Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme: 18 months on
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Events Leading up to the Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme

Tragic death of Sarah Payne in July 2000

Review of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offenders in June 2007

Created 20 actions of which 1 and 4 are of particular importance to the process

Action 4 Pilot a process where members of the public can register their child protection interest in a named individual. Where this individual has convictions for child sex offences and is considered a risk, there will be a presumption that this information will be disclosed to the relevant member of the public.

Insertion into the Criminal Justice Act 2003
Disclosure Pilot Trials – 2008

1. September 2008 – trials began in Cambridgeshire, Cleveland, Hampshire and Warwickshire Police areas;
2. Ran for 12 months and independent evaluation completed
3. March 2010 Home Secretary expressed his desire for the process to be rolled out nationally
4. What is new?
5. What is the same?
The Process

- Initial Contact
- Face to Face Application
- Empowerment / Information
- Full Risk Assessment
- Decision Making on Disclosure
- Outcome and Closure
Deviations from the process

- Consideration of no face to face in all applications;
- If a written request is received then no initial contact form is completed;
- No face to face in certain applications;
- In certain circumstances no joint visit with Children’s Social Services in cases of disclosure;
- Consistently different approaches to officers completing the face to face
No. of Applications Recorded & Disclosures Made in the UK
August 2010 - March 2012

39 UK Forces participating

Totals
2712 Applications Recorded
299 Disclosures Made
Disclosure Ratio: 1:9 Applications

Number of Total Applications
Number of Total Disclosures
Linear (Number of Total Applications)
Linear (Number of Total Disclosures)
Publicity Impact
August 2010 - March 2012

- Campaign Aug 2010
- Campaign Oct 2010
- Campaign Apr 2011

1st Anniversary Aug 2011

- Number of Total Applications
- Number of Total Disclosures
- Linear (Number of Total Applications)
- Linear (Number of Total Disclosures)
Force Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Applications Recorded</th>
<th>Number of Disclosures Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London-Met</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mercia</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyfed-Powys</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GMP: Greater Manchester Police
London-Met: Metropolitan Police
West Mercia: Metropolitan Police
Devon & Cornwall: Large Rural Forces
Dyfed-Powys: Large Rural Forces
Dorset: Small Forces
Wiltshire: Small Forces
Suffolk: Small Forces
Force Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force Type</th>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Number of Applications Recorded</th>
<th>Months in Scheme</th>
<th>Average Applications per Month</th>
<th>Population of Force Area</th>
<th>Ratio of Enquiries per Head of Population</th>
<th>Number of Disclosures Made</th>
<th>Disclosure to Application Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conurbation</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,629,388</td>
<td>1: 32,462</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London - Met</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,813,500</td>
<td>1: 289,389</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Rural Forces</td>
<td>West Mercia</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,192,714</td>
<td>1: 4,127</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,680,370</td>
<td>1: 11,354</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyfed-Powys</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>506,054</td>
<td>1: 8,878</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Forces</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>715,042</td>
<td>1: 6,442</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>661,592</td>
<td>1: 7,434</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>719,511</td>
<td>1: 12,405</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1: 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Metropolitan Police – London
  - Low number of Applications recorded.
  - However, 25% of all applications have resulted in a disclosure
  - Large pop. – 7.8M people
  - Lower Community confidence
  - Transient population
Negative Outcomes?

- Maintaining confidence of RSOs
- Compliance of RSOs with registration and monitoring requirements
- Vigilantism
- Malicious false applications i.e. Journalists
- Breach of disclosure confidentiality agreement
Positive Outcomes

- Child Protection Investigations
- Intelligence about RSOs (Registered Sexual Offenders)
- Breaches of SOPO (Sexual Offences Prevention Order)
- Highlights other risks (i.e. serious domestic violence)
- Recall to Prison

PUBLIC PROTECTION
CASE STUDY EXAMPLES WHERE REFERAL ABOUT A NEW PARTNER

**Force A**

- 3rd party applicant about a new partner
- Believed acting strangely around child and evasive about background
- Disclosure as CSO with extensive history

**Force B**

- Mother concerned about a male who had befriended her and her son after hearing rumours
- Heard rumours that on the Sex Offenders Register
- Disclosure as RSO and arrested as in breach of SOPO and received 26 weeks custodial sentence
CASE STUDY EXAMPLES ABOUT EMPLOYEES WHERE THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT FOR CRB CHECKS

**Force C**
- Applicant was the nanny of two children; subject was the gardener who was also employed by the family
- Gardner had made comments that caused concern
- Disclosure given as CSO and dismissed from employment

**Force D**
- Application was about a nanny who was associating with a 3\textsuperscript{rd} party
- Rumours about the 3\textsuperscript{rd} party
- Disclosure made as CSO and referral to OFSTED as nanny was aware of the conviction
CASE STUDY EXAMPLE THAT HAS RESULTED IN SIGNIFICANT VALUE ADDED TO CHILD PROTECTION

Force E

• Applicant current partner of subject

• Motivation was regaining custody of child in care because of previous risky relationship

• Disclosure made about previous allegations of CSO’s

Force F

• Simple CSO Disclosure Scheme application sparked a 17 month investigation

• 30 year criminal history relating to CSO but no convictions

• 16 charges ranging from indecent assault against a child to possession of IIOC
CASE STUDY EXAMPLE THAT HAS RESULTED IN SIGNIFICANT VALUE ADDED TO MAPPA

Force G

- CSO Disclosure Scheme application that did not fit the criteria
- Contact with applicant and further information obtained
- Children Services referral made as pregnant 17 year old girlfriend
- Referral to MAPPA (L2) as subject was under investigation for CSO’s
- CIA as community aware and concern over safety
- Child placed into care as mother chose to remain with subject after disclosure
- Awaiting outcome of investigation into rape of a child and possession of IIOC
Judicial Review

- June 2011 a judicial review was instigated against the Home Secretary and S.Yorkshire Police
- Challenged the CSO Disclosure Scheme on:
  i) Offender not given an opportunity to make representations about disclosure prior to it being made;
  ii) Misrepresentation of the ‘test’ for disclosure
- Judicial Review outcome was that CSO Disclosure Scheme is lawful subject to the necessary amendments being made to the guidance
Any Questions?