



# Children's Hearings Scotland


## Feedback Loop 2014/15 - Clackmannanshire Council

The feedback loop is a legislative requirement under section 181 of the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011. It requires the National Convener to report to the Scottish Ministers on the implementation of Compulsory Supervision Orders (CSOs) by local authorities. This report presents information about the numbers and nature of CSOs for Clackmannanshire Council as the implementation authority from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2015. All counts which can lead to the identification of individual children are shown as <5 or <10 within this report to protect their anonymity.

In the period 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2015, Clackmannanshire local authority reported that there were 426 decisions from 423 meetings (hearings and court) around compulsory measures of supervision. The types of CSO decision were as follows:

- Interim CSO - 119
- CSO made - 38
- CSO continued - 65
- CSO varied - 119
- Interim variation CSO - 45
- CSO terminated - 40

These meeting decisions relate to 193 children. Of these, 44.0% of the children were girls with the remaining 56.0% boys. The ages of children with meetings in the year is shown in the graph below.




\* Please note that as a child can have a meeting at more than one age in the year, there will be double counting of children within the graph.

Where local authorities were able to go further, we asked them to provide some additional information about the children subject to CSOs within their area.

Of the 382 decisions with the non-disclosure status recorded, 15.7% had measures of non-disclosure attached to the order (count = 60). Nationally, this rate was 14.8%. Please note, these figures do not include non-disclosure which results from the application of Rule 16 by the Reporter, as opposed to a measure attached to the CSO. Please note, these figures exclude decisions to terminate a CSO, thereby reducing the total number of returns possible.

Of the 220 residences recorded, 'with parent/relevant person' was the most common. This was the case for 48.2% of cases (count = 106). Nationally, the most common residence was 'with parent/relevant person' (39.1%). The residence types are shown in the graph below.



\* Please note, the graph includes all children with residences recorded, even if the residence was not specified as a condition of the order.

All returns had information completed about whether or not there was a Child's Plan. In 90.4% of returns (count = 385), the child had a Child's Plan present. Nationally, for those returns with information completed, 98.7% were recorded as having a Child's Plan present.

## Secure accommodation authorisations

The following section relates specifically to secure accommodation authorisations and the information which was recorded around them.

There were <5 secure accommodation authorisations recorded in the period for <5 children. These were as a result of CSOs, Interim Variations of CSOs, Interim CSOs or Interim Continuations of CSOs. All information contained below relates to these cases. Nationally, 448 secure accommodation authorisations were recorded in the period.

### Information within the order

Alongside having a secure accommodation authorisation, a specified local authority and a relevant period, the CSO may contain one or more of the following measures below:

- A requirement that the child resides at a specified place - in all returns, the child was required to reside at a specific place. Nationally, in 95.8% of cases, children were required to reside at a specific place by the order.
- A direction authorising the person in charge of that place to restrict the child's liberty - no returns had restrictions on the child's liberty recorded within the order. Nationally, <5 cases were recorded as having restrictions on their liberty within the order.
- A movement restriction condition - no returns had movement restriction conditions recorded. Nationally, <5 cases were recorded as having movement restriction conditions within the order.
- A requirement that the implementation authority arrange a specified medical or other examination or treatment of the child - no returns had Section 186 medical exams/treatments to be arranged by the implementation authority. Nationally, 1.1% of cases were recorded as having Section 186 medical exams/treatments to be arranged by the implementation authority within the order.
- A direction regulating contact between the child and a person or class of person - in all returns, there were directions regulating contact between the child and a specific person or class of person within the order. Nationally, 19.0% of cases were recorded as having directions regulating contact between the child and a specific person or class of person within the order.
- A requirement that the child comply with any other specified condition - no returns had other conditions specified within the order with which the child was to comply. Nationally, 2.7% of cases were recorded as having other conditions specified within the order with which the child was to comply.
- A requirement that the implementation authority carry out specified duties in relation to the child - no returns had specified duties in relation to the child recorded within the order. Nationally, <5 cases were recorded as having specified duties in relation to the child recorded within the order.

- A prohibition on disclosure (direct or indirect) of the specified place where the child is to reside - no returns had non-disclosure conditions attached to the CSO. Nationally, 1.8% of cases were recorded as having non-disclosure conditions attached to the CSO.

In practice every CSO should contain a measure. Where no other measure exists, a measure that 'the implementation authority must provide supervision and support for the child' is attached.

## Implementation of the secure accommodation authorisation

There were <5 returns filled in around the implementation of secure accommodation authorisations. In all returns, the secure accommodation authorisations were implemented. Nationally, in 96.1% of cases with a secure accommodation authorisation and information around implementation, the secure accommodation authorisation was implemented.

Finally, in terms of the days between the meeting and the next local authority contact, please see the national report for further information about the trends identified in this area.

### Children's Hearings Scotland

Area 2/1/1 Ladywell House | Ladywell Road | Edinburgh | EH12 7TB  
t: 0131 244 3696 | [www.chscotland.gov.uk](http://www.chscotland.gov.uk) |  Follow @CHScotland



This publication has not been printed to save paper. However, if you require a printed copy or a copy in an alternative format and/or language, please contact us to discuss your needs.



*The Children's Panel – life changing.*

## Notes on counting within the report

Where nationally is referred to in this report, this is taken to mean the total number of returns which were submitted by all local authorities.

Some children had the same information (meeting date, outcome etc.) returned multiple times. This may be as a result of the way information was provided to local authorities or by the way the information was submitted by local authorities. The duplicates have been excluded from this report. In this report, 3 of 429 records were excluded for this reason. Counting conventions are noted below.

Meetings are counted using a combination of child identifier and meeting date. This provides a unique reference which can be counted. The reason for calculations being undertaken this way are because a meeting may have more than one CSO decision within this report and as such can appear on more than one row of the return. Therefore a way to provide a unique count of meetings is required. In addition, duplicate rows were provided by some local authorities within the submissions and these needed to be recorded as such to allow accurate counting. The overall assumption for this is that a child will only have a single meeting on any given day.

If a child has multiple returns relating to a meeting on the same day, these will be counted once for a meeting count.

CSO decisions are counted using a combination of child identifier, meeting date and CSO decision. This provides a unique reference which can then be counted. The reason for calculations being undertaken this way are because duplicate rows were provided by some local authorities within the submissions and these needed to be recorded as such to allow accurate counting. The overall assumption for this is that a child will only have a specific CSO decision, such as CSO made, once within a meeting on any given day (though there may be different CSO decisions within a meeting).

If a child has multiple returns relating to a meeting with the same CSO decision on the same day, these will be counted once for the CSO decisions count.

Only cells with values in them are counted. Blank cells are excluded.