



Department
for Education



Home Office

Local authority support for non-EEA migrant child victims of modern slavery

Research report

December 2017

Cordis Bright



Contents

Acknowledgements	4
List of tables	5
Executive summary	6
1 Introduction and methodology	10
1.1 Overview	10
1.2 Key research questions	10
1.3 Methodology	11
1.3.1 Approach	11
1.3.2 Limitations of the review	17
2 Scale of the need for placement and support	18
2.1 Prevalence of modern slavery experienced by non-EEA migrant children	18
2.2 Identification of potential victims	20
2.3 Risk factors for going missing	23
3 Availability of specialist placement and support	25
3.1 Placement	25
3.2 Other specialist services	28
4 Understanding of good or innovative practice	29
4.1 Placement	29
4.2 Other specialist services	31
4.3 Barriers and enabling factors to providing placement and support	33
5. Conclusions	40
5.1 Overview	40
5.2 Potential measures to strengthen support provided to non-EEA trafficked children	40
Appendix 1: Glossary of key terms	42
Key terminology	42
Definitions of placement types	43
Appendix 2: Literature review search terms and bibliography	46
Search terms	46
Bibliography	48

Appendix 3: Research tools	54
Online survey of local authorities	54
Topic guide for local authority interviews	60
Topic guide for voluntary sector interviews	62

Acknowledgements

Cordis Bright would like to thank:

- all colleagues in local authorities who responded to the survey request,
- all colleagues in local authorities and voluntary sector agencies who shared their views during telephone interviews, and
- all colleagues who promoted the review through their networks and encouraged participation in the survey or interviews.

List of tables

Table 1: Research questions and methods	11
Table 2: Representation of regions in survey respondents	13
Table 3: Representation of local authority types in survey respondents	14
Table 4: Representation of urban and rural areas in survey respondents	15

Executive summary

Introduction

This report presents key findings from a review of local authority placement and support provided to non-European Economic Area (EEA) migrant children who are identified as potential victims of modern slavery, including trafficking. This includes both accompanied and unaccompanied minors, those seeking asylum and those not seeking asylum. The review was commissioned by the Department for Education and the Home Office and was conducted by Cordis Bright, an independent research and consultancy organisation. Its key objectives were to:

- improve understanding of the range, location and accessibility of specialist local authority placement provision for this group, and
- identify examples of good and innovative practice to help inform policy on different ways to monitor, evaluate and strengthen specialist placement provision and support for this group.

Prevalence and identification of modern slavery of non-EEA migrant children

This review considered available evidence relating to the prevalence of modern slavery of non-EEA migrant children. In so doing, it sought to understand the scale of the issue and therefore to consider resource implications for local authorities seeking to identify, place and support this cohort. The primary national source of data on the prevalence of reported cases of suspected modern slavery in the UK is the National Referral Mechanism (NRM). In 2015, 747 children from non-EEA countries were referred to the NRM in England and Wales as potential victims of modern slavery (National Crime Agency, 2017b).

Reviewed literature suggests that it is likely that prevalence estimates based on the number of NRM referrals are an under-estimate of the total number of victims of modern slavery. This is due to both the under-identification of victims and the under-reporting to the NRM of those who are identified.

The review did not specifically test this hypothesis but interviews with local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders provided anecdotal evidence that local authorities experience challenges in identifying victims and are not necessarily referring all children who are potential victims to the NRM. In addition, responses to the online survey of local authorities which formed part of this review provide exploratory findings about the variation in numbers of non-EEA children identified as potential victims of modern slavery by participating local authorities. This varies significantly across different local authorities.

Approaches to identification

The literature review and online survey of local authorities indicated that there are variations in the extent to which local authorities are identifying non-EEA migrant children as potential victims of modern slavery. As a result, interviews conducted as part of this review sought to explore the different approaches taken by local authorities.

The review found evidence that approaches to the identification of non-EEA migrant children as potential victims of modern slavery vary across local authorities. A minority of local authorities who participated in telephone interviews as part of the review reported that they consider all unaccompanied asylum seeking children as potential victims of modern slavery in the first instance until this possibility is either confirmed or discounted. However, the majority of local authority stakeholders who participated in interviews as part of this review suggested that they would not take this approach and would wait for positive evidence of modern slavery before considering an unaccompanied asylum seeking child as a potential victim.

Local authority stakeholders who reported that their local authority initially regards all unaccompanied asylum seeking children as potential victims of modern slavery did not usually report that all unaccompanied asylum seeking children would therefore be referred to the NRM. Rather they described ensuring that social workers conducting initial assessments and early engagement with unaccompanied asylum seeking children were particularly alert to signs that a child might have been trafficked or exploited.

Following the introduction of the UK Modern Slavery Act 2015, local authorities (and a number of other professional bodies) have a duty to notify the Home Office of any child or adult encountered in England and Wales who they suspect is a victim of modern slavery (Home Office, 2016a). The NRM is one of two mechanisms by which the Home Office can be notified and it is the only mechanism which should be used for children who are suspected victims. Children do not need to consent to be referred to the NRM. This review found evidence from interviews with local authority stakeholders to support the view within the literature that local authorities are not consistently referring to the NRM. In interviews, some of the reasons suggested for this include a lack of awareness of the NRM, the Duty to Notify and the referral process, as well as a perception that a referral to the NRM does not lead to any improved outcomes for the child.

Provision and availability of placement and support

There is limited evidence within published literature of what constitutes good practice in supporting this cohort. This was reflected in the extent to which interviewed local authority stakeholders reported an in-depth understanding of good practice; the majority indicated that they did not necessarily have extensive knowledge of good practice and had often worked with very few children in this cohort.

Interviews with local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders suggested that placements and other services offered to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery are not usually specifically commissioned or designed for this cohort. Instead, placements and services are broadly selected on a case-by-case basis from the offer available to all vulnerable children in local authority care. In a minority of cases, there is evidence of specialist support for unaccompanied asylum seeking children – such as specialist social workers – and this tends to be in local authority areas where demand for such services is higher because the local authority supports a relatively high number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Examples of local authorities reportedly providing these services include local authorities in the South East of England.

Foster care was identified by the majority of interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders as the most effective placement type for this cohort, particularly for children under 16. Almost all local authorities who participated in the review and discussed their placement offer reported placing children in this cohort in foster care. The majority recognised that specialist knowledge of supporting potential victims of modern slavery would be likely to make placements and support more effective and reduce the incidence of potential victims going missing.

Gaps and barriers in providing placement and support

The 32 local authorities which responded to questions on the supply of placements within the online survey that formed part of this review most commonly identified undersupply in foster care, supported accommodation and supported lodgings. The majority of local authority stakeholders who took part in interviews also reported that there is an undersupply of foster carers who are knowledgeable and trained in understanding the needs of this cohort or who may have cultural backgrounds and life experiences in common with this cohort. A need for recruitment and additional training of foster carers was recognised.

Advocacy and guardianship was recognised in the literature and by interviewed voluntary sector stakeholders as a key specialist service in improving outcomes for this cohort. However, only a minority of interviewed local authority stakeholders reported using independent advocates for children and young people.

Other key gaps in specialist services which were identified by review participants, and especially local authority stakeholders, included access to specialist mental health services and services to enable children to maintain contact with their culture of origin.

Key barriers to providing placements and specialist services include the availability of specialist provision (as opposed to more generic provision for vulnerable children), as

well as a lack of resources and specialist knowledge within local authorities and partner services. A particular resource pressure was thought to exist for children aged 16-17.

Further, participating local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders reported that improvements could be made in information sharing between local authorities. It was suggested that this would improve the response to children going missing and potentially reduce missing incidents.

The majority of local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders who participated in interviews as part of this review reported that local authorities would benefit from increased resources to support this cohort. In addition, they stated that increased guidance and training on the identification, support, and safeguarding of children in this cohort, as well as national mechanisms for sharing good practice evidence, would be beneficial. Locally, it was reported that a more regional and strategic approach could provide opportunities to better assess need and to plan and develop cost-effective services to support improved outcomes for this cohort.

Going missing from local authority care

The reviewed literature and both local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders who participated in interviews identified a number of factors associated with children from this cohort going missing. These included absence of suitable placement or consistent support from a trusted individual and failure to support children to integrate effectively into the local community. In addition, Vietnamese children were reported by a minority of local authority stakeholders and the majority of voluntary sector stakeholders to be at particular risk of going missing.

As with other vulnerable children at risk of going missing, local authorities who have taken successful steps to reduce the incidence of children from this cohort going missing tend to report the use of multi-agency approaches to locating and supporting missing children. The approach in these local authorities involved coordination across services including police, healthcare, social care and the voluntary sector. Specific practices that could be implemented by local authorities and partners as a means of reducing the incidence of children in this cohort going missing included trafficking risk assessment of all vulnerable non-EEA migrant children at first point of contact with services.

1 Introduction and methodology

1.1 Overview

This report presents key findings from a review of local authority placement and support provided to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. This includes both accompanied and unaccompanied minors, those seeking asylum and those not seeking asylum. The review was commissioned by the Department for Education and the Home Office and was conducted by Cordis Bright, an independent research and consultancy organisation.

The focus of the review was:

- identification of non-EEA migrant modern slavery victims,
- specialist placements and services for this cohort,
- gaps in placements and services,
- barriers to the provision of placement and services, and
- non-EEA migrant modern slavery victims going missing from local authority care.

A glossary of key terms used within the report is included at appendix 1.

1.2 Key research questions

The Department for Education and the Home Office specified a number of key research questions for this review. Table 1 summarises these research questions and the research methods used to gather data in relation to them.

Table 1: Research questions and methods

Research question	Desktop review	Online survey	Interviews ¹
How many non-EEA migrant children in local authority care in England and Wales are identified as potential victims of modern slavery?	✓	✓	
How do local authorities identify potential victims of modern slavery? Are all non-EEA children who are potential victims referred to the NRM? If not, why not given the requirements of the Duty to Notify?	✓	✓	✓
What specialist placements and services do local authorities provide for non-EEA migrant children they identify as potential victims of modern slavery?	✓	✓	✓
Are there any gaps in placement and service provision? If there are gaps in placement or service provision, what are they? What can central government do to support local authorities in addressing these?	✓		✓
What are the barriers to providing specialist placements and other support services?	✓		✓
How many non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery go missing from local authority care? Are there any particular circumstances or characteristics associated with those who go missing?	✓		✓
How do local authorities seek to reduce incidents of these children going missing from their care?	✓		✓
Have local authorities been able to reduce incidents of these children going missing from their care? Are there examples of good practice that could be replicated?	✓		✓

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 Approach

The review methodology was developed by Cordis Bright in collaboration with the Department for Education and the Home Office. The methodology included four key stages, which are summarised below.

¹ This includes interviews with both local authority representatives and voluntary sector representatives.

Desktop review of data and literature. This focused on published data and literature relating to children identified as potential victims of modern slavery, focusing where possible on evidence relating to non-EEA migrants. It sought to explore the policy and practice context for local authority placement and support for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. This included synthesising prevalence data and any evidence of good or innovative practice discussed within the literature. Summary findings from the literature review are included in the report. The search terms and bibliography of reviewed literature are included at appendix 2.

Online survey of local authorities in England and Wales. A short online survey circulated to all 174 local authorities in England and Wales with responsibilities for children's services. The survey aimed to gather data on:

- the numbers of non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery in local authority areas,
- the demographic characteristics of non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery,
- the agencies which identified these non-EEA migrant children as potential victims of modern slavery, and
- the range, location and accessibility of placement and support offered to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery.

The survey, which was designed by Cordis Bright and agreed with the Department for Education and the Home Office before use in the field, was open between 10 November 2016 and 9 January 2017. 87 local authorities responded to the survey, giving a 50% response rate. Of the 87 local authorities who responded, 73 (42%) provided sufficient data to be analysed².

Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 provide a profile of the local authorities who responded to the survey, in terms of their region, type and rural or urban nature. As shown in Table 2, all regions were represented within the sample but the extent to which each region was represented varied. For example, only 30% of local authorities in North West England participated in the survey whilst 64% of local authorities in the East of England participated.

² Three of these local authorities responded jointly, resulting in 71 completed survey responses. One local authority responded anonymously, resulting in 70 completed survey responses which could be attributed to a particular local authority.

Table 2: Representation of regions in survey respondents³

Region	Total number of local authorities⁴	Number of participating local authorities	Proportion of local authorities in region which participated	Proportion of total respondents
East Midlands	9	3	33%	4%
East of England	11	7	64%	10%
London	33	11	33%	15%
North East England	12	6	50%	8%
North West England	23	7	30%	10%
South East England	19	8	42%	11%
South West England	16	7	44%	10%
West Midlands	14	6	43%	8%
Yorkshire and the Humber	15	7	47%	10%
Wales	22	10	45%	14%

Similarly, as indicated in Table 3, all types of local authority which have responsibility for children's services were represented within the sample but representation varied from 36% of London boroughs and metropolitan boroughs participating in the survey to 56% of county councils participating in the survey.

³ Three of 73 local authorities responded jointly, resulting in 71 completed survey responses. One local authority responded anonymously, resulting in 70 completed survey responses which could be attributed to a particular local authority.

⁴ One survey was completed anonymously so this local authority could not be included in the profiling.

Table 3: Representation of local authority types in survey respondents⁵

Local authority type	Total number of local authorities ⁶	Number of participating local authorities	Proportion of local authorities in region which participated	Proportion of total respondents
County Council	27	15	56%	21%
London Borough	33	11	33%	15%
Metropolitan Borough	36	16	44%	22%
Unitary authority	56	20	36%	27%
Welsh unitary authority	22	10	45%	24%

Lastly, both rural and urban areas were represented in the sample, as shown in Table 4⁷. This ranged from mainly rural areas to urban areas with a major conurbation. However, the extent to which different categories of rural or urban areas are represented varies.

This means that the responses of local authorities which participated in the survey cannot necessarily be considered to be representative of all local authorities with responsibility for children's services. Rather, the findings from the survey might best be viewed as exploratory research which might highlight topics and issues which could usefully be investigated further.

⁵ Three of these local authorities responded jointly, resulting in 71 completed survey responses. One local authority responded anonymously, resulting in 70 completed survey responses which could be attributed to a particular local authority.

⁶ One survey was completed anonymously so this local authority could not be included in the profiling.

⁷ The rurality or urbanness of local authorities was classified using the Government Statistical Service Rural-Urban classification system. Please see: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/2011-rural-urban-classification-of-local-authority-and-other-higher-level-geographies-for-statistical-purposes> for more detail. County Councils and Welsh local authorities are not classified under this system. Therefore only 125 of the 174 local authorities which were invited to complete the survey can be categorised in this way.

Table 4: Representation of urban and rural areas in survey respondents

Rural or urban classification	Total number of local authorities ⁸	Number of participating local authorities	Proportion of local authorities in region which participated	Proportion of total respondents
Mainly rural	4	2	50%	3%
Largely rural	7	4	57%	5%
Urban with significant rural	8	2	25%	3%
Urban with city and town	38	13	34%	18%
Urban with minor conurbation	5	2	40%	3%
Urban with major conurbation	63	24	38%	33%

Summary findings from the survey responses are included in the report. The survey template is included at appendix 3.

Telephone interviews with representatives from 28 local authorities. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with representatives from 28 local authorities. These focused on:

- the range, location and accessibility of placement and support offered to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery,
- understanding of good or innovative practice in providing placement and support to this cohort,

⁸ The rurality/urbanness of local authorities was classified using the Government Statistical Service Rural-Urban classification system. Please see: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/2011-rural-urban-classification-of-local-authority-and-other-higher-level-geographies-for-statistical-purposes> for more detail. County Councils and Welsh local authorities are not classified under this system. Therefore only 125 of the 174 local authorities which were invited to complete the survey can be categorised in this way.

- factors which might contribute to this cohort going missing from local authority care and practices which might reduce the incidence of the cohort going missing,
- enabling factors and barriers to providing placement and support to this cohort, and
- monitoring and evaluating placement and support to this cohort.

The interview topic guide, which was designed by Cordis Bright and agreed with the Department for Education and Home Office, is included at appendix 3. 54 local authorities were specifically targeted with invitations to interview. 35 of these were suggested by the Department for Education and Home Office because they are the local authorities who had the highest number of non-EEA child referrals to the NRM. The remaining 19 local authorities were invited because they had completed the online survey by 21 December 2016 and indicated their willingness to be interviewed.

Therefore 52% of the local authorities who were specifically targeted were able to participate in interviews during the required timescales. This represents 16% of the 174 local authorities who were either targeted specifically or received an invitation alongside the survey request. The local authorities which participated in interviews included unitary authorities, county councils and metropolitan and London boroughs of a range of different sizes. There was a geographical spread within England with both urban and rural areas represented but only one Welsh local authority participated in an interview. Local authorities who were currently supporting a number of children in this cohort were represented, as were those who were not currently supporting any children in this cohort.

The local authority stakeholders were generally nominated to participate by colleagues within their local authority because they were judged to have the greatest insight into local practice in placement and support for this cohort. However, the opinions they expressed during interview are their individual views and are therefore not necessarily representative of a particular standpoint within their organisation.

Telephone interviews with representatives from six voluntary sector organisations.

Semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with representatives from six voluntary sector organisations with specialist knowledge of modern slavery. These focused on similar topics to those discussed within interviews with local authority representatives. The interview topic guide is included at appendix 3. The six voluntary sector organisations which were invited to participate in an interview were proposed by the Home Office and Department for Education because they were identified as the main voluntary sector organisations working in this policy area.

This is a small sample of voluntary sector stakeholders, albeit one including a number of key organisations operating in this policy area. In addition, as with local authority stakeholders, the views the voluntary sector stakeholders shared during interview are their individual views and not necessarily representative of the standpoint within their organisation. It is therefore important to be cautious about viewing their responses as

representative of the full range of voluntary sector stakeholders who might have experience within this policy area.

The responses to the interviews with local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders were analysed thematically to draw out key themes emerging from the interviews. This analysis was conducted by the researchers who had undertaken the interviews and took a collegiate approach to build in internal challenge when identifying themes and determining their relative importance. The key findings from the analysis are included within this report.

Due to the qualitative nature of this element of the review, the importance of a theme is not quantified by the number of stakeholders who reported it, as this might not be the only consideration when determining the relative importance of a theme emerging from qualitative analysis. However, where themes were identified by multiple stakeholders we report this as the view of either the minority or the majority of stakeholders, to give some indication of how frequently this theme emerged within responses.

1.3.2 Limitations of the review

There were two key practical limitations to the effective delivery of this review; these are likely to have impacted on participation rates by local authorities and therefore on the extent to which the review findings can be considered representative.

First, the timescales for conducting the review were tight, with the bulk of the fieldwork taking place from mid-November until early January and therefore spanning the Christmas period.

Second, the online survey and telephone interviews with local authority stakeholders were aimed at service managers with responsibility for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. Direct contact details for these service managers were not available to Cordis Bright. These contact details proved challenging to obtain for a variety of reasons, including the fact that the job title and team in which the appropriate manager was based varied substantially across local authorities and a number of local authorities were not able or willing to share names and contact details when approached by phone.

In addition, as discussed in section 1.3.1, the size and characteristics of the sample for the online survey (42% of all eligible local authorities) and interviews with local authority stakeholders (16% of all eligible local authorities) mean that the review findings cannot confidently be considered as representative of the practice or perspectives of all local authorities with responsibility for children's services. Instead, the findings of the review might more accurately be viewed as exploratory.

2 Scale of the need for placement and support

2.1 Prevalence of modern slavery experienced by non-EEA migrant children

This review considered available evidence relating to the prevalence of modern slavery of non-EEA migrant children. In so doing, it seeks to understand the scale of the issue and therefore to consider resource implications for local authorities seeking to identify, place and support this cohort. The primary national source of data on the prevalence of reported cases of suspected modern slavery in the UK is the National Referral Mechanism (NRM). The NRM is a framework for identifying victims of human trafficking or modern slavery and ensuring they receive the appropriate support (National Crime Agency, 2017a).

In 2015, 927 children in England and Wales were referred to the NRM as potential victims of modern slavery. 747 (81%) of these children were from non-EEA countries (National Crime Agency, 2017b). A detailed breakdown of NRM decisions is provided within the quarterly reports rather than the end of year summary. Within these reports, 395 (53%) of referrals of non-EEA minors were still awaiting a conclusive grounds decision. 43 (6%) had received a positive conclusive grounds decision (National Crime Agency, 2017b).

Reviewed literature suggests that it is likely that prevalence estimates based on the number of NRM referrals are an under-estimate of the total number of victims of modern slavery. This is due to both the under-identification of victims and the under-reporting to the NRM of those who are identified. Indeed, publications relating to the NRM statistics include careful caveats to make it clear that they cannot offer an analysis of prevalence because they only contain data relating to numbers referred to the NRM (National Crime Agency, 2017b). For example, in an attempt to estimate prevalence a multiple systems estimation was recently conducted which estimated the number of potential victims in the UK in 2013 at between 10,000 and 13,000 (Bales, Hesketh and Silverman, 2015). When compared to the figure of 2,744 identified by the National Crime Agency's strategic assessment of the nature and scale of human trafficking in 2013 and 1,746 referrals made to the NRM in 2013, this suggests under-representation of the number of potential victims of modern slavery in the UK.

In the online survey conducted as part of this review, local authorities were asked how many non-EEA migrant children had been identified as potential victims of modern slavery in the past 12 months. Combined, the 73 local authorities that responded identified 312 potential victims of modern slavery. The number of identified potential victims ranged from zero to 36.

26 local authorities stated that there were zero identified cases in their local authority area in the past 12 months. This was the most frequent answer and was reported by

local authorities of a variety of sizes, types, levels of rurality or urbanness and across a range of regions. It is therefore difficult to establish whether there is any pattern in non-identification of potential victims by particular groups of local authorities and whether this might suggest poorer performance by these local authorities in identifying potential victims or simply lower prevalence of modern slavery of children in these local authorities.

The highest number of cases identified by a single authority was 36. This was reported by an urban unitary authority. The 10 local authorities which reported the highest numbers of identified potential victims (ranging from nine to 36 potential victims) were responsible for 214 potential victims identified by local authorities who responded to the survey. This represents 69% of the total number of potential victims identified by all survey respondents. Four of these 10 local authorities were in South East England and two were in London. They were predominantly urban authorities or county councils.

Based on the analysis of survey responses, it appears that older children and young people are more commonly identified as potential victims of modern slavery, at least by those local authorities who responded to the survey. 150 (58%) of the 261⁹ potential victims whose age was reported were between the ages of 16-17 when they were identified as potential victims of modern slavery. This compares with 63% of all minors referred to the NRM in 2015 who were aged 16-17 (National Crime Agency, 2017b)¹⁰. In both cases, the data relates to identification rather than prevalence (which is not known because of the number of potential hidden victims). Therefore, it does not necessarily provide evidence that children and young people in older age groups are more likely to be victims of modern slavery.

38 (61%) of the 62 local authorities who responded to this question identified potential victims aged 16-17, whilst 25 (40%) local authorities identified potential victims aged 11-15. Substantially smaller numbers of local authorities identified younger potential victims.

The analysis of survey responses indicates that boys and young men are more frequently identified as potential victims of modern slavery than girls and young women. 212 (73%) of potential victims whose gender was provided in the survey responses were male. The remaining 80 (27%) were all female and there were no children identified as transgender. A higher proportion of minors referred to the NRM in 2015 were also male, although the difference in the gender breakdown in NRM referrals was less marked than in responses

⁹ A total of 62 local authorities provided the age at identification of some or all of the non-EEA migrant children they had identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking. Therefore the age of 261 of the 312 potential victims/survivors was reported within the survey responses.

¹⁰ This age breakdown relates to all minors referred to the NRM in England and Wales in 2015 and not specifically to non-EEA minors referred to the NRM. This is because data is not reported in the NRM statistics on age of referrals by country of origin.

to this survey. In 2015, 61% of minors referred to the NRM in England and Wales were male whilst 38% were female (National Crime Agency, 2017b)¹¹.

22 (50%) of the 44 local authorities who provided data on country of origin of potential victims identified Vietnam among their three most common countries of origin for children in this cohort; this was the most commonly-reported country of origin. This was followed by Albania, which was reported by 14 (32%) local authorities as within their three most common countries of origin. Afghanistan, Eritrea, Iran and Iraq were all reported by six (14%) local authorities as within their three most common countries of origin and these were the third most commonly-reported countries of origin. This is in line with the most common countries of origin of non-EEA minors referred to the NRM. In 2015, 230 (31%) of the 747 non-EEA minors referred to the NRM were from Vietnam, and 203 (27%) were from Albania (National Crime Agency, 2017b).

Within their three most common countries of origin 31 (70%) local authorities identified children coming from destinations in Asia, 21 (48%) local authorities identified children coming from destinations in the Middle East, 19 (43%) local authorities identified children coming from destinations in Africa and 15 (34%) local authorities identified children coming from destinations in Europe.

These reflections on prevalence should be viewed within the context of the wider population of unaccompanied asylum seeking children in the UK. 60% of unaccompanied asylum seeking children in 2016 were aged 16 or 17; the proportions referred to the NRM reflect the breakdown in the wider population (Home Office, 2017). The higher prevalence of identified male victims of trafficking also reflects higher prevalence of males within the cohort of unaccompanied asylum seeking children. In 2016 90% of applications for asylum from unaccompanied children were from boys (Home Office, 2017). In addition, the country of origin of NRM referrals reflects the prevalence in the wider cohort of unaccompanied asylum seeking children. The top six countries of origin for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children in 2016 were: Afghanistan, Albania, Eritrea, Iran, Iraq and Sudan (Home Office, 2017).

2.2 Identification of potential victims

The majority of local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders who were interviewed as part of this review emphasised challenges with the effective identification of potential victims of modern slavery. Indeed, many recommended increased training around identifying this cohort. These stakeholders reported that training for social workers was

¹¹ This gender breakdown relates to all minors referred to the NRM in England and Wales in 2015, and not specifically to non-EEA minors referred to the NRM. This is because data is not reported in the NRM statistics on gender of referrals by country of origin.

particularly important, including frontline social workers and those in more managerial roles. In addition, a minority of local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders reported that it would be beneficial to offer more systematic training about modern slavery and identifying victims to professionals in other roles which might encounter children who have been or are at risk of modern slavery. Examples included housing officers and placement providers, including staff in residential care homes. For example, one local authority respondent highlighted a reduction in missing episodes in the local authority following improved multi-agency training in early stage identification of potential victims of modern slavery.

The interviews conducted with local authority stakeholders provided evidence of a range of different approaches to the identification of non-EEA migrant children as potential victims of modern slavery. For example, a minority of interviewed local authority stakeholders reported that their local authority initially regards all unaccompanied asylum seeking children as potential victims of modern slavery and continues to do so unless assessment and investigation indicates otherwise. This included local authorities who reported supporting both lower and higher numbers of non-EEA migrant children and identifying lower and higher numbers of these children as potential victims of modern slavery. However, the majority indicated that their local authority only regards unaccompanied asylum seeking children as potential victims if they find evidence that suggests this, or if the unaccompanied asylum seeking child reports it to a professional.

Local authority stakeholders who reported that their local authority initially regards all unaccompanied asylum seeking children as potential victims of modern slavery did not usually report that all unaccompanied asylum seeking children would therefore be referred to the NRM. Rather, they described ensuring that social workers conducting initial assessments and early engagement with unaccompanied asylum seeking children were particularly alert to signs that a child might have been trafficked or exploited. In one instance, a county council described undertaking specific trafficking risk assessments with all children thought to have experienced or be at risk of trafficking. This is reportedly used to establish a more detailed picture of risk and to plan placement and support accordingly.

Based on responses to the online survey conducted as part of this review, the most common route via which non-EEA migrant children were identified as potential victims of modern slavery was via the police. A total of 28 (65%) of the 43 local authorities who provided data on identification routes cited the police as one of their three most common identification routes. The other most common identification routes reported by local authorities within the survey were local authorities themselves, which was reported by 13 (30%) local authorities, and UK Border Force, which was reported by 11 (26%) local authorities.

In 2015, the agency which most commonly referred children to the NRM was the Home Office, which referred 335 (36%) children in England and Wales to the NRM (National Crime Agency, 2017b)¹². The next most common type of agency referring minors to the NRM was local authorities, which referred 268 (29%) children. This was followed by the police, which referred 157 (17%) children.

Following the commencement of Section 52 of the UK Modern Slavery Act 2015 on 1 November 2015 local authorities (and a number of other professional bodies) have a duty to notify the Home Office of any child or adult encountered in England and Wales who they suspect is a victim of modern slavery (Home Office, 2016a). The NRM is one of two mechanisms by which the Home Office can be notified and it is the only mechanism which should be used for children who are suspected victims. Children do not need to consent to be referred to the NRM.

This review found evidence from interviews with local authority stakeholders to support the view within the literature that local authorities are not consistently referring to the NRM. Whilst the majority of local authority stakeholders reported an awareness of the NRM, a minority stated that they were not confident that all social workers were aware of it or of when and how to make referrals to it.

A minority of local authority stakeholders also suggested that there may be a misunderstanding amongst some social workers about the purpose of a referral to the NRM. For example, some stakeholders reported a belief (by themselves or by colleagues in their local authority) that a referral to the NRM would trigger different placement and support options becoming available to a child at the point of referral. In addition, a minority stated that they did not see any benefit to the potential victim of making a referral to the NRM as it did not alter the support they would receive.

A minority of local authority and the majority of voluntary sector stakeholders commented on this lack of awareness and understanding by professionals as a barrier to the use of the NRM. They also highlighted other barriers, such as the unwillingness of some children to be referred to the NRM due to a perceived threat of immigration investigations. Those local authority stakeholders who discussed this as a barrier did not clearly state whether they believed that a child's consent was required (and therefore are not aware of the duty to refer minors identified as potential victims of modern slavery to the NRM, irrespective of their consent). Rather, they reported that children's unwillingness to be referred to the NRM impacted negatively on their disclosure of information relating to their experience of modern slavery, and thus on the ability of first

¹² 'Home Office' and 'UK Border Force' are listed as distinct referring agencies within the NRM statistics. Further explanation is not provided within the statistics or related reports of which Home Office teams are included within 'Home Office'.

responders to establish whether modern slavery may have taken place and to submit high-quality NRM referrals.

Concerns about the use of the NRM are reflected in research undertaken by the Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group (ATMG) examining the NRM in practice for children. This found evidence of (ATMG, 2014):

- limited awareness of child trafficking indicators among first responders,
- limited awareness of the NRM by first responders, and
- lack of input by the child into the NRM process and a lack of understanding of the NRM process by the child.

2.3 Risk factors for going missing

A recent study on trafficked and unaccompanied children going missing from care in the UK included an online survey completed by 288 professionals who were working with – or might encounter – trafficked, unaccompanied or separated children (Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016). The reason most commonly suggested by these survey respondents for trafficked or unaccompanied children going missing was not being recognised as a potential victim of trafficking (Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016). Other circumstances which professionals and young people who participated in research studies associated with likelihood of going missing include (Franklin and Doyle, 2013; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016):

- control or influence of traffickers on children,
- inappropriate accommodation, such as placements which do not promote trusting relationships, wellbeing, safety planning and protective factors to reduce the likelihood of children going missing,
- carers who are not adequately trained to understand the experiences and risks faced by children who have been victims of modern slavery or how best to support them to remain in placements,
- lack of consistent support from a trusted individual, such as independent advocates or guardians,
- children's concerns about their asylum or immigration applications and engaging with official interviews, and
- being criminalised, for example being arrested or prosecuted.

These views were upheld in the interview responses of local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders. In addition, a minority of local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders reported that a failure to support potential victims to integrate into the local community can increase the risk of them going missing.

Interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders were asked whether they were aware of any particular characteristics associated with this cohort going missing. The majority of local authority stakeholders reported that they felt unable to comment. The reasons cited were that their local authority had only provided placement and support to a small number of children in this cohort or that none or only a small number of these children had gone missing.

However, a minority of local authority stakeholders and the majority of voluntary sector stakeholders stated that Vietnamese children who have been identified as potential victims of modern slavery are particularly vulnerable to going missing. For local authority stakeholders, this belief was usually based on specific instances of which they were aware, where one or more Vietnamese child victims of modern slavery who were in the care of their local authority had gone missing.

Most local authority and voluntary sector interview respondents who discussed a perceived high prevalence of missing episodes amongst Vietnamese victims were unable to offer an explanation for this. However, a minority of local authority stakeholders attributed this to the highly organised nature of the trafficking and criminal exploitation that these Vietnamese victims experience. These local authorities also mentioned the fact that Vietnamese victims are often first identified following a period of exploitation in cannabis factories or nail bars and then return to what is “familiar”, due to the existing links they have within the industry into which they have been trafficked. This chimes with a report by the Office of the Children’s Commissioner highlighting a high proportion of Vietnamese children arriving to Kent in 2010 that went missing and were later found in cannabis factories (The All-Party Parliamentary Group for Runaway and Missing Children and Adults and the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Looked After Children and Care Leavers (APPG), 2012).

3 Availability of specialist placement and support

3.1 Placement

Safe accommodation has been highlighted as one of the immediate needs presented by young people who have been trafficked at the point of arrival (Pearce, Hynes and Bovarnick, 2009).

An analysis of responses to the online survey conducted as part of this review suggests that the placement type most commonly offered to non-EEA migrant children who are identified as potential victims of modern slavery is foster care. 51 (89%) of the 57 local authorities who responded to this question indicated that they provide foster care to this cohort. 33 (58%) local authorities offered supported accommodation, 24 (42%) offered supported lodgings, 22 (39%) offered residential children's home places, 16 (28%) offered shared accommodation, and one (2%) local authority offered placements in a semi-secure reception unit for trafficked children. For all forms of placement except the semi-secure reception unit, the majority of provision was based within the local authority.

Survey responses suggest that supply of all placement types meets or exceeds demand in the majority of responding local authority areas. The placement types in which undersupply was most frequently reported were¹³:

- foster care, which was reported as undersupplied by 12 (38%) of the 32 local authorities,
- supported accommodation, which was reported as undersupplied by 9 (28%) of the 32 local authorities, and
- supported lodgings, which were reported as undersupplied by 7 (22%) of the 32 local authorities.

Furthermore, of these 32 local authorities:

- 17 (53%) local authorities reported no areas of undersupply in their accommodation offer.
- By comparison, 15 (47%) local authorities reported at least one area of undersupply in their accommodation offer.

Of those local authorities who reported at least one area of undersupply in their accommodation offer, 12 (80%) had experienced a lower volume of demand for

¹³ Reported by 32 local authorities that answered the question about supply/demand of accommodation/placements and also reported that at least one non-EEA migrant child had been identified as a potential victim of modern slavery/trafficking in the previous 12 months.

accommodation for this cohort in the past 12 months, having identified four or fewer non-EEA migrant children in the last 12 months as potential victims of modern slavery.

However, there were three local authority areas which appeared to experience a greater undersupply of placements than the others. One local authority in South East England reported that demand somewhat exceeded supply across a wide range of its placement types: including foster care, supported accommodation, shared accommodation, supported lodgings, residential children's homes and semi-secure reception units for trafficked children. This was the local authority which reported identifying the highest number (36) of non-EEA migrant children as potential victims of modern slavery in the past 12 months. Two local authorities reported demand far exceeding supply for three different types of accommodation: foster care, supported lodgings, and one other type of accommodation (residential children's homes in one case and supported accommodation in the other). This included one local authority in the East Midlands which reported identifying a relatively high volume (8) potential victims of modern slavery in the last 12 months and one local authority in South West England which reported identifying a lower volume (1) of potential victims in the last 12 months.

These findings are echoed by the analysis of interview responses by local authority stakeholders. Almost all indicated that they would initially seek to offer foster care to non-EEA migrant children who are identified as potential victims of modern slavery and that they do offer this in most instances. In particular, local authority stakeholders reported that foster care was used in most cases for potential victims under the age of 16, with exceptions only being made if specific concerns around a child's behaviour or the complexity of their support needs meant that an alternative placement (most commonly in a residential care home) was sought. For those aged 16-17, the majority of local authority respondents also referred to using supported accommodation and/or shared housing, sometimes referring to both as "semi-independent accommodation". The provision of this "semi-independent accommodation" was also perceived as good practice by some stakeholders; this will be discussed in more detail in section 4.1.

The majority of interviewed local authority stakeholders highlighted that there is sufficient supply of these foster placements overall, but a minority stated that they have difficulties in identifying an adequate number of suitable placements within the local authority area. The majority attributed this to the small volume and unpredictability of demand for placements for victims of modern slavery, and indeed for unaccompanied asylum seeking children more generally, in their localities. A minority also saw cultural matching as important in determining the suitability of a foster care placement and commented on gaps in their local authority area for specific demographics of foster carers with regards to religion, ethnicity, language and those able to cater to specific age groups.

In addition, a minority of interviewed local authority stakeholders stated that it is more challenging to find foster care for older young people, particularly those aged 16 and

over. However, these interview respondents tended to emphasise that this is a wider supply issue and not specific to foster placements suitable for non-EEA migrant children or potential victims of modern slavery. This was cited as one of the reasons for offering supported accommodation or shared housing to potential victims aged 16-17.

The responses of the majority of interviewed local authority stakeholders suggest that the placements offered to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery are usually not specialist in the sense that they are not distinct from the placements offered to other children and young people in local authority care. Where more specific provision was described, this was often provision offered to unaccompanied asylum seeking children (including unaccompanied asylum seeking children who may have experienced modern slavery) and not focused only on potential victims of modern slavery. For example, a minority of local authority stakeholders suggested that specialist foster care was available locally with foster carers who had received specific training on supporting unaccompanied asylum seeking children, which included reference to modern slavery. However, most explained that the standard pool of foster carers was used for this cohort but that experienced foster carers would be sought in preference to less experienced ones and additional training and support would be offered as needed.

A small minority of interviewed local authority stakeholders referred to using temporary accommodation, such as bed and breakfasts, for unaccompanied non-EEA migrant children aged 16 or over. These stakeholders recognised that placing children in this type of accommodation contravenes good practice guidance and should be avoided. Yet they cited examples of spontaneous arrivals of non-EEA migrant children to their local authority area, for whom more appropriate placements could not be found within the first 24 hours. They therefore referred to a need to place these children in bed and breakfasts overnight for the first night following their referral to the local authority.

Placement was consistently described by interviewed voluntary sector stakeholders as a problematic issue for non-EEA migrant children and young people identified as potential victims of modern slavery. The majority of voluntary sector respondents were of the opinion that, despite a high level of demand, there was limited capacity of foster care placements for these children and young people. Perhaps as a result of this perceived limited availability, multiple voluntary sector respondents commented that these children and young people were often placed in “semi-independent accommodation” (such as supported accommodation or shared housing), which was cited as inappropriate due to safeguarding risks being higher. Concerns about the limited availability of suitable placements and particularly placements with foster carers with specialist training in supporting victims of modern slavery, were echoed within the reviewed literature (e.g. Brownlees and Finch, 2010).

3.2 Other specialist services

An analysis of responses to the online survey conducted as part of this review indicates that some local authorities are offering other specialist services to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. 15 (33%) of the 45 local authorities who provided information about specialist services they offer reported that they offer specialist counselling and 12 (27%) local authorities reported that they offer a specialist support worker. 12 (27%) local authorities reported that they offer at least one other form of specialist service, including: establishing multi-agency teams to support non-EEA children (3); mental health services (2); commissioning specific training for social workers (3); and specialist child sexual exploitation teams (2).

It should be noted that there was considerable ambiguity in the responses of several local authorities about whether services commissioned are specific to non-EEA migrant children or potential victims of human trafficking, or whether they are part of more generic services for vulnerable children and young people. Indeed, in six responses, local authorities highlighted that they would provide the same services that they would provide for other vulnerable children and young people not specifically in this cohort.

Survey responses on the extent to which supply of other specialist services meets local demand suggest that specialist counselling is frequently undersupplied; 12 (61%) of the 19 local authorities who responded to this question reported that specialist counselling was either greatly or somewhat undersupplied, meaning that there were not enough services available to meet demand locally.

The responses of interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders also indicated that there are significant gaps in the provision of a range of both universal services and specialist versions of these services which might cater for the more specific needs of this cohort. In particular, a majority of both local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders identified a lack of appropriate mental health and therapeutic services. This ranged from reported difficulties in many local authority areas in accessing standard Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) for unaccompanied asylum seeking children (who may have been victims of modern slavery), to an absence of more specialist provision to support children and young people to address or manage the negative impact of trauma they have experienced at the hands of perpetrators of modern slavery, or previously in their country of origin.

A minority of interviewed local authority stakeholders indicated that they offer some kind of advocacy or an independent visitor, particularly in cases where a child is in a placement that is not matched with their cultural and language needs. However, this was not offered by the majority of interviewed local authorities. The perceived benefits of offering this service are discussed in more detail in section 4.2.

4 Understanding of good or innovative practice

The published evidence base for good practice in placement and support of non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery is relatively limited. For example, the review of literature found limited evidence of the known impact of programmes and approaches perceived to be good practice.

This section references a number of examples that were highlighted as good practice by local authority and/or voluntary sector stakeholders interviewed as part of this review. These examples have not been independently verified as good practice through any further research into their known impact or outcomes for non-EEA children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. At this stage they are therefore anecdotal examples and not known to be evidence-based. Most stakeholders who referenced specific providers or local authorities whose practice they perceived to be strong, stated that these were simply the examples of which they were aware and that as a result there may be different, or better, examples.

In addition, the majority of local authority stakeholders who participated in interviews reported that they did not have extensive knowledge of the specific needs of non-EEA children who are potential victims of modern slavery and how these might differ from the needs of unaccompanied asylum seeking children more widely, or indeed of other vulnerable children in their care. In a minority of cases, these stakeholders suggested that a colleague in a different role might have this knowledge. In the majority of cases they explained that the local authority had not supported a large enough number of children in this cohort to amass this knowledge and confidently identify support needs that were common to this cohort and distinct from other cohorts of vulnerable children.

4.1 Placement

Specialist foster care is consistently described in the literature as a good solution in provision of accommodation for children and young people who are potential victims of modern slavery (APPG, 2012; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016). Specialism in this context is predominantly used to mean foster carers who have received training to provide them with knowledge of what constitutes modern slavery, as well as an understanding of the experience of children who have been victims of modern slavery or of other experiences which are relatively common amongst non-EEA migrant children in local authority care, such as being unaccompanied and seeking asylum. In addition, they should have received training on safeguarding risks, risks of going missing, and risks of becoming repeat victims of modern slavery and how to reduce these risks within the placement.

Secure accommodation (such as a semi-secure reception centre for trafficked children) is another placement type referenced in some publications as effective provision on an

immediate short-term basis (The Centre for Social Justice (CSJ), 2013; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016).

Almost all local authority stakeholders interviewed as part of this review viewed foster care as the most effective type of accommodation for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. This was echoed by all but one of the voluntary sector stakeholders interviewed¹⁴. Strengths of foster care which were reported by these local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders included:

- the familial and homely setting, which was seen to promote children's sense of comfort and safety,
- the consistent provision of care by one or two carers, which reportedly provides an opportunity for children to build trust with these carers,
- the increased chance of finding a cultural match or more culturally-sensitive placement within foster care when compared with other placement types, and
- the small-scale nature of the placement, meaning that foster carers are more able to focus on the needs and wants of an individual child, which can sometimes be more difficult in a placement setting where there are a number of other children.

The majority of local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders suggested that ideally this would be provided by specialist foster carers with training in understanding the experience of children who have been victims of modern slavery and in supporting and safeguarding them. The majority of local authority stakeholders also indicated that in the event that such specialist foster care was not available, more generic foster care would still be more effective than other types of placement.

However, the majority of both types of stakeholder also highlighted the importance of selecting the most appropriate placement on a case by case basis. For example, age was cited as an important consideration when placing this cohort, with many suggesting that supported accommodation might be equally or more appropriate than foster care for young people aged 16 and over. Alongside age, the complexity of a child's support needs, their levels of independence and their cultural background and expectations were identified by interviewed stakeholders as key determiners of the most appropriate placement.

The majority of local authority stakeholders and all voluntary sector stakeholders reported that foster carers and other placement providers should be appropriately trained around areas such as safeguarding risks, risks of going missing, risks of becoming repeat victims of modern slavery, healthcare, immigration, and referring to local services. There is also

¹⁴ The remaining voluntary sector stakeholder was reluctant to identify any one type of placement as most effective for this cohort, emphasising instead the importance of selecting the most appropriate placement on a case by case basis.

a consistent theme within the literature around training of placement providers to recognise and respond to the needs of this cohort (Department for Education and Home Office, 2011; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016; Shuker, 2013). Specific training areas recommended for specialist carers include: information regarding the immigration system, use of specific safety measures, and challenging societal assumptions that increase young people's vulnerability to exploitation (Shuker, 2013).

A minority of local authority stakeholders described experience of working with supported accommodation providers who were less effective in supporting unaccompanied asylum seeking children more broadly. In particular, these stakeholders reported that such providers were less skilled at building trust and rapport with unaccompanied asylum seeking children and at supporting them to integrate with peers within the accommodation and to identify and engage with other support services or communities of interest. These stakeholders tended to attribute the lack of success to the absence of key skills and expertise within the frontline workforce. They also reflected that the best accommodation providers often display a balance of specialist knowledge and local knowledge, meaning that sometimes smaller, local providers who are established in the area can offer provision which is as effective as that offered by national providers who may have more specialist knowledge in supporting potential victims of modern slavery.

4.2 Other specialist services

Advocates were highlighted within the reviewed literature and by the majority of interviewed voluntary sector stakeholders as the most effective type of specialist service in improving outcomes for non-EEA migrant children and young people identified as victims of modern slavery (APPG, 2012; Crawley and Kohli, 2013; ECPAT UK, 2011a; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016; Tuggey and Smith, 2016). Advocates and guardians have been recommended for accompanying victims through the NRM decision-making process, protecting their rights and wellbeing, and providing them with guidance and assistance through the asylum or immigration process and required services. Indeed, both professionals' views reported in the literature and a minority of voluntary sector stakeholders interviewed as part of this review suggested that advocates act as a protective factor in reducing the likelihood of this group going missing (ECPAT UK, 2011a; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016; Tuggey and Smith, 2016).

One of the key functions which might be fulfilled by an advocate or guardian is the role of a trusted and consistent adult with whom a child feels safe to share their views and experiences. This capacity to build trust and offer consistency to children has also been recognised as crucial for other professionals and carers working with children who have been victims of modern slavery. It is seen to promote a sense of safety and wellbeing, which acts as a foundation for children to engage in placements and wider services (Crawley and Kohli, 2013; Franklin and Doyle, 2013; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016; Stanley et al., 2016).

A guardianship system for unaccompanied asylum seeking children (which included potential victims of modern slavery) has been trialled in Scotland. A 12-month trial of Independent Child Trafficking Advocates in England concluded that advocates added value to existing provision for trafficked children, with advocates being important for ensuring clarity and coherence for the child (Home Office, 2015). However, the trial also found no evidence that having an Independent Child Trafficking Advocate reduced the incidence of children going missing from care.

Only a minority of local authority stakeholders highlighted existing statutory advocates as a type of specialist service that is effective in improving outcomes for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. The majority did not reference advocates specifically when asked about key services apart from placements which support improved outcomes for this cohort. Those who did report that advocates were a key component in effective support for this cohort tended to suggest that they were particularly important in improving the integration of children in placements that are not matched with their cultural and language needs. They reported that advocates or independent visitors can support these children to feel more heard, better understood, and to identify and engage with community groups and smaller, local provision that might support their integration.

Alternatively, the majority of respondents from local authorities emphasised the importance of mental health and therapeutic services, both for this group of child victims and unaccompanied asylum seeking children more broadly. Many highlighted this in the context of the trauma and emotional difficulties that these young people may have experienced.

Other services recommended within the reviewed literature and/or by interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders for this cohort are access to (BAWSO, 2012; CSJ, 2013; Department for Education, 2014; Franklin and Doyle, 2013; Hemmings et al., 2016; Pearce, Hynes and Bovarnick, 2009; Rigby, Malloch and Hamilton-Smith, 2012; Stanley et al., 2016):

- legal support,
- community support, including links to relevant cultural groups,
- education,
- healthcare,
- interpreters with safeguarding checks,
- social workers, and
- peer support and social integration.

Many of these might be classed as universal services to which all children and young people who need them should have access, rather than specialist services.

A minority of local authority stakeholders reported that the voluntary and community sector, including small, local community groups and leaders, is very significant in enabling children to maintain appropriate contact with their culture of origin. These stakeholders stated that community groups can provide opportunities for children to meet with peers and adults with whom they share a common language and culture, and who may have had similar experiences to them (such as living in the same socio-political context in their country of origin, migrating to the UK and integrating and building a life in the UK). This was seen to be particularly important in areas where there is a shortage of placements offering a cultural match for children from non-UK nationalities and cultures, or where cultural match might not be the primary factor in selecting a suitable placement for a child.

A small number of these local authority stakeholders suggested that it would be beneficial for local authorities to employ someone to work more systematically with these voluntary and community sector organisations, with a view to supporting them to build capacity, training them in safeguarding and other key areas, mapping them and promoting them to professionals working with children.

4.3 Barriers and enabling factors to providing placement and support

A number of barriers and enabling factors to the provision of effective placements and support were identified within the reviewed literature and in interviews with local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders. These included:

Age of victims and transition: Specific issues identified by interviewed voluntary sector stakeholders were described to be experienced by those approaching the age of 18, due to problems with assessment procedures, inappropriate placements, the child's immigration status, and being treated as more resilient than younger children and young people. This was supported by the reviewed literature, which also highlighted age disputes and age assessments as a barrier to providing effective support, partly because of their detrimental effect on relationship building between professionals and a young person (Association of the Directors of Children's Services, 2015; Pearce, Hynes and Bovarnick, 2009; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016; Tuggey and Smith, 2016). Perhaps as a result of this, multiple local authority stakeholders highlighted this transition period as a particular risk factor for likelihood of child victims of modern slavery and unaccompanied asylum seeking children going missing.

A local authority stakeholder from Calderdale stated that Calderdale implements good practice in supporting unaccompanied asylum seeking children in transition (including non-EEA migrant children who are potential victims of modern slavery) by supporting unaccompanied asylum seeking children of all ages within the local Pathway and Leaving Care Service. All unaccompanied asylum seeking children are initially referred to the Mulita-Agency Screening Hub and from there are immediately transferred to the Pathway

and Leaving Care Service. This includes unaccompanied asylum seeking children under the age of 16 and reportedly means that children and young people are able to receive consistent support from the same team up until the age of 25. There is currently a specialist unaccompanied asylum seeking children social worker in this team, with a second about to join.

This stakeholder reported high proportions of positive placement and progression outcomes for unaccompanied asylum seeking children within this service. For example, it was reported that a high proportion of unaccompanied asylum seeking children maintain their placements in the medium to long-term and that in the last 18 months none have gone missing¹⁵. Another reported positive outcome is that all unaccompanied asylum seeking children who are supported by the service are currently in education, training or employment and none have become involved with the criminal justice system.

Capacity: The majority of interviewed local authority stakeholders commented on the lack of resources in their locality to support child victims of modern slavery and unaccompanied asylum seeking children. London and the South East were highlighted by voluntary sector stakeholders as areas experiencing particular challenges around capacity, relating to the relatively high volume of unaccompanied asylum seeking children supported in these areas. Multiple voluntary sector stakeholders suggested that the National Transfer Scheme may act as an enabling factor in the provision of specialist placement and support, due to lessening the load for local authorities such as London and the South East where there are a high number of this cohort.

Data collection and information sharing: Limitations in current mechanisms for collating data and sharing information about prevalence and good practice were highlighted by the majority of local authority stakeholders and voluntary sector stakeholders as a barrier to providing specialist placements and support to child victims of modern slavery. For example, a minority of local authority stakeholders and the majority of voluntary sector stakeholders emphasised the lack of a central system at a national level between local authorities for recording prevalence of modern slavery, location of victims and demand for placement and services.

These stakeholders did not consider the NRM to fulfil this function because they believed that local authorities do not currently use it as a source of data on prevalence and because it does not offer information about where children are placed or what services they might be accessing or need. The absence of a system like this was seen to

¹⁵ However, recent research which included data requests to local authorities about the number of children they had identified/suspected as being trafficked in the 12 months up to September 2015 and how many of these went missing found that the two young people identified/suspected as trafficked in Calderdale in this period were both reported as going missing (Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016). The time period referred to in the research and the cohort under examination do not fully overlap but the research does indicate that there is some evidence of trafficked children having gone missing in Calderdale.

exacerbate challenges relating to capacity because it makes it difficult for local authorities to gauge the scale of current need in their region, consider implications for future levels of need and demand for services, and to plan an accurate and adequate response to this need.

A minority of local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders also reported that the sharing of good practice between local authorities at a national or regional level would be useful in addressing gaps and barriers in provision of placements and support for this group. For example, a minority of local authority stakeholders stated that they had looked to other local authorities to try to establish how they were providing placements and services for this cohort and that it had been difficult to establish which local authorities to approach because they had limited information about what might constitute good practice and where it might be happening. These stakeholders explained that they had identified contacts and good practice in other local authorities through chance meetings with colleagues in other local authorities (e.g. at conferences) or through initiating contact with local authority areas which they believed might be supporting a high volume of unaccompanied asylum seeking children. They reported that it would have been easier to make judgements about which practices to investigate if they had access to updates about good practice or to more systematic mechanisms to communicate with other local authorities and partners working with this cohort.

A minority of local authority stakeholders suggested that it would be useful to have access to face-to-face workshops or online fora to exchange information, knowledge and experience about developing and delivering placement and support to this cohort, including any evidence of positive outcomes associated with particular practices. One voluntary sector respondent suggested that the Local Government Association, Home Office, or regional hubs might be able to help with establishing or administering these fora.

Training: Training was frequently highlighted by interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders as an enabling factor for promoting effective practice in placement and support for this cohort. Specific areas of training which local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders thought would promote improved practice included specialist training for foster carers and social workers around the complex needs of this cohort and how best to support and safeguard them.

Despite this, the majority of interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders indicated that social workers and other professionals working with this cohort do not receive adequate training in this area. This was attributed variously to:

- a lack of knowledge within local authorities about the range of training that might be available on modern slavery,
- limited availability of relevant training,
- limited resources with which to commission it,

- difficulties for staff in balancing attendance at training with delivering their day-to-day roles,
- a high turnover of staff, and
- an increasing number of victims requiring support (meaning that a higher proportion of staff need to be well-versed in supporting this cohort).

A minority of voluntary sector stakeholders mentioned that a training scheme for foster carers is available, which is delivered by Refugee Council and ECPAT UK and funded by the Department for Education. These stakeholders reported their belief that this training promotes effective practice in providing placements and supports for this group, with one stakeholder commenting on the high demand for this training.

Multi-agency working: Multi-agency approaches have been identified as key to effectively addressing modern slavery (CQC, 2016; London SCB, 2011a and 2011b; Pearce, Hynes and Bovarnick, 2009; Home Office, 2014a; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016; Tuggey and Smith, 2016). In particular, the literature highlighted the importance of collaboration between different agencies in reducing incidence of missing episodes (Department for Education, 2011; Home Office, 2011; Pearce, Hynes and Bovarnick, 2009). Multi-agency working was also referenced by all voluntary sector stakeholders and the majority of local authority stakeholders as crucial to the effective provision of placement, services and support to non-EEA migrant children and young people who have been identified as potential victims of modern slavery and in preventing missing episodes. In addition to discussing the importance of local multi-agency working, stakeholders highlighted challenges in sharing information and evidence across local authorities in order to be able to track children (including those who go missing in one local authority area and are found in another) and to share details of assessments, risk assessments, support offered and outcomes. This was seen as a key mechanism for re-locating missing children, managing any risk of them going missing again and supporting them to sustain stable placements and progress towards positive outcomes.

A number of examples were provided by local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders of local authorities taking a multi-agency approach to reducing the incidence of this group going missing or re-locating children and young people more quickly when they do go missing. These included local authorities in the South East of England and London boroughs, which had reportedly experienced high volumes of unaccompanied asylum seeking children who might be at risk of going missing. In addition, a regional approach taken by a group of local authorities in Wales was highlighted as good practice. The approach in all areas referenced involved coordination across services including police, healthcare, social care, and the voluntary sector.

Further, Hillingdon was cited in the Government's human trafficking strategy as an example of best practice in reducing numbers of missing children (Home Office, 2011). A significant reduction was reported in the number of potentially trafficked children going

missing in the local authority, which was attributed to an operational model established in partnership with law enforcement agencies. This model includes work around:

- **Education:** including work with teachers, school governors, residential staff and foster carers regarding identifying and dealing with potential child victims of trafficking or those at risk of going missing.
- **Intelligence:** meetings with multi-agency groups of frontline staff to discuss and assess every missing child case.
- **Communication:** the LSCB produces an annual report to share with partner agencies and communication materials regarding child trafficking and missing children for use by professionals and members of the public.
- **Support:** training provided to foster carers of potential victims of trafficking and/or children going missing and support by trained social workers on stand-by duty.

The Home Office (2011) has reported that this approach has significantly reduced the number of potential child victims of trafficking going missing in the local authority.

The Willow team in Hampshire, a multi-agency group comprised of social workers, police, specialist nurses and attached to Barnardo's, was a further example of effective multi-agency working for this cohort, as reported by the interviewed stakeholder within this local authority. Once an unaccompanied asylum seeking child is identified in this locality, the Willow team provides an immediate response including conducting risk assessments and safety planning, with any recognised victims allocated to Barnardo's workers. This local authority respondent commented that this enables their locality to share resources and skills across different agencies, thereby allowing capacity to deal with other issues such as education and awareness around modern slavery.

Guidance: A minority of interviewed voluntary sector and local authority stakeholders highlighted guidance developed to support local authorities and partners to prevent this group from going missing. The Department for Education's guidance for care of unaccompanied children was provided by one voluntary sector respondent as an example of guidance for reducing the likelihood of this group going missing. However, this stakeholder also commented that many local authorities in which their organisation was providing services and with which they had discussed this guidance were not currently aware of it, and are not therefore using it.

A minority of voluntary sector stakeholders cited specific examples of local authorities that have developed and are utilising local protocols to address this group going missing. This included local authorities in the South East of England and urban local authorities with major conurbations. This was supported by interviews with local authority stakeholders, with multiple respondents highlighting that these protocols were in place in their own and other local authorities. In addition, a minority of local authority stakeholders referred to the importance of carrying out trafficking risk assessments with children

thought to have been trafficked, as well as with all unaccompanied asylum seeking children.

One local authority stakeholder provided an example of best practice by another local authority¹⁶, which reportedly undertakes risk assessments of the likelihood of children going missing within 24 hours of them becoming known to services. Guidance by Barnardo's was also highlighted by one local authority that can be utilised when children go missing; it also provides general guidance to social workers for providing specialist support to victims and includes a helpline that can be used to discuss cases.

Regional approach: A minority of interviewed local authority stakeholders reported that adopting a more regional approach to the placement and support of non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery was likely to result in more effective and efficient provision. A minority of local authority stakeholders stated that this might offer greater scope to develop specialist provision which was also affordable for commissioners because the volume of demand for these placements would be higher at a regional level than at an individual local authority level. For example, a minority of stakeholders reported that local authorities in their region are currently exploring a regional approach to commissioning more specialist placements for unaccompanied asylum seeking children, which could be extended to specialist placements and provision for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims.

Strategic approach: In addition, a minority of stakeholders reported that it would be beneficial for local authorities to take a strategic approach to accepting unaccompanied asylum seeking children (including potential victims) under the National Transfer Scheme or any other re-distribution schemes. They reported that this approach might entail more consideration of how the profile and potential support needs of children accepted under re-distribution schemes might fit with the existing local population of looked after children and local communities. They also explained that it might entail considering the impact on demand for services and whether accepting young people with similar characteristics and support needs would create a 'critical mass' and therefore justify the commissioning of more specialist services which could not necessarily be commissioned for a smaller volume of children.

These local authority stakeholders stated that such an approach would enable local authorities to develop expertise in supporting unaccompanied asylum seeking children with particular characteristics or presenting issues. They also reported that it could help to ensure that individual unaccompanied asylum seeking children were placed in geographical proximity to other unaccompanied asylum seeking children with similar

¹⁶ This local authority has not been named as the stakeholder who referenced this example stated that she would prefer it to be reported anonymously because consent has not been gained from the local authority whose practice is being referenced.

experiences (such as having been trafficked and exploited) or cultural backgrounds, and therefore felt less isolated with more opportunities for peer support.

Child-centred support: A child-centred approach, focusing primarily on the welfare of the child was highlighted in the literature as key to effective support for this cohort (Bovarnick, 2010; Jago et al., 2011; Pearce, 2011, SOLACE, 2009). Research has acknowledged that good practice for victims “helps the child to understand their experience of abuse while alleviating any sense of responsibility for it” (Pearce, 2011; 9). Further, a project identifying how local authorities can improve their response to human trafficking concluded that a “victim-centred approach should be at the heart of all Local Authority strategies on trafficking and should be the central foundation upon which local government services for victims are delivered” (SOLACE, 2009; 131). This was supported by voluntary sector and local authority stakeholders interviewed, who frequently emphasised the importance of considering the voice of the child in safety plans and provision of accommodation and services. Doncaster highlighted good practice regarding capturing the voice of victims in their locality, outlining that a non-EEA migrant child identified as a victim of modern slavery sits on their Council’s panel for children and young people.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Overview

This review found evidence of variation in the numbers of non-EEA children identified by different local authorities as potential victims of modern slavery. Whilst this may relate to differences in the prevalence of modern slavery in different areas, interviews with local authority stakeholders indicate that it may also be the result of varied approaches taken by different local authorities to identify potential victims.

Interviews with local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders suggested that placements and other services offered to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery are not usually specifically commissioned or designed for this cohort. Foster care was perceived in the literature and by the majority of interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders as the most effective placement type for this cohort, particularly for children under 16.

Online survey responses indicated that the most commonly identified areas of undersupply by participating local authorities were in foster care, supported accommodation and supported lodgings. The majority of local authority stakeholders who took part in interviews also reported that there is currently an undersupply of foster carers who are knowledgeable and trained in understanding the needs particular to this cohort.

Key gaps in specialist services which were identified by review participants, and especially local authority stakeholders, included access to mental health services and support networks to enable children to maintain contact with their culture of origin.

Key barriers to providing placements and specialist services which were identified by interviewed local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders included:

- the limited availability of specialist provision (as opposed to more generic provision for vulnerable children),
- a lack of resources and specialist knowledge within local authorities and partner services,
- a particular resource pressure for children who are aged 16-17, and
- challenges or gaps in information sharing between local authorities.

5.2 Potential measures to strengthen support provided to non-EEA trafficked children

A key way in which interviewed local authority stakeholders suggested that local authorities could strengthen the current provision of placement and support to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery was in promoting the

enabling factors and emulating the perceived good practice described in the previous sections. Specific actions highlighted by interviewed local authority stakeholders included:

- commissioning specialist training and services where there is evidence that this is required,
- ensuring that all unaccompanied minors are risk assessed for modern slavery,
- developing specialist roles in local authorities to support victims of modern slavery,
- adopting a more regional approach to planning and commissioning placement and support, and
- adopting a more strategic approach when considering which children they might best be able to support under re-distribution schemes.

Interviewees noted that Central Government could support Local Government to ensure existing provision to support this cohort is strengthened through: supporting effective commissioning of specialist services, raising awareness about modern slavery and facilitating learning between local authorities. Whilst local authorities generally acknowledged that commissioning specific local training was the responsibility of the local authority or LSCB, they also indicated that a national awareness raising campaign or centrally-developed materials to support local training would be beneficial. Specific topics which these stakeholders stated could be included in this awareness raising campaign included: the nature and scale of modern slavery, how to recognise signs of modern slavery and where to report concerns about children who might have been victimised. This is supported by recent literature highlighting the need for training amongst professionals and carers to improve awareness around issues specific to modern slavery (Home Office, 2013; Simon, Setter and Holmes, 2016). Furthermore, multiple voluntary sector and local authority stakeholders interviewed felt that Central Government could support local authorities further with sharing of learning and good practice, as discussed in section 4.3.

Interviews with local authority and voluntary sector stakeholders highlighted that there are no specific performance frameworks in place in any local authorities for monitoring placements and support for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery. However, more general performance indicators were highlighted as being used on a more informal basis to measure effectiveness of placements and support, including outcomes such as: missing episodes; stability of placements; progress in education; and emotional and physical health outcomes.

Appendix 1: Glossary of key terms

Key terminology

Accompanied asylum seeking child: A child who is seeking asylum and is being cared for either by parents or by someone who in law or custom has responsibility to do so. Please see: Home Office, 2016. *Processing children's asylum claims*.

Advocate or independent advocate: An independent advocate is a person employed to provide children with information and advice, advocacy, representation and support to ensure their wishes and feelings are heard, understood and taken seriously by agencies making decisions about them and that their rights are upheld. Looked after children have a right to receive support from an independent advocate and this is set out in statutory guidance. In addition, recent trials have taken place of Independent Child Trafficking Advocates. Their role is to provide specialist independent support to trafficked children and to act in the child's best interest across the areas of social care, immigration and criminal justice.

Guardianship (as per the definition used in the Scottish Guardianship Service Pilot Project): A Guardian is someone who accompanies children and young people when they claim asylum or are trafficked and are cared for by health, education and welfare services. A Guardian will help a child or young person to be actively involved in decisions that affect their life and to get the help they need, when they need it. A Guardian is on the child's side, can explain what is happening to them, will listen to their views and experiences and speak up for them when needed. A Guardian will also help a child or young person to plan their future, whether in the UK or elsewhere.

Independent visitor: An independent visitor is a volunteer who does not work for children's services and who visits and befriends a child who is in local authority care. Their role is to act as a consistent and reliable presence in the child's life to enable the child to build a trusting relationship with an adult outside of the social care system.

Modern slavery (as per the UK Modern Slavery Act 2015): Slavery is categorised as: human trafficking, domestic servitude; sexual exploitation; child exploitation; labour exploitation; criminal exploitation; human tissue or organ harvesting.

Non-European Economic Area (EEA) migrant child: A child whose country of origin is outside of the European Economic Area (EEA) who has migrated to the UK. This includes both unaccompanied and accompanied minors, those seeking asylum and those not seeking asylum. It includes children originating from all countries EXCEPT: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Republic of Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the UK.

National Referral Mechanism (as per the National Crime Agency definition): A framework for identifying victims of human trafficking or modern slavery and ensuring they receive the appropriate support. The NRM is also the mechanism through which the Modern Slavery Human Trafficking Unit (MSHTU) collect data about victims. Local authorities and other key professionals have a duty to notify the NRM about all children identified as potential victims of modern slavery.

National Transfer Scheme: A voluntary transfer arrangement between local authorities for the care of unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Under the scheme, a child arriving in one local authority area already under strain caring for unaccompanied asylum seeking children may be transferred to another council with capacity. The scheme was launched in July 2016 and is accompanied by an interim national transfer protocol to provide guidance to local authorities in England on the operation of the scheme.

Trafficking (as per the Palermo protocol ratified in 2006): Trafficking constitutes modern slavery and is therefore covered by the UK Modern Slavery Act 2015. According to the Palermo protocol, trafficking is defined as the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons for the purpose of exploitation. This might entail the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability, or the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person.

Unaccompanied asylum seeking child: A child who is seeking asylum and who is under 18 years of age when the claim is submitted; claiming in their own right; separated from both parents and not being cared for by an adult who in law or by custom has responsibility to do so. Being unaccompanied is not necessarily a permanent status and may change, particularly if the child has family members in the UK. Please see: Home Office, 2016. *Processing children's asylum claims*.

Definitions of placement types

The following definitions are taken from information provided to local authorities to accompany the interim national transfer protocol for unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Where possible, references to placement types within this report use these categories. In cases where the reviewed literature or interview participants referred to different accommodation categories, we have provided an indication of which of the below categories are likely to be included in this additional category.

Foster care: Care in a family setting either in a placement with an Ofsted registered and inspected Independent Fostering Agency foster carer or in a placement with a local authority foster carer.

Residential care home: Care within an Ofsted regulated and inspected children's residential care home.

Semi-secure reception centre for trafficked children: Care in specialist accommodation tailored to enable high levels of monitoring and supervision while children who have been identified as having been trafficked are intensively engaged by staff to prevent onward trafficking.

Shared housing (only for children aged 16 or over): Shared housing is a multiple occupancy house, shared between other unaccompanied asylum seeking young people (and sometimes some non-asylum seeking young people) to provide peer support, with additional visiting support. This type of accommodation allows young people to live very independently but usually with visiting support, which should be tailored to the needs of the individual young people.

Supported accommodation (only for children aged 16 or over): Supported accommodation (not regulated by Ofsted but covered by regulations and may be evaluated as part of single inspections via tracked or sampled cases) typically has multiple rooms and young people can provide peer support to each other on accessing services, local facilities and learning English. Staff are available on site (often 24/7) and typically have experience in helping young people to settle in and begin to develop independent skills. They will be trained in safeguarding children issues, and will be responsive to feedback from the young people placed there.

Supported accommodation may include study areas, outside space and a communal meeting room. Staff and health providers are able to run sessions to support the development of independent living skills, support with homework and meeting others. Security can be tailored to the needs of the young people, for example, some have all visitors and guests sign in and out, and CCTV.

Good supported accommodation will provide a family environment in which unaccompanied asylum seeking children can learn to develop and grow. This can serve to nurture a sense of belonging – strengthening their confidence and trust in adults – and providing them with the emotional stability needed to develop positive friendships and engage with their wider community. House meetings can provide an opportunity to encourage young people to eat together and share, whilst also providing them with a forum to air any frustrations within the community and to teach them resolution skills.

Supported lodgings (only for children aged 16 or over): Supported lodgings are a service which can allow an individual to live in a family home, experiencing domestic life in a shared and supportive environment, but with a lower level of monitoring than in foster care. The young person has their own room and shares the kitchen and bathroom facilities with the family or householder - or 'host'. Similar to foster carers, hosts can be families, couples or single people.

The accommodation is a furnished bedroom in a domestic house, with use of WC, bathing, cooking and laundry facilities as a member of the household. The householder

or host is resident full time in the property but pursues their own lifestyle (including daily routine, absence at work, holidays and weekends away). They provide a home-like environment and domestic routine consistent with the young person engaging in education, training or work, including the provision of some meals. They establish an appropriate and consistent personal relationship with the young person, including non-intrusive practical help and advice.

The service provider (a local authority or independent organisation) undertakes recruitment, scrutiny and approval of a host's accommodation and suitability to work with vulnerable young people in an unsupervised home environment. They typically provide general skills development, training and experience-sharing events for host families.

Appendix 2: Literature review search terms and bibliography

Search terms

The bibliography was developed using the following search terms in Google Scholar. Each primary search term was searched in combination with each secondary search term (e.g., “slavery” + “child”; “slavery” + “young person” etc.). The first 50 articles for each combined search term were reviewed rapidly and abstracts were scanned for all potentially relevant, publicly available articles. The most appropriate articles were included in the bibliography for full review. A regular Google search was also conducted using the primary search terms to make sure key UK literature was included

The search terms for the literature review were developed by Cordis Bright and agreed by the Department for Education and the Home Office.

Primary search terms	Secondary search terms
Slavery Human trafficking Domestic servitude Forced labour Exploitation Organ harvesting	Child Young person Refugee Asylum Migrant Victim Survivor Support Service Barrier Provision Identification Missing children Runaways Running away Placement Good practice Best practice Effectiveness Evaluation Outcomes Impact Research England Wales UK

Bibliography

Abas, M., Ostrovski, N. V., Prince, M., Gorceag, V. I., Trigub, C., & Oram, S. (2013). Risk factors for mental disorders in women survivors of human trafficking: a historical cohort study. *BMC Psychiatry*, 13(1), 204.

The Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group (2011). *Assistance to trafficked people*. Briefing.

The Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group (2014). *Proposal for a revised National Referral Mechanism*.

The All-Party Parliamentary Group for Runaway and Missing Children and Adults and the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Looked After Children and Care Leavers (2012). *Reporting from the joint inquiry into children who go missing from care*.

Association of Directors of Children's Services. (2015). *Age Assessment Guidance*.

Bales, K., Hesketh, O., & Silverman, B. (2015). Modern slavery in the UK: How many victims? *Significance*, 12(3), 16-21.

Barnado's (2012). *Children who go missing from care*. Briefing for joint inquiry by All-Party Parliamentary Group for Runaway and Missing Children and Adults and the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Looked After Children and Care Leavers, May 2012.

BAWSO (2012). *Overcoming Barriers and Healing the Scars of Human Trafficking*.

Bovarnick, S. (2010). How do you define a "trafficked child"? A discursive analysis of practitioners' perceptions around child trafficking. *Youth and Policy*, 104.

Brownlees, L. and Finch, N. (2010). Levelling the playing field. *A Unicef UK report into provision of services to unaccompanied or separate migrant children in three local authority areas in England*. Unicef UK.

The Centre for Social Justice (2013). *It Happens Here: Equipping the United Kingdom to fight modern slavery*. A policy report by the Slavery Working Group.

Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (2011). *Child trafficking update*.

Children's Society (2009). *Hidden Children – Separated Children at Risk*.

Coghlan, D. (2010). *Trafficking for Forced Labour in Ireland and the United Kingdom: Issues and Emerging Good Practice*. Migrant Rights Centre Ireland.

Connolly, H. (2014). 'For a while out of orbit': listening to what unaccompanied asylum-seeking/refugee children in the UK say about their rights and experiences in private foster care. *Adoption & Fostering*, 38(4), 331-345.

Cordis Bright (2016). *Effectiveness of anti-slavery training and survivor care pathway: Final Evaluation Report*. Welsh Government.

Crawley, H, & Kohli, R. S. (2013). *'She Endures with Me'. An evaluation of the Scottish Guardianship Service Pilot*.

Department for Education & the Home Office (2011). *Safeguarding children who may have been trafficked*.

Department for Education (2014). *Care of unaccompanied and trafficked children. Statutory guidance for local authorities on the care of unaccompanied asylum seeking and trafficked children*.

Department of Health (2013). *Identifying and supporting victims of modern slavery: guidance for health staff*.

Dwyer, P., Hodkinson, S., Lewis, H., & Waite, L. (2013) *Precarious lives: refugees and asylum seekers' experiences of forced labour, exploitation and asylum*. Research report. University of Leeds.

Ecclestone, D. (2013). Identifying victims of human trafficking. *Community Practitioner*, 86(5).

ECPAT UK (2007). *Missing Out: A Study of Child Trafficking in the North-West, North-East and West Midlands*.

ECPAT UK (2010). *Child Trafficking in the UK: A Snapshot*.

ECPAT UK (2011a). *Watch over me. A system of guardianship for child victims of trafficking*.

ECPAT UK (2011b). *On the Safe Side: Principles of Safe Accommodation for Suspected Child Victims of Trafficking*.

Elliott, J. (2009). (Mis) Identification of Victims of Human Trafficking: The Case of R v. O. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, eep023.

Franklin, A., & Doyle, L. (2013). *Still at Risk: A review of support for trafficked children*. The Refugee Council and the Children's Society.

The Freedom Fund (2015). *Addressing the Mental Health needs in Survivors of Modern Slavery – A Critical Review and Research Agenda*.

GRETA (2016). *Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by the United Kingdom: Second Evaluation Round*. GRETA (2016) 21.

- The Guardian (2011). *Children lost from care in human trafficking cases, says Council*. [Online]. <https://www.theguardian.com/law/2011/oct/18/children-lost-human-trafficking> [Accessed 17 December 2016]
- Harvey, J. H., Hornsby, R. A., & Sattar, Z. (2015). Disjointed service: an English case study of multi-agency provision in tackling child trafficking. *British journal of criminology*, 55(3), 494-513.
- Hemmings, S., Jakobowitz, S., Abas, M., Bick, D., Howard, L. M., Stanley, N., & Oram, S. (2016). Responding to the health needs of survivors of human trafficking: a systematic review. *BMC health services research*, 16(1), 320.
- Home Office (2011). *Human Trafficking: The Government's Strategy*.
- Home Office (2013). *More training to identify and support victims of human trafficking*. [Online]. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/more-training-to-identify-and-support-victims-of-human-trafficking> [Accessed 9 January 2017].
- Home Office (2014a). *Multi Agency Working and Information Sharing Project. Final Report*.
- Home Office (2014b). *Modern Slavery Strategy*.
- Home Office (2014c). *Review of the National Referral Mechanism for victims of human trafficking*.
- Home Office (2015). *Evaluation of Independent Child Trafficking Advocates trial: Final Report*. Research Report 86.
- Home Office (2016a). Duty to notify the Home Office of potential victims of modern slavery. [Online] <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/duty-to-notify-the-home-office-of-potential-victims-of-modern-slavery> [Accessed 2 March 2017]
- Home Office (2016b). *National Referral Mechanism: guidance for child first responders*. Version 2.
- Home Office (2016c). *Victims of modern slavery – Competent Authority guidance*. Version 3.0.
- Home Office (2017). *Immigration statistics, October to December 2016*. [Online]. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-october-to-december-2016/asylum#data-tables> [Accessed 21 March 2017]

- House of Commons, Home Affairs Committee (2009). *The Trade in Human Beings: Human Trafficking in the UK, Sixth Report of Session 2008-09*, Volume 1.
- House of Lord, European Union Committee (2016). *Children in crisis: unaccompanied migrant children in the EU*. 2nd Report of Session 2016-17.
- Human Trafficking Foundation (2014). *Trafficking Survivor Care Standards*.
- Hynes, P. (2010). Understanding the “vulnerabilities”, “resilience” and processes of the trafficking of children and young people into, within and out of the UK. *Youth and Policy*, 104, 97-118.
- Institute for Public Policy Research (2012). *The UK’s Response to Human Trafficking. Fit for Purpose?*
- Inter-Departmental Ministerial Group on Modern Slavery (2015). *Report of the Inter-Departmental Ministerial Group on Modern Slavery*.
- 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?* University of Bedfordshire.
- Kiss, L., Yun, K., Pocock, N., & Zimmerman, C. (2015). Exploitation, violence, and suicide risk among child and adolescent survivors of human trafficking in the Greater Mekong Subregion. *JAMA pediatrics*, 169(9).
- Kliner, M., & Stroud, L. (2012). Psychological and health impact of working with victims of sex trafficking. *Journal of occupational health*, 54(1), 9-15.
- Lebov, K. (2010). Human trafficking in Scotland. *European Journal of Criminology*, 7(1), 77-93.
- Leon, L. & Raws, P. (2016). *Boys Don’t Cry. Improving identification and disclosure of sexual exploitation among boys and young men trafficked to the UK*. The Children’s Society.
- Lipscombe, S., & Beard, J. (2014). *Human trafficking: UK responses*. House of Commons, Home Affairs Committee.
- London Safeguarding Children Board (2011a). *Final monitoring report. Local authority pilots of the London Safeguarding Trafficked Children guidance and toolkit*.
- London Safeguarding Children Board (2011b). *London Safeguarding Trafficked Children Toolkit*.

- Myers, J., & Carmi, E. (2016). *The Brooke Serious Case Review into Child Sexual Exploitation. Identifying the strengths and gaps in the multi-agency response to child sexual exploitation in order to learn and improve*. Bristol Safeguarding Board.
- National Crime Agency (2014). *The Nature and Scale of Human Trafficking in 2013*.
- National Crime Agency (2017a). *National Referral Mechanism*. [Online]. <http://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/about-us/what-we-do/specialist-capabilities/uk-human-trafficking-centre/national-referral-mechanism> [Accessed 21 February 2017]
- National Crime Agency (2017b). *2015 NRM statistics*. [Online]. <http://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/publications/national-referral-mechanism-statistics/2015-nrm-statistics> [Accessed 21 February 2017]
- Nichol, S., & Skipper, S. (2013). Child Trafficking for Sexual Exploitation within the United Kingdom: A North Western Perspective. *Journal of Public Administration*, 48(1), 89-104.
- Ofsted, Care Quality Commission, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, & HM Inspectorate of Probation (2016). *'Time to listen' – a joined up response to child sexual exploitation and missing children*.
- Pearce, J. J. (2011). Working with trafficked children and young people: Complexities in practice. *British journal of social work*, 1-8.
- Pearce, J. J., Hynes, P., & Bovarnick, S. (2009). *Breaking the wall of silence. Practitioner's responses to trafficked children and young people*. NSPCC.
- Prime Minister's Office (2016). *Prime Minister urges international action to stamp out modern slavery*. Press release. [Online]. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-calls-for-global-action-to-stamp-out-modern-slavery> [Accessed 9 January 2017].
- Rafferty, Y. (2016). Challenges to the rapid identification of children who have been trafficked for commercial sexual exploitation. *Child abuse & neglect*, 52, 158-168.
- Rigby, P. (2011). Separated and trafficked children: The challenges for child protection professionals. *Child Abuse Review*, 20(5), 324-340.
- Rigby, P., Malloch, M., & Hamilton-Smith, N. (2012). *A report on child trafficking and care provision: Towards better survivor care*.
- Rigby, P., Murie, S., & Ball, M. (2012). *Child trafficking in Glasgow: The journey so far*.
- Ross, C., Dimitrova, S., Howard, L. M., Dewey, M., Zimmerman, C., & Oram, S. (2015). Human trafficking and health: a cross-sectional survey of NHS professionals' contact with victims of human trafficking. *BMJ open*, 5(8).

Simon, A., Setter, C. and Holmes, L. (2016). *Heading back to harm: A study on trafficked and unaccompanied children going missing from care in the UK*. ECPAT UK and Missing People.

Shuker, L. (2011). *Safe accommodation for sexually exploited and trafficked young people: briefing paper*. University of Bedfordshire.

Shuker, L. (2013). *Evaluation of Barnardo's Safe Accommodation Project for Sexually Exploited and Trafficked Young People*. University of Bedfordshire.

SOLACE (2009). *The role of local authorities in addressing human trafficking*. Report of the SOLACE Study Group.

Stanley, N., Oram, S., Jakobowitz, S., Westwood, J., Borschmann, R., Zimmerman, C., & Howard, L. M. (2016). The health needs and healthcare experiences of young people trafficked into the UK. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 59, 100-110.

Stepnitz, A. (2012). A Lie More Disastrous than the Truth: Asylum and the identification of trafficked women in the UK. *Anti-Trafficking Review*, 1.

Tuggey, L., and Smith, T. (2016). *Achieving a durable solution for trafficked children*. UNICEF UK.

UK Visas and Immigration (2016). *Interim National Transfer Protocol for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children 2016-17*. Version 0.8.

UNICEF (2016). *Neither Safe Nor Sound. Unaccompanied children on the coastline of the English Channel and the North Sea*.

Wood, S. (2011). *Child trafficking investigations and prosecutions*. In P. Chandran (ed.), *The Human Trafficking Handbook: Recognising human trafficking and modern slavery in the UK*. Edinburgh: LexisNexis.

Appendix 3: Research tools

Online survey of local authorities

Introduction

The Department for Education and Home Office have commissioned Cordis Bright to conduct a review of local authority support provided to non-European Economic Area (EEA) migrant children identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking, including trafficking. As part of this review, we would like to hear from local authority service managers for children in need services or equivalent to gather: an estimate of the number of non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking; key information on current specialist placement and services provided; views on gaps and challenges experienced in supporting these children.

Thank you for completing this survey. It should take 10-15 minutes to complete. The deadline for completion is Monday 9th January.

Questions in this survey require data from your local authority area regarding prevalence, demographics and other statistics relating to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking. This data is critical in enabling us to gain a national view of non-EEA children who are potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking. We appreciate that the information may require time and effort to collate and we greatly value your input in providing us with data which is as accurate and complete as possible.

If you have any questions about this survey or the review please contact Hannah Nickson on hannahnickson@cordisbright.co.uk or 020 7330 9170.

We are using the following definitions for the purpose of this questionnaire:

Non-EEA migrant child: A child whose country of origin is outside of the European Economic Area (EEA) who has migrated to the UK. This includes both unaccompanied and accompanied minors, those seeking asylum and those not seeking asylum. It includes children originating from all countries EXCEPT: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Republic of Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the UK.

Trafficking (as per the Palermo protocol ratified in 2006): The recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons for the purpose of exploitation. This might entail the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, abduction, fraud,

deception, the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person.

Modern slavery (as per the UK Modern Slavery Act 2015): Slavery is categorised as: domestic servitude; sexual exploitation; child exploitation; labour exploitation; criminal exploitation; human tissue/organ harvesting.

Background information

1. Which local authority do you work for?

2. What is your role?

Prevalence and identification

3. In the last 12 months, how many **non-EEA migrant children** (aged 0 - 17) have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking in your area?
Please include all children about whom concerns/issues relating to modern slavery/trafficking have been raised, even if the child was not referred to the National Referral Mechanism.

Number

4. In the last 12 months, of these **non-EEA migrant children** who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking in your area, how many were (at time of identification):

0-4 years old

5-10 years old

11-15 years old

16-17 years old

5. In the last 12 months, of these **non-EEA migrant children** who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of trafficking in your area, how many were:

Female

--

Male

--

Transgender

--

6. In the last 12 months, what were the three most common countries of origin for **the non-EEA migrant children** who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking in your area? *Please note that we are aware that you may not be able to rank responses in the event that three or fewer non-EEA migrant children in your local authority area were identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking. In this case, please list your responses in no particular order.*

1st (most common)

--

2nd

--

3rd

--

7. In the last 12 months, what were the three most frequent identification routes for **non-EEA migrant children** who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking in your area? *Please note that we are aware that you may not be able to rank responses in the event that three or fewer non-EEA migrant children in your local authority area were identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking. In this case, please list your responses in no particular order.*

Drop-down menu of response options: Education, health services, local authorities, members of the public, NGO/voluntary sector organisations, police services, UK Border Force, Other.

1st (most frequent)

--

2nd

--

3rd

--

Other (please specify)

Specialist placements, services and support

8. At present, what types of placement/accommodation are offered in your local authority area to **non-EEA migrant children** who are identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? *Please tick all that apply.*

	Located within the borough	Located outside of the borough
Foster care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supported accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shared accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supported lodgings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Residential children's home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Semi-secure reception unit for trafficked children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify)

9. Aside from placement, does your local authority commission any other specialist services/support for **non-EEA migrant children** who are identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? *Please tick all that apply.*

Specialist counselling

Specialist support worker

Other (please specify below)

If you answered "other" above then please specify details here

10. From which providers does your local authority tend to commission accommodation and/or specialist services/support for **non-EEA migrant children** who may be victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? *Please provide the name of all relevant providers used.*

11. Please indicate the extent to which supply of the following different types of services/support meets demand for **non-EEA migrant children** identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking.
Drop-down menu of response options: Demand is far greater than supply; demand is somewhat greater than supply; supply meets demand; supply exceeds demand.

Extent to which supply meets demand

Foster care

Supported accommodation

Shared accommodation

Supported lodgings

Residential children's home

Semi-secure reception unit for trafficked children

Specialist counselling

Specialist support worker

Other (please specify)

If you answered "other" above then please specify details here

Thank you

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Your answers will be submitted automatically when you press the "done" button.

12. As part of this research the Department for Education and Home Office are interested in conducting in- depth interviews with local authority service managers. If you would be interested in participating in a 40-minute interview please provide your details below.

Name

Email

Contact number

Topic guide for local authority interviews

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this interview. It should take between 45 minutes and one hour to complete. It forms part of a review of local authority support provided to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery, including trafficking. This includes both unaccompanied and accompanied minors, those seeking asylum and those not seeking asylum.

The review has been commissioned by the Department for Education and Home Office. It is being conducted by Cordis Bright, an independent research and consultancy organisation.

The key aims of the review are to:

- Gather data on the range, location and accessibility of specialist local authority placement provision for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery/trafficking.
- Identify good/innovative practice and ideas to help inform policy on different ways to monitor, evaluate and strengthen specialist placement provision/support for this group.
- Feed into other key pieces of Government work in this area, such as the new Missing Children and Adults Strategy; the production of Modern Slavery Act 2015 statutory guidance on the identification and support of victims; and the work of the Modern Slavery Taskforce.

The opinions you share during the interview will remain confidential and will only be reported on an anonymised basis, unless you refer to examples of good practice and we ask for your consent to share details and attribute this to your local authority. If you have any questions during the interview, please just ask. Thank you again for taking part.

Your role and experience of modern slavery/trafficking

1. What is your job title and which local authority do you work in?
2. Please could you describe your role, and any current and previous experience/knowledge of supporting children who are potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? Do you have any specific experience with non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking?

Accommodation/placements provided to potential victims/survivors

3. What types of accommodation/placement do you think are effective in improving outcomes for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? Why do you say this?

4. What do you think are the main gaps in your local authority area in the provision of accommodation/placement for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. geographical gaps; gaps in types of placement; placements are: not catering for particular group; of poor quality, poorly located, inaccessible, too expensive, inflexible, have waiting lists.

5. In your opinion, what (if anything) could be done to address these gaps?
6. Are you aware of any examples of effective/innovative practice in providing accommodation/placement for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? (E.g. from own or other local authorities or other agencies)
7. *(If yes to above)* Do you have any evidence you could share with us to demonstrate any associated outcomes of the effective/innovative practice?

Other specialist services/support for potential victims/survivors

8. Apart from accommodation/placement, what types of specialist service/support do you think are effective in improving outcomes for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? Why do you say this?
9. Are these types of specialist service/support provided on a regular basis in your local authority area? If not, why do you think they are not provided? What do you think are the main gaps?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. geographical gaps; gaps in types of service/support; services are: not catering for particular group; of poor quality, poorly located, inaccessible, too expensive, inflexible, have waiting lists.

10. Are you aware of any examples of effective/innovative practice in providing specialist services/support for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? (E.g. from own or other local authorities or other agencies)
11. *(If yes to above)* Do you have any evidence you could share with us to demonstrate any associated outcomes of the effective/innovative practice?

Child victims/survivors going missing from local authority care

12. We know that children who are identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking are relatively likely to go missing from local authority care. Do you think there are any characteristics/circumstances associated with those who go missing? Are any of these specific to non-EEA migrant children? Why do you say this?
13. Has your local authority taken any specific steps to reduce the incidence of non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking

going missing? If so, please could you describe these in more detail? Do you think they have been effective? Do you have any evidence you can share with us to demonstrate any associated outcomes?

Enabling factors and barriers to effective placement and support

14. What factors need to be in place to promote effective practice in providing placement and support to non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? Why do you say this?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. strategy; policy; leadership; staff knowledge/skills; capacity; partnership working arrangements; interpretation/translation; partnerships with trusted voluntary agencies; monitoring/evaluation, etc.

15. Are you aware of any challenges or barriers in providing specialist placement/support for non-EEA migrant who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. lack of knowledge/awareness regarding how to support potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking; lack of skills/experience in supporting potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking; lack of resources/finances required to support potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking; lack of leadership at strategic/operational level; issues with multi-agency working.

16. In your opinion, what could be done to address these challenges and barriers?

17. Is there any support that could be provided by central government to help local authorities to address these challenges and barriers?

Monitoring and evaluating specialist placements/support

18. How is the performance/success of specialist placement and support for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking currently measured?

19. Do you have any suggestions for how monitoring of performance and/or outcomes could be improved in the future?

Any other comments

20. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you very much again for taking the time to speak with us.

Topic guide for voluntary sector interviews

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this interview. It should take between 45 minutes and one hour to complete. This interview forms part of the review of local authority support provided to non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery, including trafficking. This includes both unaccompanied and accompanied minors, those seeking asylum and those not seeking asylum.

The review has been commissioned by the Department for Education and Home Office. It is being conducted by Cordis Bright, an independent research and consultancy organisation.

The key aims of the review are to:

- Gather data on the range, location and accessibility of specialist local authority placement provision for non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims of modern slavery/trafficking.
- Identify good and innovative practice and ideas to help inform policy on different ways to monitor, evaluate and strengthen specialist placement provision and support for this group.
- Feed into other key pieces of Government work in this area, such as the new Missing Children and Adults Strategy; the production of Modern Slavery Act 2015 statutory guidance on the identification and support of victims; and the work of the Modern Slavery Taskforce.

The opinions you share during the interview will remain confidential and will only be reported on an anonymised basis. If you have any questions during the interview, please just ask. Thank you again for taking part.

Your role and experience of modern slavery/trafficking

1. What is your job title and which organisation/local authority area(s) do you work in?
2. Please could you describe your role, and any current and previous experience/knowledge of tackling modern slavery/trafficking? Do you have any specific experience with non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking?

Accommodation/placements provided to potential victims/survivors

3. What types of accommodation/placement do you think are effective in improving outcomes for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? Why do you say this?
4. What do you think are the main gaps in the provision of accommodation/placement for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. geographical gaps; gaps in types of placement; placements are: not catering for particular group; of poor quality, poorly located, inaccessible, too expensive, inflexible, have waiting lists.

5. In your opinion, what (if anything) could be done to address these gaps?
6. Are you aware of any examples of effective/innovative practice in providing accommodation/placement for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? (E.g. from local authorities or other agencies)
7. *(If yes to above)* Do you have any evidence you could share with us to demonstrate any associated outcomes of the effective/innovative practice?

Other specialist services/support for potential victims/survivors

8. Apart from accommodation/placement, what types of specialist service/support do you think are effective in improving outcomes for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? Why do you say this?
9. Do you think these types of specialist service/support are provided on a regular basis? If not, why do you think they are not provided? What do you think are the main gaps?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. geographical gaps; gaps in types of service/support; services are: not catering for particular group; of poor quality, poorly located, inaccessible, too expensive, inflexible, have waiting lists.

10. Are you aware of any examples of effective/innovative practice in providing specialist services/support for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? (E.g. from local authorities or other agencies)
11. *(If yes to above)* Do you have any evidence you could share with us to demonstrate any associated outcomes of the effective/innovative practice?

Enabling factors and barriers to effective placement and support

12. What factors need to be in place to promote effective practice in providing placement and support to non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking? Why do you say this?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. strategy; policy; leadership; staff knowledge/skills; capacity; partnership working arrangements; interpretation/translation; partnerships with trusted voluntary agencies; monitoring/evaluation, etc.

13. Are you aware of any barriers in providing specialist placement/support for non-EEA migrant who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking?

Prompts for interviewer: e.g. lack of knowledge/awareness regarding how to support potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking; lack of skills/experience in supporting potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking; lack of resources/finances required to support potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking; lack of leadership at strategic/operational level; issues with multi-agency working.

14. In your opinion, what (if anything) could be done to address these barriers?
15. Is there any support that could be provided by central government to help local authorities to address these gaps and barriers?
16. Are you aware of any local authority areas where providing specialist placements/support for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking is a particular challenge? Why is it a particular challenge in this area?

Note to interviewer: e.g. due to high levels of non-EEA migration or particular challenges in local structures/processes?

Monitoring and evaluating specialist placements/support

17. How is the performance/success of specialist placement and support for non-EEA migrant children who have been identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking currently measured?
18. Do you have any suggestions for how monitoring of performance and/or outcomes could be improved in the future?

Child victims/survivors going missing from local authority care

19. We are aware that children who are identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking are relatively likely to go missing from local authority care. Do you think there are any characteristics/circumstances associated with those who go missing? Are any of these specific to non-EEA migrant children? Why do you say this?
20. Are you aware of any approaches taken by local authorities to reduce the incidence of non-EEA migrant children identified as potential victims/survivors of modern slavery/trafficking going missing?
21. *(If yes to above)* Do you know whether these approaches have been effective? Do you have any evidence you can share with us to demonstrate any associated outcomes?

Any other comments

22. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you very much again for taking the time to speak with us.



Department
for Education



Home Office

© Cordis Bright

Reference: DFE-RR680

ISBN: 978-1-78105-744-5

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education or the Home Office.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Bekah.Little@education.gov.uk or childtrafficking@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk or
www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications