

# **Independent Family Returns Panel report 2014-16**

# CONTENTS

CHAIRMAN'S FOREWORD.....	3
ROLE AND REMIT .....	5
SUMMARY .....	6
FAMILY RETURNS DATA 2014-16 .....	7
RECOMMENDATIONS 2014-16 .....	9
REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS .....	11
WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP .....	15
ANNEX A: PANEL MEMBERSHIP .....	16
ANNEX B: FAMILY RETURNS PROCESS DATA: 1 APRIL 2014 - 31 MARCH 2016 .....	18
ANNEX C: QUARTERLY STATISTICS ON CHILDREN HELD SOLELY UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT POWERS IN CEDARS AND TINSLEY HOUSE (2011-2016).....	19

## CHAIRMAN'S FOREWORD

I have been Chairman of the Independent Family Returns Panel ("the Panel") since March 2011, initially as Interim Chairman and in the substantive role since January 2012. This is the third Panel report building on the last reporting period of 2012-2014. Since the last report, the [Immigration Act 2014](#) has placed the Panel on a statutory footing.

During the current reporting period, I have maintained other challenges, as well as those offered by the role of Chairman of the Panel in a portfolio career which includes acting as Chairman of a Local Children's Safeguarding Board, offering support and challenge to 2 Local Authority Children's Services Departments as Independent Chairman of Improvement Boards following those services being judged by Ofsted to be "inadequate" and a spell as Interim Director of Children's Services. These varied, but related, roles have, in my opinion, allowed me to keep important oversight on wider issues as they relate to vulnerable children and families and in particular those who enter the family returns process.

I am deeply appreciative of the ongoing support and expertise of Panel members, highly experienced and talented individuals, who bring much to the process of improving the experience of families in the family returns process. Their support, challenge, and oversight of the returns process has been fundamental to the improvements made over the past 5 years. Panel members have been proactive in ensuring that the information we receive about families is accurate, the advice we give is heard and followed up by the Home Office and their contractors, and the returns process is as dignified and humane as it possibly can be.

Panel members have continued, during this reporting period, to experience the family returns process at first hand. They have spoken to and observed returning families and officials conducting those returns, interrogated relevant data and audit information, and continued to engage with Non-government Organisations (NGOs) and listen to their ideas about how the process can be improved for the families involved. I am confident that the well informed level of scrutiny offered by Panel members to the family returns process will continue to lead to important improvements in the future.

I have made reference to NGOs in previous reports and the important role they play as "critical friends" to the Panel and to the Home Office more widely. Their ongoing support and challenge is also vital if we are to build on the improvements achieved to date. NGOs are in some respects the Panel's "eyes and ears". They keep us informed about what is happening on the ground on a day to day basis and this allows the Panel to triangulate our own experiences with those of others who are engaged in returning families with children.

Our colleagues in local authorities are now much more aware of the family returns process and where families are known to them, engage positively with the Home Office to help prepare children and families for return to their country of origin. Schools too are playing an increasingly positive role in helping to ensure that children's best interests are served as part of the planning process. This is in no doubt due to the proactive role adopted by the Family Engagement Managers (FEMs), a cohort of Home Office officials whose origins can be traced to recommendations in the Panel's previous [reports](#).

I am also appreciative of the Home Office staff at Waterside House in Leeds who support the Panel with important administrative and intelligence functions. There have been many changes within the Home Office since the inception of the Panel in March 2011, including changes to structure and to management oversight. Despite these changes and the challenging nature of the work, the Panel is now well established and I would argue, is making a significant contribution to improving the experience of families in the family returns process and this has

been reflected in an increasing number of independent inspection reports by both the HM Inspectorate of Prisons, and the Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration.

Finally, I would like to pay tribute, on behalf of the Panel, to Lorna Tull-Griffith, who sadly died during this reporting period. Lorna was a highly valued and well respected member of the Panel who brought a wealth of expertise and insight from over 30 years working with children. Her significant contribution to the Panel will not be forgotten.

## ROLE AND REMIT

The Panel, which is made up of medical and child safeguarding experts (see annex A for details of Panel members), was established on 1 March 2011 to provide independent case-by-case advice to the Home Office on how to best safeguard children's welfare during a family's enforced return. This coincided with the national roll out of other key elements of the new family returns process.

The Immigration Act 2014 put the Panel on a statutory footing. In particular, it places a statutory duty on the Secretary of State to consult the Panel:

- a) in each family returns case where return is being enforced; and
- b) in each case where the Home Office proposes holding a family in pre-departure accommodation.

The advice provided by the Panel helps ensure that individual family return plans take full account of the welfare of the children involved and that the Home Office fulfils its responsibilities under [section 55 of the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009](#).

Decisions as to whether a family is removed from the UK still rest with the Home Office and the independent courts. It is not a function of the Panel to endorse or reconsider these decisions.

The Panel also maintains an overview of the handling of families who are denied entry to the UK at the border to ensure that detention in such cases is kept to a minimum. This, however, does not form part of the Panel's statutory function.

### How this works

All plans for ensured family returns are referred to the Panel for advice. The Panel normally meets to consider cases each Tuesday and Thursday, usually by telephone conference. In exceptional circumstances, the Panel may be convened at short notice to avoid unnecessary delay and uncertainty which would not be in the interests of the children. By necessity this happened on 2 occasions during this reporting period.

The Panel receives advance copies of the return plan to be considered. The Home Office Family Engagement Manager (FEM) responsible for the return plan is expected to attend the telephone conference to present the proposal and answer any questions the Panel has. The officer in charge of the arrest visit also attends where possible. In a small number of cases, other professionals involved with the family have been invited to attend, for example a social worker who knows the family well may be invited to attend. In this reporting period, no social workers or other external professional joined a Panel meeting.

While there is a presumption that the Panel's advice will be accepted, overall responsibility for enforcing the family's return lies with the Home Office. If, in exceptional circumstances, the Panel's advice is not accepted, the case is referred to the Immigration Minister to decide. This did not happen during this reporting period.

## SUMMARY

While the role of the Panel is primarily and fundamentally to provide advice and challenge to the Home Office on individual family returns, it has extended increasingly over the past 5 years to matters of policy and practice, performance, contract management and engagement with partner agencies. This in turn has led not just to a better family returns process but also to some system-wide improvements and organisational developments which in sum mean that the experience of families in the returns process is continually improving.

Returning families to their country of origin against their wishes is a sobering endeavour. However, if one believes that the UK should retain its sovereign borders then we must find the most humane and supportive way of reaching this outcome through the development of a system which gives families the best possible chance of making a successful transition. While some organisations believe families who want to stay here should never be returned home, they are few in number. The majority view is that if families have to return then the process must be supportive to achieving positive outcomes for children and their families. By making the last few days in this country as practically helpful and emotionally supportive as possible, we can help insulate the family from the disappointment and challenges of ensured return.

The Panel has played a significant part in system wide developments evidenced in this and in the Panel's previous reports which have improved the experience of children and their families within the returns process, albeit an experience they would prefer not to have. In this reporting period, families were returned to their country of origin more safely with the Home Office and its contractors operating in a way which demonstrates greater adherence to section 55.

There is still much to be done as evidenced by the review of recommendations made in the Panel's previous reports and the new recommendations laid out in this report. While our achievements over the past 5 years have been significant, many challenges remain to ensure the best interests of children are served in full during the returns process. The Home Office is to be commended for inviting independent scrutiny of the family returns process and has been receptive to the recommendations in this report and in previous reports which augurs well for further improvement in the future.

As was the case during the previous reporting periods, some of the new recommendations in this report have already been implemented through a process of formative feedback and evaluation. I am somewhat disappointed, however, to report that the Home Office and some partners have been slow to act on others.

While the Panel appreciates that the Home Office is, to some degree, still learning about its responsibility to children, it must ensure that this learning is undertaken consistently across the organisation and not left as the preserve of a specialist function (most notably the FEMs). The best interests of children remain a high priority and must become part of the organisational DNA when working with families in the returns process.

The family returns process is a much improved process. Families are no longer held for indefinite periods of time, if at all, and they are supported well throughout the process. Increasing numbers of families are also choosing to return to their country of origin voluntarily and with financial assistance. During this reporting period, Panel members have continued to directly observe the process and in the round continue to be impressed with the professionalism of the staff and their willingness to take on new ideas and alter practice to reflect those ideas. As a consequence, Panel members feel that they have been able to make a positive difference to the quality of time and support experienced by families just prior to departure from the UK and significantly the first 24-48 hours following return.

# 1. FAMILY RETURNS DATA 2014-16

- 1.1 The backdrop to this report is an increasingly positive one when comparing the number of returning families during the current reporting period with earlier data.
- 1.2 From 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2016, 2,287 families entered the family returns process compared to 665 in 2011-12 and 1,193 across the 2 year reporting period of 2012-2014. This gives a clear indication that the pace of the business has increased. However, this is not a “process” industry it is a humanitarian exercise to ensure that families are returned to their country of origin with dignity and with the support they will require to make a successful transition. The Panel’s view is that a positive outcome for a family is more likely to be achieved if they spend less time in the family returns process and where they have no rights to remain, spend as little time as possible in the UK before returning home. There are still too many families in the family returns process who, for many different reasons, have been in the system too long which makes return without stress more difficult. In some cases, the children were born in the UK and have no experience of the parents’ country of origin. It follows that if the length of stay in the UK impacts on the likely stress of return, then administrative efficiency in dealing with outstanding cases is an important aspect of the family returns process. Therefore, the increase of cases entering the family returns process is considered a positive aspect of the past 2 years.
- 1.3 During this reporting period, 1,470 families returned through the process, with removal not pursued in 243 cases. A further 60 cases were identified as not including a child aged under 18. Of those 1,470 families who left the country, 1,323 did so voluntarily, 89 families with assisted voluntary return for families and children (AVRFC) and 14 families at the required return stage. This means 97% of families who left the country did so without the need for an ensured return. This compares favourably with previous reporting periods when the figures were 51% in 2011-12 and 76% in 2012-2014. The data also reflects a positive trend of smaller numbers of families being arrested as part of the returns process as well as a significantly greater proportion of families returning voluntarily or with assistance. This is a very welcome trend as it reflects that fewer families have to experience the trauma of an arrest as part of an ensured return.
- 1.4 It is important to recognise that the larger proportion of families returning without the need for an ensured return is due to a number of factors including the reality that there is now a clear possibility of the family having to return home once they have entered the family returns process. Improvements made to the process of engaging families in the process have improved as a consequence of previous recommendations made by the Panel and other stakeholders and that too has played a part in the improving picture for families once they enter the returns process. The creation of the FEM role for example has greatly improved communication with families and helps them to understand the process and prepare for a return both practically and psychologically.
- 1.5 There is also a positive trend of families taking financial assistance through AVRFC although the numbers are still too low with just 89 family returns process families returning with AVRFC in 2014-16. There have been recent improvements to the process of engaging parents in considering the benefits of accepting the support open to them through AVRFC based on a realistic appraisal of the family being able to remain in the UK. It has always been the Panel’s view that more families should go home with assistance than has been the case in the past. The availability of financial assistance can help re-establish a family following return so it is important that the Home Office considers ways of making AVRFC more widely available to families in the returns process.

- 1.6 In summary, the data reflects that more families are entering the family returns process and as a proportion many more are returning to their country of origin without the need for an ensured return. Also, more are going home voluntarily and with assistance. This is clearly good news for children who are spared the experience of seeing their parents arrested and forcibly returned. There are still a number of families who are very resistant to return where an ensured return is the only option, but with improvements to the process these families are becoming fewer in number and in proportion to the total number of families in the process.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS 2014-16**

- 2.1 It is not proposed in this section to review each aspect of the family returns process - this has been undertaken in previous reports. This section is limited to commentary where further improvements are required as indicated during the reporting period.

### **Recommendation 1 – Using the ferry for returns to Europe**

- 2.2 In planning returns to Europe which can be reached by ferry this option should be given priority.
- 2.3 During the reporting period, the Panel has advised where possible to return families via ferry. This should include all countries where there is a direct ferry route from the UK. Travel by ferry, while taking longer than air travel, is considered to be more dignified with families afforded the privacy of their own cabin. For ensured returns involving difficult to remove families it also gives less opportunity for disruption as the family can be driven onto the ferry from dockside without the usual opportunities for disruption if travelling by air. A ferry also provides opportunity for children to play in soft play areas and other age appropriate facilities. The family is given an opportunity to arrive at their destination having rested and having a bed to sleep in if required. During the reporting period, there were a small number of very successful returns via ferry and the Panel believes this option would be best suited to more families.

### **Recommendation 2 – Expediting third country cases**

- 2.4 Third country cases should be expedited once they enter the family returns process.
- 2.5 There is an issue emerging with third country cases referred to the Panel which suggests that the timescales involved are challenging if the family is to be thoroughly prepared for return. This may be linked to the point at which the case is handed over to Family Returns or the late stage at which the case is worked by them. Whatever the reason, it often means that the FEM has very little time to prepare the family for return compared to non-third country cases and the Immigration, Compliance, and Enforcement (ICE) team has just one opportunity for a successful return before the window expires and the Home Office assumes responsibility for considering the family's asylum claim.

### **Recommendation 3 – Scottish Schools**

- 2.6 The Home Office should consider how best to involve schools when planning to return a family from Scotland.
- 2.7 It has come to the notice of Panel members when considering families from Scotland that school based colleagues have been reluctant to provide up to date educational information on children's performance and development which is important to help with finding appropriate education provision for the children following a return. There has been exceptionally good progress in other parts of the UK with schools and other partners playing a constructive role in helping families come to terms with their return home and in giving practical support. It is now the norm with the majority of schools to provide important data on attendance, progress, behaviour, welfare, and interactions with parents. However, the approach in Scotland all too often appears to be one of non-compliance with requests for information. This may be related to the common practice in Scotland of the FEM approaching the local authority rather than the schools directly.

#### **Recommendation 4 – Return support**

- 2.8 FEMs should ensure that the organisations listed in the “return support” section who could offer support to the family have a presence on the ground.
- 2.9 The Panel recommended the introduction of the post-return support consideration into the returns process very soon after the Panel came into being in March 2011. The importance of early support is now a well established principle with the Home Office. Meet and greet services such as those offered by WELDO in Pakistan are a very positive development and play an important part in helping to resettle families, particularly during the first few days following return. The Panel will continue to state the importance of such support to families returning to other parts of the world.
- 2.10 The Panel often engages in quality assurance of the organisations listed and has a lead member who takes special interest in return support and occasionally it is the case that the organisation listed is no longer operating or does not have a presence on the ground. Although rare, the Home Office should ensure that all return support listed in the return support section is currently available. Furthermore, other more comprehensive packages of support should be developed in other parts of the world where there are high numbers of returning families including Nigeria, Sri Lanka, India, and China. This work is already under way with the work being undertaken in Nigeria as part of project Ekaabo.

#### **Recommendation 5 – Separating families**

- 2.11 The Home Office should provide officers with clear guidelines on the practice of separating families.
- 2.12 The Panel has widely publicised views on the need to avoid the separation of families for removal purposes unless as a last resort. Such plans should only be included in the contingency section of the planning process and this practice is now well established across ICE teams. Children under 5 should never be separated from their mother unless to protect them from harm or distress. On the rare occasion when a plan includes the possibility of a separation as part of the contingency section it should include the circumstances under which the separation would take place and as far as possible the likely impact on the children and the capacity of the remaining parent to care for the children.

### 3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 What follows is an evaluation of the Home Office response to recommendations outlined in the Panel's previous [reports](#).
- 3.2 In reviewing progress, commentary is limited to those recommendations which the Panel feels have not been implemented in the manner, or the extent, to which the Panel feels reaches its expectations when making the recommendation.

#### 2011-12 report

##### **KR1(a): Use of Cedars as part of the returns process**

- 3.3 The Panel recommended that the UK Border Agency (UKBA) should review the criteria for the use of Cedars and ensure that they are applied consistently.
- 3.4 The Panel accepts that the criteria for the use of Cedars were reviewed as a consequence of the recommendation made by the Panel and that this has led to the more consistent use of the facility when returning families to their country of origin. While acknowledging Stephen Shaw's recommendation regarding Cedars in his [review into the welfare in detention of vulnerable persons](#), the Panel feels that the use of the facility in more cases could benefit children and their families. A stay at Cedars for up to 72 hours gives a family time to prepare themselves for return to their country of origin both psychologically and practically. It also allows them more time to consult their legal advisers than a same day removal. It would also mean better value for money as Cedars is a very expensive facility which is under used.

##### **KR2 (and recommendation 4 in the 2014 report): Managing non-compliant behaviour**

- 3.5 The Panel recommended that UKBA should develop a behaviour policy which includes, as a last resort, the use of physical intervention with children underpinned by a thorough training programme for officers and stringent guidelines for its use. It is important to stress that the Panel recommends that physical intervention should form part of a broader behaviour management policy and be used only in exceptional circumstances.
- 3.6 The Panel has set out very clearly in previous reports the case for a comprehensive behaviour policy which includes as a last resort, the use of physical intervention. The Home Office, however, has been slow to respond to this recommendation and it remains the case that such a policy has still not been developed. This means that in a small number of cases since the Panel came into existence, children have been subjected to unacceptable pressure from parents not to co-operate with Home Office officials and where such cases occur it is a form of child abuse. A comprehensive behaviour management policy which includes the use of physical intervention as a last resort, similar to those that exist for children and young people when they are in the care of schools, children's homes or the secure estate is still outstanding.

##### **KR 4: Managing contractors**

- 3.7 The Panel recommended that UKBA should monitor the implementation of the contract with Reliance to ensure that the specification is being delivered as intended. In addition, UKBA should satisfy itself that:

- Reliance staff have completed foundation level training before being tasked to accompany families on returns and that at least one member of the Reliance team accompanying families has higher level training experience.
- There are appropriate escalation procedures and a whistle blowing process for Reliance staff in relation to safeguarding matters and that those are audited regularly by UKBA staff.
- All escorts accompanying family returns should be CRB checked and these checks are renewed every 3 years in keeping with best practice.

3.8 The Panel believes that there was a very good response to this recommendation following the 2012 report. The Home Office seconded a senior member of staff to support and provide management oversight to the training of Reliance staff. However, since that time Reliance has changed ownership and been renamed Tascor. The Panel believes that the recommendation should be revisited in order that the Home Office is able to satisfy itself that those arrangements are still in place.

#### **KR 6: Children and family at the border**

- 3.9 The Panel recommended that Border Force should provide the Panel with monthly data on the number of children detained in holding rooms at ports, and the length of time they are held.
- 3.10 The Panel now receives data from all ports of entry, but it took until the end of 2015 for this to be provided. Despite repeated requests, the Panel was, up to then, only able to report on children and families held at Tinsley House, an immigration removal centre (IRC) close to Gatwick Airport (See annex C).

#### **Recommendation 7: Legal representatives**

- 3.11 The Panel recommended that legal representatives should consider the impact of their actions on the welfare of the children involved in families at the ensured stage of the process. In particular, injunctions and judicial reviews should be lodged earlier in the process to avoid the disruption to children's lives and the confusion this can cause when lodged at the last minute.
- 3.12 It is still the case that legal representatives lodge legal objections to removal at the last minute in order, it seems, to frustrate the process. The Panel believes that children and families should be given access to good quality legal advice early in the family returns process in order to avoid families being arrested before objections are raised. The arrest and return of a family is a traumatic experience for any child and it is too often the case that legal representatives do not raise objections until after the family has been arrested. While the Panel accepts that the parents are usually the clients, legal representatives should give greater consideration to the impact of their actions on the welfare of the children involved.

#### **Recommendation 13: Protective clothing**

- 3.13 The Panel recommended that UKBA officers should only wear protective clothing where risk assessments indicate this necessary to protect themselves or members of the family.
- 3.14 It is an on-going source of concern to Panel members that Home Office arrest teams still insist on wearing full protective clothing when undertaking an enforcement visit. While the Panel accepts in some cases where the risk assessment indicates that such

precautions are necessary, it is not necessary in every case. The Panel has carried out a number of direct observations when the use of protective clothing has been considered unnecessary and detrimental to the children involved. The Home Office should revisit this recommendation.

#### **Recommendation 16: Medics**

- 3.15 The Panel recommended that UKBA and Reliance should reconsider the need for medics on all return journeys.
- 3.16 While the Panel does not feel strongly that the presence of a medic on all enforced returns is necessarily detrimental to the families involved, it is apparent that too frequently this is an unnecessary precaution. Despite the need to deliver efficiencies across the public sector this aspect of Home Office policy seems to represent poor value for money.

#### **Recommendation 26: Holding facilities at the border**

- 3.17 Panel members visited a number of holding rooms in 2011-12 and considered the use of some of them for anything more than a few hours to be inappropriate. The Panel considered that they were not always family friendly, often they were shared spaces with single adults, and there was little available to keep children engaged in purposeful activity. Neither was there sufficient fixtures and fittings for rest and recuperation. It was the view of the Panel that families would be more appropriately held at Tinsley House if the port of entry was either Heathrow or Gatwick. The Panel recommended that an alternative would be for UKBA to renegotiate the leasing of more suitable space at the busier ports of entry with airport operators.
- 3.18 There has been very good progress at some ports in providing family friendly holding facilities for those arriving at the border. Panel members have observed for themselves the improvements made at Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow and London Heathrow to provide child and family friendly spaces. However, this recommendation remains as there are still too many holding spaces around the country which are not suitable for holding families arriving at the border for anything more than a short period. The greater use of Tinsley House for families arriving at London airports while controversial due to the facility being an IRC, offers families far better facilities for rest and recuperation than a holding room at the airport.

### **2012-14 report**

#### **Recommendation 2: Trafficking**

- 3.19 The Panel recommended that in all cases where trafficking was suspected or where an individual was referred into the National Referral Mechanism (NRM) for consideration by a competent authority, the Competent Authority's decision and reasoning should be included as part of the papers submitted to the Panel.
- 3.20 The Panel has been asking for the NRM referral form where an assessment has been carried out, to be attached to the evidence presented to the Panel. Where there has been a determination by a competent authority of "no reasonable grounds" this does not mean that there is no risk in returning a family to their country of origin - it may mean that there is no evidence but the risk may still exist. It is important that the Panel has access to all information that may have a bearing on safeguarding or wider welfare issues as they relate to families in the family returns process. This issue was raised in the 2012-14

report, but the Home Office response was to hold its views on whether to share such information with the Panel until the outcome of the NRM review is known.

### **Recommendation 3: Trafficking**

- 3.21 The Panel recommended that case owners receive additional training in human trafficking risk mitigation and child safeguarding where human trafficking is suspected.
- 3.22 The Home Office has confirmed its existing and ongoing specialist trafficking and modern slavery training provided to decision makers which includes an e-learning course. During this reporting period the Panel has started, at least, to see an increased awareness of trafficking in family welfare forms.

## 4. WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP

4.1 In addition to advising on individual family returns, the Panel continues to work with a range of partners to help inform and improve the family returns process. Work during this reporting period has included:

- Various members have partaken in shadowing parts of the process, by accompanying FEMs in their family return conferences and family departure meetings. A Panel member has also observed a family on their return to Pakistan, and has observed how families are reintegrated back into their home country by their local organisations.
- Many Panel members have taken the opportunity to build up working relationships, by visiting offices throughout the region to meet FEMs. Panel members have also been actively involved in training new FEMs.
- Panel members have been actively involved in the retender of the Assisted Voluntary Return process.
- A Panel member has conducted a tour of the holding room facilities which are available for families and children; this included national holding rooms at Manchester and London Heathrow and holding rooms overseas at Calais and Coquelles.
- A Panel member has taken an active interest in attending compliance surgeries throughout the London boroughs. These surgeries involve meetings with families in order to encourage voluntarily departure from the UK.
- All Panel members have taken part in the Family Returns Improvement Partnerships (FRIP) meetings.
- In order to promote the work of the Panel, members have attended the following events:
  - Meetings with Refugee Council.
  - Civil Service live event.
  - National Association of Directors of Children's Services conference.
  - Westminster Legal Policy Seminar.

## ANNEX A: PANEL MEMBERSHIP

**Chris Spencer (Chairman)** - has 10 years experience as a Corporate Director of Children's Services in 2 local authorities. Since finishing his last substantive post in the London Borough of Hillingdon in 2011, when he was also the Association of Directors of Children's Services national lead on Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children and Trafficking, he has filled various roles including Independent Chair of 2 Children's Improvement Boards, Independent Chair of a Local Safeguarding Children's Board and 2 periods as an Interim Director of Children's Services. Earlier in his career he worked for 13 years as a child psychologist.

Chris is currently Corporate Director for People Services at the London Borough of Harrow. This role includes responsibility as Statutory Director of Children's Services and overall responsibility for Adult Social Care and Public Health. He retains overall lead responsibility on behalf of the ADCS for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) and for the delivery of the newly established dispersal model for newly arrived UASC.

**Dr. Robin Basu** - a former Medical Manager and Consultant Child and Adolescent Psychiatrist in the National Health Service.

**Dr. Stephanie Green** - a Port Medical Officer at Heathrow Airport for 10 years, advising on the health of new entrants to the UK, including those seeking asylum. Currently a Medical member of the First Tier Tribunal (Social Security and Child Benefit) and Independent Member of the High Speed 2 Compensation Panel. Also, a consulting doctor for a sexual health charity.

**Philip Ishola** - Director Counter Human Trafficking Bureau for 5 years and has worked in central and local government for 26 years. Philip was formerly Head of Immigration and Asylum and counter-child-trafficking lead officer at Harrow Children's Services, Deputy Chair of the Serious Organised Crime Victim Care Group, and chair of the London Safeguarding Children Board sub-groups on trafficked children and the 2012 Olympics Games.

**Dr. John Keen** - a General Practitioner in Chiswick since 1988. He is also chair of an HRA Research Ethics Committee and Medical Adviser to several local authorities in London and elsewhere.

**Bernard Phillips** - a former head teacher of an inner city comprehensive school for 19 years. He has extensive experience in community cohesion work. He was the education adviser for a successful bid to open a secondary free school.

**Sir Roger Singleton** - a former chief executive of Barnardo's and was previously both chair of the Independent Safeguarding Authority and the Government's Chief Adviser on the safety of children. He is currently chair and director of Safeguarding First Ltd. He has a background in education, children's services, risk assessment, policy and management.

**Geoff Sloan** - retired Detective Superintendent with Merseyside Police who, as Operations Commander for the Wirral Division, was head of the Family Support Unit and a member of the area's child protection committee.

**Prospera Tedam** - a senior lecturer in Social Work at the University of Northampton where she has been since 2006. Prior to joining the University, she worked in the voluntary and statutory sectors as a social work practitioner and manager specialising in children and families social work. Prospera's growing portfolio of publications include the area of culturally competent social work practice, child abuse linked to faith and religious beliefs as well as equality and diversity in higher education. Prospera is a member of the board of trustees for Africans Unite

Against Child Abuse (AFRUCA), a UK based NGO which works to promote and safeguard the rights and welfare of African children.

**Lorna Tull-Griffith** - a trainer and consultant who worked with children and young people for 30 years and was previously a head of service in a large local authority. Lorna sadly died in 2014.

## ANNEX B: FAMILY RETURNS PROCESS DATA: 1 APRIL 2014 – 31 MARCH 2016

Families entering the returns process – 2,287

Families referred to Panel - 171

### Outcomes

- Family removal not pursued - 243
- Returns – 1,470
- Not family with children<sup>1</sup> - 60
- **Total outcomes – 1,773**

### Types of return

- Voluntary – 1,323
- AVRFC - 89
- Required return - 14
- Ensured return - 44
- **Total returns – 1,470**

Family returns data is published as part of Immigration Enforcement data which can be found at: [GOV.UK](http://GOV.UK).

<sup>1</sup> Families subsequently identified as not falling within the process, e.g. because a child turned 18.

## ANNEX C: QUARTERLY STATISTICS ON CHILDREN HELD SOLELY UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT POWERS IN CEDARS AND TINSLEY HOUSE (2011-2016)

	Cedars	Tinsley House
2011 Q2	Does not apply	12
2011 Q3	11	15
2011 Q4	23	13
2012 Q1	35	12
2012 Q2	37	18
2012 Q3	20	27
2012 Q4	29	27
2013 Q1	28	6
2013 Q2	11	23
2013 Q3	30	34
2013 Q4	30	29
2014 Q1	5	11
2014 Q2	9	9
2014 Q3	6	16
2014 Q4	12	15
2015 Q1	11	23
2015 Q2	15	17
2015 Q3	7	14
2015 Q4	8	9
2016 Q1	10	8

Some children may be recorded more than once if, for example, the child has entered on more than one separate occasion in the time period shown.

Children are defined as those with age recorded as under 18 on entering the facility; these figures may include age-disputed cases.

Since 2013 Q1, the data for Tinsley House refers specifically to the family unit there. The family unit actually re-opened in March 2011, following refurbishment, but was not separately identified from the rest of Tinsley House on the Case Information Database until January 2013.

This data is published as part of the Immigration statistics quarterly release. It can be found at: [GOV.UK](http://GOV.UK) in the data tables on children entering detention by age and place of initial detention.