  
Sally Howard – minute taker (CYCJ)

### Apologies:

Chris Wright (CI)  
Liz Murdoch (SG)  
John Trainer (SWS)  
Mhairi Shewan (Aberdeen City Council)  
Jennifer Ward (SG)  
Kirsten Urquhart (Young Scot)  
Kirsty Nelson (CHS)  
Sharon Maciver (Action for Children)  
Stephen Bermingham (CHS)

|     | Agenda Item                            | Notes of Discussion   |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.0 | <b>Welcome and introductions</b>       | NH welcomed all to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves  |
| 2.0 | <b>Membership</b>                      | No changes at this time   |
| 3.0 | <b>Approve minutes of last meeting</b> | Minutes approved.   |
| 4.0 | <b>Areas of focus</b>                  |   |
| 4.1 | <b>WSA survey results</b>              | <p>RG shared early results of the WSA with the group. The survey was carried out in December and was extended into January. 21 responses out of a possible 32 had been received, with 11 Local authorities yet to respond. <b>RG will pursue these further.</b></p> <p>Responses were collated into themes, which highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of resources were highlighted by the vast majority of authorities. This served as a barrier to WSA delivery and extension.</li> <li>EEl is available in most areas; the group discussed the importance of universal EEl availability following the CCJ Act.</li> </ul> |

|     |                             |  |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|
|     |                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCJ Act will impact upon the delivery of support to 16/17s within majority of local authorities. This reflects the variety of approaches adopted in responding to this cohort of children.</li> <li>• All authorities required training on the content of the CCJ Act, with staff from residential, area team, intensive services and generic children and families identified</li> <li>• CARM was incorporated within CP practice in most authorities, however there remain a substantial number where this is not the case.</li> <li>• Intensive and preventative services highlighted the importance of third sector and voluntary organisations. The group were concerned that financial pressures might impact upon the resourcing of such services.</li> <li>• Most authorities considering reconfiguration / developments in the way they deliver support to children.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - RG will seek to complete 32/32 responses and aim to present findings at a future NYJAG.</b></p>   |
| 4.2 | <b>EI - mapping process</b> | <p>KS provided update on the progress of the EI mapping process. This has been in operation from some time now, with previous attempts failing to garner the fuller picture required.</p> <p>A total of 21 responses had been received so far. Preliminary findings include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variety of routes into EI, with Police having powers in every LA. Other bodies – SW, education, SCRA etc – had route to do so in a smaller number of LAs.</li> <li>• In around one third of responses, EI is available to children who had not accrued charges</li> <li>• Variety in the nature of offences dealt with by each LA’s EI process</li> <li>• Gaps exist in relation to the involvement of children and parents when progressing through EI process. This poses challenges in relation to UNCRC compliance.</li> <li>• Inconsistent consideration of mental ill-health and neurodiversity amongst respondents</li> <li>• Challenges in measuring impact of EI, noting a lack of data and research in this field</li> </ul> <p>The group discussed input from KS and noted the need to better understand the impact of EI and therefore consider the investment needed within 3<sup>rd</sup> sector and statutory bodies who undertake this piece of work.</p> <p>Group felt that there was a need to develop:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data collection</li> </ol> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>2. Collaboration<br/>3. Gathering information</p> <p><b>Action - KS will seek to gather further responses and present updated findings at a future WSAIG.</b></p> <p><b>Action - Once EEI scanning is complete, NH, RG and KS to discuss what data / research is required in order to better understand EEI impact</b></p>   |
| <p><b>4.3 Youth Court progress</b></p> |  | <p>GM provided a summary of her work to date, noting that agreement in principle from the Sheriff Principal had been given for the consideration of youth courts across the country.</p> <p>GM has spent attended and observed a variety of court models over recent months, noting that Hamilton and Glasgow Sheriff Courts have developed their models and were in the process of delivering Youth Court services, which GM described.</p> <p>GM has also been in discussion with a variety of local authorities over the creation of more courts, with a general appetite for this service. She provided a summary of these areas.</p> <p>GM has produced a Youth Court Blueprint which highlights areas for consideration when creating Youth Courts: <a href="https://www.cycj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/CYCJ-Youth-Court-Blueprint-3.pdf">https://www.cycj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/CYCJ-Youth-Court-Blueprint-3.pdf</a></p> <p>CYCJ are happy to support any local authorities who were interested in developing this and have delivered support / workshops to bring partner agencies together.</p> <p>GM noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress has been quite slow as local authorities and other partners respond to competing demands</li> <li>• Many courts already have robust system in place to respond to young people; any developments may simply be formalising what they already have in place.</li> <li>• Some authorities anxious not to make any decisions that would conflict with the CCJ bill.</li> <li>• Resourcing issues pose a challenge</li> </ul> <p>NH thanked GM for her input. Group noted the progress that has been made thus far and would welcome a further update on this subject at a future WSAIG.</p> <p><b>Action – GM to return at future WSAIG to provide update.</b></p> |
| <p><b>4.4 CCJ Bill</b></p>             |  | <p>DN provided a summary of the CCJ Bill, noting that this is due to reach stage 3 in mid April.</p>  |

|            |   |  |
|------------|---|--|
|            |   | <p>DN noted a variety of significant implications for the WSA were it to be passed in the current form, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes relate to the hearing system and relate to information support to victims where a child has been harmed, and the child has caused times cases dealt with through the hearing system.</li> <li>• Access into the CHS for all children, therefore introducing greater number of 16 or 17 year olds children</li> <li>• Alterations to the MRC criteria, potentially making greater access to this resource</li> <li>• 212 amendments brought forward, with 100 proposed amendments which relate to reporting restrictions which will impact victims and witnesses.</li> <li>• Others relate to reporting restrictions / anonymity for suspected offences in relation to anonymity extending beyond the age of 18.</li> <li>• A slight change to the definition of secure care to ensure that in meeting the needs of children and secure care, any trauma that the child has experienced is taken into account; this change would merely reflect existing practice but would align to the conclusions within <i>the promise</i>.</li> <li>• Language within the 2011 Act is amended to remove references to 'moral welfare', replacing with 'health, safety, and development'.</li> <li>• Provision will allow under 18s with a mental health diagnosis to be cared for in a hospital setting rather than custody or secure.</li> <li>• New duty to provide standards for Secure transport and a duty to ensure the standards are being met.</li> </ul> <p>The WSAIG discussed these issues in some depth, with DN providing further details where necessary. Members agreed on significant impact of the Act upon WSA practice and were eager to receive further update at future WSAIG following stage 3 of the Bill's journey through Holyrood.</p> <p><b>Action – RG to share slides</b></p> <p><b>Action - DN to return to future WSAIG to explain CCJ Act implementation plan.</b></p> |
| <p>4.5</p> | <p><b>CARM - Consider capacity issues in relation to CARM</b></p> | <p>RG noted that with SG reporting requirements for use of CARM coming into force imminently, that more local authorities were in search and need of support to train staff and incorporate CARM into CP practice. This has been hampered by capacity within CYCJ.</p> <p>Allied to this, a growing number of local authorities were seeking training in START-AV. Again, capacity within CYCJ proved a challenge.</p> <p><b>Action – RG to provide fuller update at next WSA with a view of making report to subsequent YJIB and/or NYJAG</b></p>   |



|            |                                 |  |
|------------|---------------------------------|--|
|            |                                 |  |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>AOCB</b>                     | Nothing raised at this time.                           |
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Set date of next meeting</b> | To be arranged following discussion between NH and RG. |