



Department
for Education

Child sexual exploitation

Annexes to ‘Definition and a guide for practitioners, local leaders and decision makers working to protect children from child sexual exploitation’

February 2017

Contents

Annex A: Adolescent Development	3
Introduction	3
Transitions	3
The importance of relationships in adolescence	4
Key risks in adolescence	5
Risk and adolescent development	5
Responses to risk in adolescence	6
Annex B - Guide to Disruption Orders and Legislation	9
Disruption Measures	9
Criminal Offences	12
Annex C: Sources	16

Annex A: Adolescent Development

Introduction

Adolescence is one of the most dramatic stages of development. With puberty comes bodily changes (such as spurts in growth and development of the sexual organs) as well as changes in the neurobiological system, focused on emotions and social interaction. These latter changes can have a number of impacts, such as heightened sensitivity to emotional cues (such as rewards and threats) in comparison to older and younger age ranges. Alongside this, the neural systems that underlie the complex cognitive abilities involved in control and regulation develop very differently, maturing gradually over the course of adolescence into young adulthood. This accounts for the gradual gains in the skills comprising 'executive functioning': the control and co-ordination of thoughts and behaviours (Anderson et al, 2001; Blakemore and Choudhury, 2006). Skills in this repertoire include working memory (the ability to hold information in mind and apply it to current tasks), impulse control, selective attention and planning ahead.

Transitions

Adolescence shares common characteristics with other periods of transition. These include:

- Anticipation of the future;
- A sense of loss or regret for the stage that has been lost;
- A sense of anxiety about what is unknown (worrying about the future);
- A major psychological adjustment due to multiple domain changes – relationships, education, employment and home; and
- A degree of status ambiguity during the transition period – for example, with neither the adult world nor the individual being sure whether he/she should be treated as a child or an adult (Coleman, 2014a).

The changes experienced during adolescence include:

- *Physical change*: puberty including sexual maturation, growth and hormonal changes; brain development; alterations in sleeping patterns;
- *Psychological change*: development of new intellectual skills; the psychological and emotional impact of puberty; identity change and development – a changing sense of self; and
- *Social change*: friends appear to become more important; the establishment of a wider network; some individuals become more open to peer influence; the growing influence of the digital world with associated risks and opportunities.

Moving successfully from childhood to adulthood therefore involves a number of key developmental tasks:

- *Physical (and sexual) maturity*: including brain and physical development as well as puberty;
- *Emotional maturity*: the ability to recognise and manage the different states of one's own mind;
- *Cognitive maturity*: thinking in a range of ways, including theorising (and seeing ideas as things that exist separately from oneself), holding ethical and moral stances, and practical problem solving;
- *Individuation and Identity*: developing a clear sense of self – incorporating gender, sexuality, ethnicity and usually involving the development of degrees of independence from family (strongly influenced by family, community and cultural and religious factors); and
- *Social maturity*: achieving the capacity to manage a range of different types of social relationships and roles such as work, intimate partnerships and parenthood (Coleman, 2014a).

The importance of relationships in adolescence

As noted above, adolescence is a time of changing social relationships. Peers become increasingly important as friends, intimate partners and prominent social groups in which one's identity and status are constructed and worked out. It is therefore critical that children and young people's social contexts are considered when planning work around child sexual exploitation – see Firmin's (2015) contextual safeguarding model for further information (available from www.beds.ac.uk/ic).

Risk in adolescence and the salience of the peer group interact. For example, adolescents are more likely to engage in behaviours that are perceived as risky when they are observed by or interacting with peers, in a way that is not true for adults (Gardner and Steinberg, 2005). However, young people may also be particularly receptive to support and positive guidance from their peer group; it makes sense therefore that relationships are noted as both a risk factor and a protective factor in public health discourse, amongst other literature. The online world, too, can enhance peer influence in both directions, with moderated peer-to-peer youth forums a good example of how the strength of peer influence can be positively harnessed (Webb et al, 2008). Care must be taken to ensure that those working with adolescents facing risk do not overlook the impact of peers.

Intimate or romantic relationships are a normative part of adolescence, their significance developing in line with sexual interest and peer relationships more generally. Early adolescents are more likely to have idealised notions of romance (Smetana et al, 2006). Perpetrators of child sexual exploitation can be acutely attuned to these developmental tendencies, which they may manipulate in order to execute abuse (Hanson and Holmes,

2014). By late adolescence, romantic attachments (when they are present) can offer a central source of support (Smetana et al, 2006). However, they can also be a source of harm, with significant levels of intimate partner violence observed in some such relationships (Barter et al 2009).

Key risks in adolescence

From a global perspective, the UK can be seen as a relatively safe place for many children to grow up. However, a high proportion of adolescents still face one or more serious risks. Potential risks faced by adolescents, presented with illustrative examples, include:

- *Sexual abuse*: child sexual exploitation by individuals and by gangs or groups (peers or adults; online or offline); other forms of sexual abuse and duress/coercion to sexually abuse others;
- *Physical abuse*: family violence; gang related and community violence; violence within intimate relationships;
- *Neglect*: neglect from family members including rejection and abandonment, parental mental health or substance abuse that disrupt parenting capacity and/or impose inappropriate caring responsibilities on the part of the young person; overly restrictive parenting; neglect in custody;
- *Emotional abuse*: within the family; extensive bullying by peers (in person and/or online); living with domestic abuse between parents; emotional abuse within intimate relationships; and
- *Other potential risks*: homelessness and running away; mental health problems (including depression, anxiety, self-harm, suicide attempts and eating disorders); gang involvement; substance misuse (Hanson and Holmes, 2014).

A significant minority of young people experience multiple risks, which can make it more difficult to identify causal and resultant risks in order to develop an appropriate service response. The research shows that exposure to multiple forms of victimisation – termed ‘poly-victimisation’ – significantly increases young people’s vulnerability to negative outcomes (Finkelhor et al, 2011).

Risk and adolescent development

Adolescence is recognised as a period of vulnerability to what is described as ‘risk-taking’ behaviours (Van Leijenhorst et al, 2010). These behaviours might involve ‘riskily’ seeking rewards (for example, the use of illegal recreational drugs) as well as impulsively responding to threats (for example, responding to a verbal slur with physical violence).

The ‘risk-based’ terminology used to describe these behaviours presents challenges around conceptualisation and blame. For example, ‘risk-taking’ can be interpreted as meaning that young people are making unconstrained lifestyle choices when, in fact,

these 'choices' and behaviours are underpinned by complex interacting developmental, social and psychological drivers. As explored in section 5 of the guidance, it is important to avoid interpreting 'risky behaviours' in cases of child sexual exploitation (continued contact with the abuser, for example) as freely made choices. Such an interpretation can affect young people's capacity to ask for help, can lead to professional and societal victim-blaming and can leave young people highly vulnerable. It is more useful and accurate to recognise these 'risky' behaviours as part of the complex power dynamic associated with child sexual exploitation; as survival strategies; as adaptations to previous harm or trauma; and/or as the means by which a young person seeks to meet unmet needs:

"Sometimes people's been through that [abusive background] and they just put on a brave face like nothing's happened but really deep inside they're hurting and they don't know what to do. People that's been through so much like that, you can't blame them for turning to drink or drugs because it's the only thing; it's givin them'ins like a big buzz and it's takin away their problems. But then you get up and then it's happenin again, so you take more" (Beckett 2011)

It is also critical to remember that a child/young person's vulnerability or behaviours are not the reason child sexual exploitation occurs. As Beckett (2011:4) observes "*it is the interplay of these and other factors - together with exposure to someone who would take advantage of these vulnerabilities and inadequate protective structures to mediate against this risk - that culminate in a young person being abused through sexual exploitation*". These complex inter-connected conditions must be addressed in any response to child sexual exploitation. Pearce's (2014) social model of consent offers a useful tool for considering how these contextual factors impact upon a young person's capacity to give consent (available from www.beds.ac.uk/ic).

Responses to risk in adolescence

When resources are strained, those working with adolescents can sometimes feel there is a de-prioritisation of adolescents' needs in favour of those of younger children (Gorin and Jobe, 2013). It may be wrongly assumed that adolescents, because of their age, are more resilient than younger children or that their choices are always freely made and informed. The level of agency adolescents have in relation to risk makes adolescents 'imperfect victims' (Rees and Stein 1999) and makes addressing those risks a complex task. This may be made more challenging by working within a child protection system that is designed primarily to meet the needs of younger children maltreated within the family (Pearce; Hanson and Holmes, 2014; Hanson, 2016).

Local authority spending to protect adolescents from serious risk is often geared towards solutions that involve the care system, with a high proportion of children's services spending being committed to care placements, the most expensive often being those for adolescents (Dept for Education 2014). While many placements are effective at reducing

risk, some looked after children are also disproportionately vulnerable to serious risks, including sexual exploitation, violence and running away (Department for Education, 2013; Beckett 2014).

This growing sense that the child protection system is not well-designed to protect adolescents is accompanied by increasing knowledge and understanding about adolescent development. This evidence converges with key policy drivers, such as foregrounding the young person's perspective (for example, Munro, 2011), innovating within social care to better meet the needs of adolescents (Department for Education, 2014; Hanson and Holmes, 2014) and working preventatively in order to support well-being (The Care Inquiry, 2013; Hagell et al, 2015).

An effective response to child sexual exploitation requires consideration of more than physical safety. In the context of work with looked after children, Shuker (2013; available from www.beds.ac.uk/ic) argues that physical, relational and psychological safety are *all* vital for safeguarding the welfare of young people affected by child sexual exploitation. A child-centred approach is needed to recognise which type of security is the first priority for services to work towards for the individual child. For some young people, a stable trusting relationship will be a necessary precondition for attempting to achieve physical safety by disrupting a relationship with a perpetrator. For others in immediate danger, physical safety will be the foundation for work to achieve psychological and then relational security. Crucially, where physical safety is achieved at the *expense* of relational and psychological security, interventions will only ever be short-term solutions that deliver 'enforced compliance rather than meaningful change' (Beckett 2011) and may ultimately hinder exit from exploitative situations or relationships (Shuker 2013).

Both young people and professionals across a range of studies have indicated that dealing with child sexual exploitation (through approaches such as secure residential units) without providing support to address the interconnected conditions for abuse will be unlikely to provide any long-term change – and, in the short term, could exacerbate their problems leading to increased disengagement from services and increased risk (Beckett, 2011; Hallett 2013; Shuker, 2013b).

When working with young people affected by child sexual exploitation it is important to acknowledge that their involvement in what we perceive to be 'risky behaviours' can be their attempt to exert some control and power in circumstances in which they have very little of either (Coy, 2009; Melrose, 2010; Beckett, 2011; Phoenix, 2012; Beckett et al., 2013; Dodsworth, 2014). Young people may continue to engage in what we perceive to be 'risky behaviours' – or, more accurately in the case of child sexual exploitation, continue to be entrapped in risky circumstances and faced with severely constrained choices – while they are accessing support. There is a growing realisation that 'protection' cannot necessarily mean 'rescue' in all cases of child sexual exploitation, and with this comes a clear understanding that respecting young people's voices is part of building their resilience. A parallel is drawn with changing approaches to domestic violence, a point that has been acknowledged by others (O'Neill, 2001). These

approaches now acknowledge that simply ‘rescuing’ victims of domestic abuse from an abusive relationship is unlikely to end the relationship, nor is it likely to encourage help-seeking recovery behaviours:

“just as services and practitioners working with those experiencing domestic abuse now recognise the complexities of this issue, we would do well to understand that CSE is not a simple case of rescue, abstinence or of victim blaming when a young person doesn’t willingly leave an exploitative relationship” (Hickle and Hallett 2016: 308)

Recognising this, Hickle and Hallett (2016) explore the potential learning that can be gleaned from a harm reduction approach, as frequently used in the field of substance misuse. A harm reduction approach contends that asking young people to commit to abstinence ‘before they have the requisite life skills or psychological ability to successfully maintain their drug-free status’ undermines their ability to sustain change (Stevens et al, 2007). This, and other tenets of a harm reduction approach, closely align with the principles that have underpinned many longstanding responses to child sexual exploitation within the third sector, although the terminology of ‘harm reduction’ has rarely applied within this field (See for example: Pearce 2002; Melrose and Barratt, 2004; Scott and Skidmore, 2006; Clutton and Coles, 2007; Pearce, 2009; Beckett 2011). Hickle and Hallett (2016) consider the potential contribution, and challenges, of a more explicit adoption of a harm reduction approach within the field of child sexual exploitation in their paper that is available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/chso.12145/full>

Annex B - Guide to Disruption Orders and Legislation

This annex sets out examples of the range of disruption measures, civil powers and criminal offences which may be used by practitioners as part of a strategy to tackle child sexual exploitation. This is not an exhaustive list and practitioners should consider the full range of powers available to them when developing effective disruption strategies. Government work on a more comprehensive toolkit of disruption measures is also being developed and will be made available to practitioners.

Disruption Measures

Child sexual exploitation may be associated with other crimes, or perpetrators may be involved in other criminal activity. In these instances there are a number of civil measures that can be used to disrupt the activities of individuals also involved with child sexual exploitation, alongside criminal and civil processes that directly address sexual offending and other child protection procedures.

The range of formal and informal disruption measures that may be used to help tackle child sexual exploitation include:

- Obtaining orders on an identified individual (see below);
- Investigation of other crime types such as drugs or theft;
- Increased police attention on an individual (checking car tax, road worthiness of car etc);
- Increased police presence in suspected hotspots (online or offline);
- Working with internet providers to address online risks; and
- Use of licensing laws and powers to obtain guest information or close down premises associated with child sexual exploitation.¹

Where applicable, an effective disruption strategy may use a range of these methods in conjunction with one another to address individual perpetrator behaviour, protect victims and address wider contexts of concern. In developing an effective disruption strategy, local partners including the police and local authorities should work together to consider the full range of powers available. Though not the focus of this guide, an effective disruption strategy will also involve work with children and young people to address the issues contributing to their vulnerability and to provide them with alternative options.

¹ The 2014 Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act gives the police or local authority power to close down premises where they have reasonable grounds to believe it is being, or likely to be used, for child sex offences and its closure is necessary to prevent this. Under the same Act, police can require an establishment to provide guest information if they believe the premise has been or will be used for child sexual exploitation or connected activities.

Civil Orders and other means of controlling individual behaviour

Child Abduction Warning Notices (CAWNs), formerly known as Harbourers' Warnings. These can be issued by the police and used with individuals over 18 to let them know (and record that they have been told) that they are not allowed to associate or contact with a named child (under 16, or under 18 if in care). CAWNs have no statutory basis in and of themselves, but are very useful in providing evidence to support the prosecution of other offences by, for example, registering that a suspect knew the child was 15, thereby taking away the age defence in criminal cases.

Sexual Harm Prevention Orders (SHPOs)² can be applied for by the police or the National Crime Agency. They can be used to impose restrictions on an individual who has been convicted or cautioned of a sexual or violent offence, where there is reasonable cause to believe that the imposition of such an order is necessary to protect an individual or the wider public from harm. Restrictions can include things like limiting their internet use, preventing them from approaching or being alone with a named child and prohibiting foreign travel. Breach of the order, without reasonable excuse, is an offence punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment.

Sexual Risk Orders (SROs) can also be applied for by the police or the National Crime Agency. These are similar to Sexual Harm Prevention Orders, and can include similar restrictions, but do not require an individual to have been convicted or cautioned. SROs can be issued when an individual has carried out an act of a sexual nature³ and there is reasonable cause to believe that such an order is necessary to protect an individual or the wider public from harm. As with SHPOs, breach of the order is an offence punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment.

Both SHPOs and SROs may be used with children under 18, but recent Home Office guidance on Part 2 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 states that the following principles should apply when considering this:

- The early consultation and participation of the youth offending team in the application process;
- That 14 to 17 year olds made subject to civil injunctions in relation to harmful sexual behaviour are offered appropriate interventions to reduce their harmful behaviour;

² SHPOs and SROs replace the previous Sexual Offences Prevention Orders (SOPO), Risk of Sexual Harm Orders (RSHO) and Foreign Travel Orders.

³ 'Acts of a sexual nature' are not defined in legislation, and therefore will depend to a significant degree on the individual circumstances of the behaviour and its context. Home Office 2015 Guidance on Part 2 of the SOA provides examples including engaging in sexual activity, watching sexual activity or images, sexual communication with a child and acts suggestive of grooming. See guidance for further detail.

- That the nature and extent of that support is based on a structured assessment that takes into account the needs of the young person and the imminent risk;
- That the welfare of the child or young person is the paramount consideration, in line with local safeguarding procedures;
- That the requirements of all other orders and sentences that may already be in existence are taken into account to ensure that any requirements made by these orders do not restrict a young person's ability to complete other current orders or sentences, and the combined burden of requirements is taken into account to ensure the young person has the capacity to comply (Home Office, 2015).

Where there are concerns that a child has been trafficked as part of the child sexual exploitation (this can include movement from one area to another within England), **Slavery and Trafficking Prevention Orders (STPOs) and Slavery and Trafficking Risk Orders (STROs)** can also be considered. STPOs and STROs can be applied for by the police, the National Crime Agency or an immigration officer. These were introduced under the Modern Slavery Act (2015) and, like the SHPOs and SROs outlined above, offer a means of placing restrictions on an individual's movements and actions. A STPO can only be made against an individual who has been convicted of a slavery or human trafficking offence, while a STRO can be made against an individual who has acted in a way which means that there is a risk that they will commit a slavery or human trafficking offence. Both require reasonable belief that the individual may commit a modern slavery offence in the future and that application of the order is necessary to protect an individual or the wider public from harm.

The **National Referral Mechanism (NRM)** is also an important mechanism in disrupting and identifying perpetrators of Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery. The NRM is a framework for identifying and safeguarding victims of human trafficking or modern slavery. The NRM applies to victims of both domestic and international trafficking and is designed to facilitate relevant multiagency involvement in trafficking and modern slavery cases, ensuring that the victim receives safe accommodation, appropriate protection, support and advice. Referrals to the NRM contribute to building evidence about trafficking and modern slavery, providing a national picture and informing policy decisions and practice actions in this area.

Criminal Behaviour Orders are available following a conviction for any criminal offence in the Crown Court, Magistrates' court or youth court. They can impose restrictions on an offender who has engaged in behaviour that had caused, or was likely to cause, harassment, alarm or distress to any person if making the order will help prevent them from engaging in such behaviour. If the offender is under the age of 18 when the application is made, the prosecution must ascertain the views of the local youth offending team before applying for a criminal behaviour order.

Notification Orders are intended to protect the public from the risks posed by sex offenders in the UK who have been convicted or cautioned for sexual offences which have been committed overseas. A Notification Order makes the offender subject to

notification requirements in the same way as if they had been convicted in the UK for a sexual or violent offence.

Non-Molestation Orders are civil injunctions that can be issued to protect named children from abuse from an individual and any third party acting on the behalf of that individual. The order only applies to those individual(s) 'associated' with the child. It is an offence if the order is breached.

Exclusion Orders can be sought upon the application for an Interim Care Order or Emergency Protection Order. The order can be taken where there is reasonable cause to believe that if an individual is excluded from a dwelling, house or defined area in which the child lives, the child will cease to suffer, or cease to be likely to suffer, significant harm. The order cannot cover an unlimited area.

A **Wardship** is a civil injunction which can be used to prevent an 'undesirable association' between a child and an individual(s). A local authority can make a Wardship application to the High Court to make a named child a ward of court and to seek an injunction against a named individual(s) to prevent that person from making any contact with the child. An injunction can be used where there is reasonable cause to believe that the child is likely to suffer significant harm without the court's intervention. An example of the use of a Wardship to disrupt child sexual exploitation is the case of [BCC v Riaz et al \[2014\] EWHC 4247 \(Fam\)](#). In this case, Birmingham local authority took civil action in this way to protect girls under the age of 18 from being approached by men with whom they were not personally associated.

Criminal Offences

The main set of offences used in criminal prosecutions of child sexual exploitation is contained within the [Sexual Offences Act \(SOA\) 2003](#). These offences are categorised according to the age of the victim (under 13s, under 16s and under 18s) as outlined below.

Under 13s

Articles 5 to 8 of the SOA 2003 cover offences against children who are 12 years of age or younger. These include two offences of penetration, a wider offence of sexual assault and one of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity:

- rape of a child under 13 (intentional penetration of vagina, anus or mouth by a penis);
- (sexual) assault of a child under 13 by penetration (intentional penetration of vagina or anus by something other than a penis, such as a finger or an object);
- sexual assault of a child under 13 (intentional sexual touching); and
- causing or inciting a child under 13 to engage in sexual activity.

Penalties for these offences are higher than those for offences against children aged 13 or above and defendants cannot utilise the defence of believing the child was of an older age (which they can for offences of children under 16 as explored below).

Under 16s

Articles 9 to 12 of the SOA 2003 cover adults sexually offending against children under the age of 16 years within England or Wales. This includes:

- Sexual activity with a child under 16 (intentional sexual touching);
- Causing or inciting a child under 16 to engage in sexual activity;
- Engaging in sexual activity in the presence of a child (for the purposes of sexual gratification); and
- Causing a child to watch a sexual act (watching someone else/viewing images).

These activities are also an offence if perpetrated by another child or young person (under 18), but in these circumstances they would be prosecuted under Article 13, and as such attract lower penalties.

Articles 14 and 15 of the SOA cover the commission of sexual offences against a child under 16 years of age outside of England and Wales:

- Article 14 criminalises an individual (of any age) arranging or facilitating the commission of any of the four offences outlined in the bullet points above, anywhere in the world (Article 14); and
- Article 15 makes it an offence for an adult to meet (or travel with the intention of meeting) a child under 16, anywhere in the world, if they have met or communicated with that child on at least two occasions and intend to commit one of the sexual offences above.

In 2015 a new offence of sexual communication with a child was introduced, under the Serious Crime Act, to strengthen the powers of the authorities to prosecute cases of grooming (without having to wait until the point of travel, as per the requirements of Article 15 of the SOA outlined above). Like Article 15 of the SOA, this only applies to adult perpetrators, and victims under 16 years of age, but it does criminalise the act of sexual communication (defined as being sexual or encouraging a sexual response, and for the purposes of sexual gratification).

Under 18s

Although the legal age of consent for sexual activity is 16, the SOA recognises the continued vulnerability of 16- and 17-year-olds in particular circumstances. These include:

- Abuse of a position of trust (e.g. sexual offences by an adult teacher or social worker – the offences covered are the same as those outlined in the bulleted list above (Articles 9 to 12), but extended to cover 16/17 year olds in these circumstances);
- Familial child sex offences (engaging in sexual activity with a child in the family or inciting them to engage in sexual activity);
- Indecent photographs of a child aged 16/17 (includes making, distributing, intent to distribute and possessing indecent photographs); and
- Sexual exploitation of children (see commentary below).

Offences of sexual exploitation

The SOA was amended by the Serious Crime Act 2015 to remove references to ‘child prostitution’ and ‘child pornography’ and replace them with ‘sexual exploitation of a child’. The changes were made to the following offences:

- Section 48: causing or inciting child prostitution or pornography;
- Section 49: controlling a child prostitute or a child involved in pornography; and
- Section 50: arranging or facilitating child prostitution or pornography.

The changes were made to the terminology of the offences in order to clearly reflect that children involved in such activities were victims of abuse. This did not however, change the behaviours to which these offences apply, which remain the recording of an indecent image of a person or the offer or provision of sexual services to another person in return for payment or a promise of payment. The SOA offences do not capture all offences that would fall under the new policy definition of child sexual exploitation in that:

- the exchange is limited to ‘financial advantage’, whereas the policy definition includes a broader list of things the victim/offender could receive; and
- the offence relating to the recording of an indecent image of a child does not require an exchange; this is outside of the policy definition of child sexual exploitation but would fall under the definition of child sexual abuse more generally.

In recognition of these differences the Government has made it mandatory from April 2016 for police forces to flag all police recorded offences that meet the policy definition of child sexual exploitation. This will include those that fall under the offences of child sexual exploitation but also those falling under other sexual offences that being perpetrated within the context of child sexual exploitation.

Indecent Images of Children

The Protection of Children Act 1978 provides for an offence of taking, making, distributing and sharing an indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of a child under 18 years of age. The Criminal Justice Act 1998 covers the possession of such images. All offences

include photographs (including moving images) and also images made, for example, on a computer but which look like real photographs.

Human Trafficking (no age restriction)

A sometimes overlooked avenue of criminal prosecutions is that of human trafficking⁴ which can be used where a child or young person (including those aged 18 or over) has been trafficked for the purpose of sexual exploitation. Under this legislation, it is an offence to arrange or facilitate the travel of another person with a view to their being exploited, whether or not the victim consents to the travel.⁵ This covers entering, departing or travelling within any country and as such can be used in cases when a child is moved from one city to another within the UK, for example.

Management and Monitoring of Offenders

Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) are designed to protect the public from serious harm by assessing and managing the risk posed by sexual and violent offenders. The system requires a multiagency partnership to work together, share information and combine resources in order to maximise the risk management of individual offenders. More information about the MAPPA framework can be found at: <https://mappa.justice.gov.uk/connect.ti/MAPPA/view?objectId=271411>.

The multiagency tool ViSOR has been developed to assist in the effective management of offenders. It provides a central store for up-to-date information about offenders that can be accessed and updated by the three Responsible Authority agencies – the police, the Prison Service (both public and the contracted-out estate) and Probation Trusts. The tool enables the prompt sharing of risk assessment and risk management information on individual offenders who are deemed to pose a risk of serious harm to the public.

⁴ In an attempt to simplify and condense human trafficking offences, The Modern Slavery Act 2015 introduced one offence of human trafficking covering sexual and non-sexual exploitation. Trafficking Offences contained in the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 have now been repealed and replaced by the offence of Human Trafficking.

⁵ Arranging and facilitating includes recruiting, transporting, transferring, harbouring, receiving or exchanging control of that person.

Annex C: Sources

The information provided in the guidance is drawn from the following sources:

Defining and understanding child sexual exploitation

Barnardo's. (2011). *Puppet on a string: the urgent need to cut children free from sexual exploitation*. Barkingside: Barnardo's.

Barnardo's. (2014). *Hidden in plain sight. A scoping study into the sexual exploitation of boys and young men in the UK Policy Briefing*. London: Barnardo's, UCL and Natcen.

Barnardo's. (2013). *The Tangled Web: How child sexual exploitation is becoming more complex*. Barkingside: Barnardo's.

Beckett, H. (2011). *Not a World Away: The Sexual Exploitation of Children and Young People in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Barnardo's NI.

Bedford, A. (2015). *Serious case review into child sexual exploitation in Oxfordshire: from the experiences of Children A, B, C, D, E, and F [overview]*. Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board.

Berelowitz, S., Clifton J., Firmin, C., Gulyurtlu, S., and Edwards, G. (2013) *'If Only Someone had Listened' Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into CSE in Gangs and Groups: Final report*. London: OCC.

Berelowitz, S., Firmin, C., Edwards, G., and Gulyurtlu, S. (2012). *"I thought I was the only one. The only one in the world."* *The Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation In Gangs and Groups*. London: OCC.

Child Exploitation and Online Protection (CEOP). (2011). *Out of mind, out of sight: breaking down the barriers to understanding child sexual exploitation*. London: CEOP.

Firmin, C. (2013). Something Old or Something New: Do pre-existing conceptualisations of abuse enable a sufficient response to abuse in young people's relationships and peer groups?. In: M. Melrose and J. Pearce, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Child Sexual Exploitation and Related Trafficking*. Palgrave Connect., pp. 38-51.

Firmin, C., and Curtis, G. (2015) *Practitioner Briefing #1: What is peer-on-peer abuse?*. MsUnderstood Partnership.

Galley, J. (2010). *Derby Safeguarding Children Board Serious Case Review BD09 Executive Summary*. Derby: DSCB.

Gohir, S. (2013). *Unheard voices: the sexual exploitation of Asian girls and young women* Birmingham: Muslim Women's Network.

Hallett, S. (2015). 'An Uncomfortable Comfortableness': 'Care', Child Protection and Child Sexual Exploitation. *British Journal of Social Work*, doi. 10.1093/bjsw/bcv136. Available at: <http://bjsw.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/12/23/bjsw.bcv136.short?rss=1>

McNaughton Nicholls, C., Cockbain, E., Brayley, H., Harvey, S., Fox, C., Paskell, C., Ashby, M., Gibson, K., and Jago, N. (2014). *Research on the sexual exploitation of boys*

and young men. *A UK Scoping Study. Summary of findings*. London: Barnardos, Natcen and UCL.

Melrose, M. (2013). Twenty-first century party people: Young people and sexual exploitation in the new millennium. *Child Abuse Review*, 22, pp.155-168.

Palmer, T. (2015). *Digital Dangers: the Impact of technology on sexual abuse and exploitation of children and young people*. Barking: Barnardo's.

Pearce, J.J. (2013b). A Social Model of "Abused Consent". In: M. Melrose and J. Pearce, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Child Sexual Exploitation and Related Trafficking*. Palgrave Connect., pp. 52-68.

Ringrose, J., Gill, R., Livingstone, S., and Harvey, L. (2012). *A qualitative study of children, young people and sexting: A report prepared for the NSPCC*. London: NSPCC.

The nature of child sexual exploitation

Barnardo's. (2014)

Barnardo's. (2013)

Barter, C., McCarry, M., Berridge, D. and Evans, K. (2009). *Partner Exploitation and Violence in Teenage Intimate Relationships*. London: NSPCC.

Beckett (2011)

Beckett, H., Firmin, C., Hynes, P. and Pearce, J. (2014). *Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation: A Study of Current Practice in London*. London: London Councils.

Beckett, H., Brodie, I., Factor, F., Melrose, M., Pearce, J., Pitts, J., Shuker, L. and Warrington, C. (2013). *It's wrong but you get used to it. A qualitative study of gang-associated sexual violence and exploitation*. Luton: University of Bedfordshire.

Bedford (2015)

Berelowitz et al (2013)

Berelowitz et al (2012)

Boxall, B. and Wonnacott, J. (2013). *Serious case review: executive summary: Case 26 [executive summary]*. Torbay: Torbay Safeguarding Children Board.

Brayley, H., Cockbain, E. and Gibson, K. (2014). *Rapid evidence assessment: the sexual exploitation of boys and young men*. London: UCL, Barnardo's and Natcen.

Cantrill, P. (2013). *Serious case review executive summary: Christine [executive summary]*. Wakefield: Wakefield and District Safeguarding Children Board.

CEOP (2011)

DH and Chanon Consulting. (2014). *Health impact of sexual exploitation on adolescents*. Barking, Ilford: Barnardo's.

Firmin (2013)

Firmin and Curtis (2015)

Firmin, C. (2015). *Peer on peer abuse: safeguarding implications of contextualising abuse between young people within social fields* (Professional Doctorate Thesis). Luton: University of Bedfordshire.

Firmin, C. and Beckett, H. (2014). Child Sexual Exploitation. In: M. Dalton., ed *Handbook of Forensic Gynaecology. Advanced Skills Series*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., pp. 136-141.

Franklin, A., Raws, P. and Smeaton, E. (2015). *Unprotected, Overprotected: Meeting the needs of young people with learning disabilities who experience, or are at risk of, sexual exploitation*. London: Barnardo's.

General on Violence Against Children. (2014). *Realizing Children's Potential and Minimizing Risk: ICTs, the internet, and violence against children*. New York.

Gohir (2013)

Griffiths, S. (2013a). *The Overview Report of the Serious Case Review in Respect of Young People 1,2,3,4,5 and 6*. Rochdale: Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Children Board.

Griffiths, S. (2013b). *The Overview Report of the Serious Case Review in Respect of Young Person 7*. Rochdale: Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Children Board.

Hagell, A. (2013). *AYPH Be Healthy Project Evaluation, Association for Young People's Health*. AYPH

Hallett (2015)

Jago, S., Arocha, L., Brodie, I., Melrose, M., Pearce, J. and Warrington, C. (2011). *What's going on to Safeguard Children and Young People from Sexual Exploitation: How local partnerships respond to child sexual exploitation*. Luton: University of Bedfordshire.

Jay, A. (2014). *Independent inquiry into child sexual exploitation in Rotherham: 1997-2013*. Rotherham: Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.

Kirtley, P. (2013). *"If you shine a light, you will probably find it": report of a grass roots survey of health professionals with regard to their experiences in dealing with child sexual exploitation*. Derby: National Working Group Network.

Klatt, T., Cavner, D. and Egan, V. (2014). Rationalising predictors of child sexual exploitation and sex-trading. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 38(2), pp. 252–260.

Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A. and Ólafsson, K. (2011). *Risks and safety on the internet. The perspective of European children. Final findings from the EU Kids Online survey, 9-16*. LSE, London: EU Kids Online.

Maddocks, P. (2014). *A serious case review: 'Child R': the overview report*. Lancashire: Lancashire Safeguarding Children Board.

McNaughton et al (2014)

Mitchell, K. J., Finkelhor, D., Jones, L. M., and Wolak, J. (2011). Youth Internet Victimization in a Broader Victimization Context. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 48, p. 128–134.

Mitchell, K. J., Finkelhor, D., Jones, L. M., and Wolak, J. (2012). Prevalence and Characteristics of Youth Sexting: A National Study. *Pediatrics*, 129(1), pp. 13-20.

PACE. (2013). *Are Parents in the Picture? Professional and parental perspectives of childhood sexual exploitation*. Pace and Virtual College's Safeguarding Children e-Academy.

PACE. (2014). *The Relational Safeguarding Model: Best practice in working with families affected by child sexual exploitation*. Leeds: PACE.

Palmer (2015)

Pearce, J.J. (2013a). What's Going On to safeguard children and young people from child sexual exploitation: A review of Local Safeguarding Children Boards' work to protect children from sexual exploitation?. *Child Abuse Review* first published online, 21 June 2013.

Pona, I., Bracey, C., Royston, S., Gibbs, A. (2015). *Seriously awkward: how vulnerable 16-17 year olds are falling through the cracks*. London: Children's Society.

Quayle, E. and Jones, T. (2011). *Sexualized images of children on the Internet. Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment*. 23(1), 7-21.

Quayle, E. and Taylor, M. (2003). Model of problematic internet use in people with a sexual interest in children. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 6, pp. 93–106.

Ringrose et al (2012)

Shuker, L. (2013a). *Evaluation of Barnardo's safe accommodation project for sexually exploited and trafficked young people*. London: Barnardo's

Shuker, L. (2013b) Constructs of Safety for Children in Care Affected by Sexual Exploitation. In: M. Melrose and J. Pearce, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Child Sexual Exploitation and Related Trafficking*. Palgrave Connect., pp. 125-138.

The complexities of child sexual exploitation

Barnardo's. (2014)

Beckett (2011)

Beckett et al (2013)

Bedford (2015)

Berelowitz et al (2013)

Firmin (2013)

Firmin (2015)

Franklin et al (2015)

Gohir (2013)

Griffiths (2013a)

Griffiths (2013b)

Hallett (2015)

Health Working Group. (2014). *Report on Child Sexual Exploitation - An independent group chaired by the Department of Health focusing on: Improving the outcomes for children by promoting effective engagement of health services and staff*. London: Department of Health.

Jay (2014)

Melrose (2013)

Ofsted. (2014a). *The sexual exploitation of children: It couldn't happen here, could it?* Report no. No. 140175. Manchester: Ofsted.

Palmer (2015)

Pearce (2013b)

Phoenix, J. (2010). Living and working on the cusp of contradictions: Consumerism, justice and closed discourses. *Youth and Policy*, 104, pp. 32-47.

Phoenix, J. (2012). *Out of place: The policing and criminalisation of sexually exploited girls and young women*. London: The Howard League for Penal Reform.

Rogstad, K. E. (2010). STIs in Children and Adolescents. *Medicine*, 38, pp. 231-234.

Prevention

Barnardo's. (2014)

Barnardo's and Local Government Association. (2012). *Tackling child sexual exploitation: Helping local authorities to develop effective responses* Barkingside: Barnardo's.

Barter et al (2009)

Beckett (2011)

Beckett, H. (2015). *Evaluation of Safe Choices/PSNI Co-Located Pilot Initiative*. Belfast: Barnardo's NI.

Beckett et al (2014)

Beckett et al (2013)

Bedford (2015)

Coy, M., Thiara, R. and Kelly, L. (2011). *Boys who think Girls are Toys?: An Evaluation of the NIA Project Prevention Programme on Sexual Exploitation*. London: Child and Women Abuse Unit, London Metropolitan University.

Coy, M., Kelly, L., Elvines, F., Garner, M. and Kanyeredzi, A. (2013). *Sex without consent, I suppose that is rape. How young people in England understand sexual consent*. London: London Metropolitan University.

D'Arcy, K., Dhaliwal, S., Thomas, R., with Brodie, I. and Pearce, J. (2015). *Families and Communities Against Child Sexual Exploitation (FCASE) Final Evaluation Report*. Barnardo's and University of Bedfordshire International Centre: Researching child sexual exploitation, violence and trafficking: Luton: University of Bedfordshire.

End Violence Against Women and YouGov. (2010). *Sexual Harassment in UK Schools Poll*. EVAW.

Firmin (2015)

Formby, E. (2011). 'It's better to learn about your health and things that are going to happen to you than learning things that you just do at school': findings from a mapping study of PSHE education in primary schools in England. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 29 (3), pp. 161-173.

Franklin et al (2015)

Girlguiding. (2013). *Care Versus Control: Healthy Relationships. A report from Girl Guiding (with Womens Aid)*. London: Girlguiding.

Girlguiding. (2015). *Girls' Attitude Survey*. London: Girlguiding.

Gohir (2013)

Griffiths (2013a)

Griffiths (2013b)

Hagell (2013)

Health Working Group (2014)

Heslip, J. C. (2013). *The Brave New Online World of Teens and a Call to Action for Educators*. A Research Paper Presented to the Gordon Albright School of Education In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements For the Degree of Master of Education.

Hickle, K. and Hallett, S. (2015). Mitigating Harm: Considering Harm Reduction Principles in Work with Sexually Exploited Young People. *Children and Society* Early View.

Hicks, M. (2009). *Working together for online safety. Blog published by Facebook online safety team describing on-going initiatives in online protection*.

Jago et al (2011)

Jay (2014)

King-Hill, S. and Barrie, R. (2015). Perceptions of consent in adolescents who display harmful sexual behaviour. *British Journal of School Nursing*, 10(5), pp. 231-235.

Kirtley (2013)

Marshall, K. (2014). *Child sexual exploitation in Northern Ireland: report of the independent inquiry*. Belfast: The Criminal Justice Inspection for Northern Ireland.

NSPCC. (2011). *Sexual Abuse: a public health challenge*. London: NSPCC.

Ofsted (2014a)

PACE (2013)

PACE (2014)

Palmer (2015).

Pearce, J.J. (2009). Beyond Child Protection: Young people, social exclusion and sexual exploitation. In: J. Phoenix., ed., *Regulating Sex for Sale: Prostitution policy reform in the UK*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 121-136.

Pearce (2013b)

Pona et al (2015)

PSHE Association. (2015). *Personal, Social, Health and Economic education (PSHE) - curriculum for life: a case for statutory status*. PSHE Association.

Rogstad (2010)

Identification and assessment of need

Barnardo's. (2014)

Barnardo's and Local Government Association. (2012)

Beckett (2011)

Beckett et al (2014)

Beckett et al (2013)

Coy (2011)

D'Arcy et al (2015)

Franklin et al (2015)

Galley (2010)

Hagell (2013)

Hallett (2015)

Health Working Group (2014)

Hickle and Hallett (2015)

Jago et al (2011)

Jay (2014)

NSPCC (2011)

Ofsted (2014a)

PACE (2013)

Pearce (2009)

Research in Practice. (2015.) *Working Effectively to Address Child Sexual Exploitation: An evidence scope*. Research in Practice.

Working with children and young people affected by child sexual exploitation

Barnardo's. (2014)

Beckett (2011)

Beckett, H. and Warrington, C. (2015). *Making Justice Work: experiences of criminal justice for children and young people affected by sexual exploitation as victims and witnesses*. Luton: University of Bedfordshire.

Beckett, H., Warrington, C., Ackerley, E. and Allnock. D. (2016). *Children's Voices Research Report: Children and young people's perspectives on the police's role in safeguarding: a report for Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies*. London: HMIC.

Bedford (2015)

Berelowitz et al (2013)

Berelowitz et al (2012)

Bernard, C. and Harris, P. (2016). *Safeguarding black children: good practice in child protection*. London, Jessica Kingsley.

Firmin (2013)

Firmin (2015)

Firmin, C. and Pearce, J. (2016). The Effects on Black Children and Young People living in Gang –affected neighbourhoods. In C. Bernard and P. Harris., ed., *Safeguarding Black Children: Good Practice in Child Protection*. London: Jessica Kingsley, pp. 76-91.

Galley (2010)

Gohir (2013)

Hagell (2013)

Hallett S (2013) '*Child Sexual Exploitation*' in *South-East Wales: Problems and solutions from the perspectives of young people and professionals* PHD Thesis.

Hallett (2015)

McNaughton et al (2014)

Ofsted (2014a)

PACE (2013)

Sharpe, F. N. (2013). Missing from discourse: south Asian young women and sexual exploitation. In: M. Melrose and J. Pearce, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Child Sexual Exploitation and Related Trafficking*. Palgrave Connect., pp. 96-109.

Shuker (2013a)

Shuker (2013b)

Warrington, C. (2013). Partners in care? Sexually exploited young people's inclusion and exclusion from decision making about safeguarding. In: M. Melrose and J. Pearce, ed., *Critical Perspectives on Child Sexual Exploitation and Related Trafficking*. Palgrave Connect., pp. 110-124.

Warrington, C. (2010). From less harm to more good: The role of children and young people's participation in relation to sexual exploitation. *Youth and Policy*, 104, pp. 62-79.

Disruption and prosecution of perpetrators

Allnock, D. (2015). *Child sexual abuse (CSA) and policing briefing*. Luton: The University of Bedfordshire.

Beckett (2011)

Beckett, H. and Schubotz, D. (2014). Young people's self-reported experiences of sexual exploitation and sexual violence: a view from Northern Ireland. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(4), pp. 430-445.

Beckett and Warrington (2015)

Beckett et al (2013)

Beckett et al (2016)

Bedford (2015)

Berelowitz et al (2012)

Brayley, H (2014)

CEOP (2011)

Child Exploitation and Online Protection (CEOP). (2013). *Threat assessment of child sexual exploitation and abuse* London: CEOP.

Dodsworth, J. and Larsson, B. (2014). *An examination of the perspectives and experiences of police officers working with children and young people at risk of, or involved in, child sexual exploitation*. Norwich: University of East Anglia.

Firmin (2015)

Galley (2010)

Gohir (2013)

Hallett (2013)

Home Office. (2015). *Guidance on part 2 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003* London: Home Office.

Jay (2014)

Klonowski, A. (2013). Report of the Independent Reviewing Officer in Relation to Child Sexual Exploitation Issues in Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council during the Period 2006 to 2013. Rochdale: Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council.

Marshall (2014)

Palmer (2015)

Strategic framework

Beckett (2011)

Beckett et al (2014)

Beckett et al (2013)

Berelowitz et al (2013)

Berelowitz et al (2012)

Coy (2011)

D'Arcy et al (2015)

Firmin (2013)

Firmin and Curtis (2015)

Firmin (2015)

Franklin et al (2015)

Grant, L., and Kinman, G. (2013). *The importance of emotional resilience for staff and students in the 'helping' professions: developing an emotional curriculum*, HEA. Available at:

https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/emotional_resilience_louise_grant_marc_h_2014_0.pdf. [Accessed 14/07/2014].

Griffiths (2013a)

Health Working Group (2014)

Hickle and Hallett (2015)

HMG. (2015). *Working Together to Safeguard Children: Statutory guidance on inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*. Department of Education.

Jago et al (2011)

Jay (2014)

Kirtley (2013)

Morrison, T. (2005). *Staff supervision in social care*. Brighton: Pavilion.

Morrison, T. (2007). Emotional Intelligence, Emotion and Social Work: Context, Characteristics, Complications and Contribution. *British Journal of Social Work*, 37 (2), pp. 245-263.

Morrison, T., and Wonnacott, J. (2010). *Supervision Now or Never: Reclaiming Reflective Supervision in Social Work*. LGA.

Munro, E. (2011). *Munro Review of Child Protection: final report – a child centred system*. Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175391/Munro-Review.pdf. [Accessed 14/07/2016].

Myers, J. and Carmi, E. (2016). *The Brooke Serious Case Review into Child Sexual Exploitation*. Available at:

https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwi0wd-62_LNAhUrAcAKHbBJBGoQFggeMAA&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.bristol.gov.uk%2Fdocuments%2F20182%2F34760%2FSerious%2BCase%2BReview%2BOperation%2BBrooke%2BOverview%2BReport%2F3c2008c4-2728-4958-a8ed-8505826551a3&usq=AFQjCNFaKzrTtXtDCO3vnPB3HUh5JMiuJg. [Accessed 14/07/2016].

NSPCC (2011)

Ofsted. (2014b). *Supporting reflective practice in front line social work, Ofsted good practice example*. Manchester: Ofsted.

Ofsted (2014a)

PACE (2014)

Pearce (2009)

Pearce (2013a)

Pona et al (2015)

Research in Practice (2015)

Spring Consortium. (2016). Children's Social Care Innovation Programme: interim learning report especially 'A workforce culture that enables professionals and fosters learning' (pp 28-37) and 'System conditions that enable new approaches to embed, flourish and scale, pp. 45-52.



Department
for Education

This practice advice was produced by the Department for Education. It is adapted from a review of evidence produced by the University of Bedfordshire and Research in Practice. To view this extended practice advice see www.beds.ac.uk/ic/publications

© Crown copyright 2017

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

Reference: DFE-00057-2017

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk