

Out of area placements for children in care and return interviews

An analysis of freedom of information requests by Missing People on behalf of the English Coalition for Runaway Children (ECRC)

The English Coalition for Runaway Children (ECRC) is a coalition of organisations that work with children and young people who run away or go missing from home or care. The group exists to share good practice and campaign on relevant issues with the aim of ensuring that all missing children are safeguarded from harm through effective policy and appropriate services at both a national and local level.

This analysis was carried out by Missing People on behalf of the ECRC. The findings and analysis were shared with members of the coalition but have not yet been endorsed by member organisations



Introduction

In 2017-18 a total of 104,100¹ children were looked after within the care system in England. In the same year more than 11,000 of those children were reported missing in over 70,000 incidents.²

Looked after children are disproportionately likely to be reported missing: whilst approximately 1 in 200 children in the UK will be reported as missing, this figure is 1 in 10 for looked after children.³

Many looked after children will be accommodated in a care placement outside of their home local authority area. For some this will be because it helps to ensure their safety and improve their wellbeing; for others it will be because no other placement was available in their home local authority area. Department for Education statistics show that 30,680 children, almost a third of all those in care, were placed out of area on 31 March 2018.

Previous research has found that children placed away from their home area are at higher risk of going missing and may be at increased vulnerability because they are more isolated from their usual social support networks, and more likely to be travelling potentially long distances to try and return home.⁴

The 2012 All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) Joint Inquiry into children who go missing from care identified that in many cases the local authority in which a child is placed are not notified of their presence, and even more regularly there is confusion about who should be informed when a child placed out of area goes missing. The placing local authority still holds responsibility for the child; however, information should be shared with the authority where they actually live and it may also be important that police forces in both the host and responsible area are informed as the child may be in either. Problems with notifications have regularly been raised, including by Ofsted⁵ and the Office of the Children's Commissioner.⁶

Children who are placed out of their local authority area are entitled to parity of service with other looked after children which includes the response provided to them if they go missing.

Department for Education statutory guidance⁷ states that *"When a child is found, they must be offered an independent return interview. Independent return interviews provide an opportunity to uncover information that can help protect children from the risk of going missing again, from risks they may have been exposed to while missing or from risk factors in their home."*

Any child who goes missing should be offered the dedicated time and space to speak about what caused them to go, what happened while they were away, and what support they want or need upon their return. These return interviews are a crucial opportunity for intervention and one of the

¹ Department for Education statistics: Children looked after in England including adoption: 2017 to 2018

² Department for Education Main Report: Children looked after in England including adoption 2017 to 2018

³ <https://www.missingpeople.org.uk/about-us/about-the-issue/information-statistics/76-keyinformation2.html>

⁴ Report from the joint inquiry into children who go missing from care (2012) The APPG for Runaway and Missing Children and Adults and the APPG for Looked After Children and Care Leavers

⁵ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/419069/From_a_distance_Looked_after_children_living_away_from_their_home_area.doc

⁶ Accelerated report on the emerging findings of the OCC's inquiry into child sexual exploitation in gangs and groups, with a special focus on children in care, Office of the Children's Commissioner, 2012, p 33

⁷ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/307867/Statutory_Guidance_-_Missing_from_care_3_.pdf

only such tools that do not require children's needs to meet a specific threshold, or a particular type of harm to have already been identified.

Members of the ECRC raised concerns about the delivery of return interviews for these children so this report examines their provision and any good practice and barriers that local authorities themselves have identified.

Methodology

Missing People, on behalf of the ECRC, sent Freedom of Information requests (Fols) to every local authority in England: of the 152 local authorities, 120 responded (79%). The analysis presented in this report is limited to the 120 local authorities that responded to the Fol.

Some local authorities did not provide a response to all questions and in a minority of cases results for certain questions had to be excluded because it was not provided in a useable format. Where this is the case, the number of responses findings are based on is made clear in the report. It is concerning that some local authorities are not able to accurately report on the situation in their area and it is important that greater scrutiny is used to ensure that local authorities are correctly understanding the numbers of out of area placements and missing episodes for the children in their care.

Scotland and Wales

Due to the devolution of powers related to social services in Wales and Scotland the DfE statutory guidance does not apply in either country.

The Fol request was sent to every local authority in Wales, but the responses were excluded in this analysis because of the different duties regarding return interviews and the low response to a number of the questions included in the Fol.

It was decided that the request would not be relevant for Scotland because of the statutory picture.

How many children are placed out of area?

Five of the 120 local authorities who responded to the inquiry were unable to provide data about the number of children they had placed out of area. Across the remaining 115 local authorities, there was a total of 30,137 children placed out of area.

Considering that not all local authorities responded to the FoI so these responses represent only three quarters of local authorities in England, this total is notably high when compared to the DfE statistics (30,680). This disparity is likely because the DfE statistics are based on a snapshot of a single day (31 March 2018) and the total placed at that particular moment, whereas the responses received through the FoI will include all children placed out of area at any time during the year.

How many of those children go missing?

14 local authorities were not able to provide this information, so these figures are based on the remaining 106 local authorities:

Number of children placed out of area	28,648
Number of missing children	4,797
Percentage of children placed out of area who went missing	17%
Number of missing incidents (based on 91 local authorities) ⁸	18,662

The percentage of children placed out of area that go missing varies significantly between the 106 local authorities; from 2% (6 out of 377 children) to 78% (32 out of 41 children).

Percentage of OoA looked after children going missing	Number of local authorities	Percentage of local authorities
Less than 5%	5	5%
From 5% to 9%	15	14%
From 10% to 14%	34	32%
From 15% to 20%	21	20%
Over 20%	31	29%
Grand Total	106	100%

In nearly half (52 of 106) of local authorities, over 15% of their looked after children placed out of area went missing; for nearly three in ten authorities, over 20% of children went missing.

⁸ 13 of the 106 local authorities did not answer the question relating to the number of missing incidents involving children placed out of area or stated they were unable to provide this information. A further 2 had to be excluded because of anomalies in the data.

This clearly shows that children placed out of area are at increased risk of going missing. Approximately 10% of all looked after children will go missing nationally compared to almost 17% of children placed out of area.

Only one in five (19% or 20 of 106) of local authorities reported that less than 10% of their looked after children placed out of area had gone missing.

Four in ten (40%) of the 106 local authorities who responded to this part of the FoI had a higher percentage of out of area children going missing (42 of 106) than the national average of 17%.

Who delivers the return interviews?

What does the guidance say?

Department for Education statutory guidance is clear that return interviews should be carried out by an independent professional, however little detail is provided:

*[A return interview] is normally best carried out by an independent person (i.e. someone not involved in caring for the child) who is trained to carry out these interviews and is able to follow-up any actions that emerge.*⁹

In practice this has been interpreted in a variety of ways with some local authorities commissioning a third sector organisation, and others building independent teams within their own staff. In some areas interviews are delivered by the child's social worker which could not be considered as independent within the parameters laid out in the DfE guidance.

There has been relatively little research carried out to understand what is most effective in terms of who provides return interviews, however, there are a number of important considerations from information already available:

- Trusted relationship model: previous research¹⁰ has found that, it is important to have a designated adult who is able to provide consistent support, particularly for children who are looked after within the care system. More broadly, it is important to build trust and positive relationships with young people. While this does not mean only one professional can or should be involved in supporting a child, it is important to consider the implications of this when considering who works with a child upon their return from missing.
- Research,¹¹ as well as anecdotal experience of members from the ECRC has shown that some children do not have positive relationships with their social workers or a positive perception of social services. This is not always the case, but it is important that the views of those children are considered and alternative opportunities for engagement are provided.

⁹ Department for Education (2014) Statutory guidance on children who run away or go missing from home or care

¹⁰ Lewing, B. Doubell, L. Beevers, T. Acquah, D. Early Intervention Foundation (2018) Building trusted relationships for vulnerable children and young people with public services

¹¹

https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/11515/1/Children_s_views_and_experiences_of_contact_with_social_workers_report_July_2010.pdf

Some children will feel more comfortable talking to someone from a charity or youth work services who they do not associate with being responsible for their care.

Ultimately it is most important that children have a choice in who they engage with upon their return from missing. An independent option should be available as the child may not feel comfortable or willing to talk to someone who is responsible for their care placement or with whom they have had a negative relationship in the past. However, if a child is more likely to engage with a professional that they already have a relationship with their choice should be respected.

Who provides OoA return interviews in the Fof local authorities?

To better understand the provision of return interviews for children placed out of area, the Fof included questions regarding which professional delivered return interviews for that group of children. The table below summarises the responses received from the 120 local authorities:

Return Home Interview delivery provider (out of area) ¹²		
Who provides out of area RHIs?	Number of local authorities	Percentage of local authorities
Combination of independent and local authority provider	56	47%
Children's Services, could be the child's social worker	27	23%
Third sector partner	15	13%
Children's Services but not the child's social worker	11	9%
Social worker (independence not stated)	5	4%
Spot purchase	3	3%
Other	1	1%
In house team	1	1%
Not given	1	1%
Total	120	100%

The responses show that, despite the majority of local authorities providing an independent option (62%), a significant minority do not. These figures suggest that in many cases children may not be offered a return interview by someone independent of their care. Children may be interviewed by their social worker which would not be a cause for concern if that is their choice but will likely be inappropriate if the child does not have a trusting or positive relationship with social services, or if they are unhappy with their care placement.

¹² The percentages in this table may not total 100% due to rounding. This may also be true of some later tables in the report

How often are return interviews happening?

Offers of return interviews

Looked after children who are placed out of area should still receive an offer of an RHI on their return from missing. Only 86 of the 120 local authorities were able to confirm the number of missing incidents involving children placed out of area for which a return interview was offered. This means that over a quarter of local authorities were not able to provide this, raising significant concerns about the monitoring of these services which are a statutory duty.

For the 86 local authorities who did report this figure, an RHI was offered for a total of 12,469 missing incidents, with an average offer rate of 78% per authority. There was significant variation between areas, with responses ranging from 10% of incidents up to 100%.

Percentage of missing incidents addressed with the offer of a return interview	Number of local authorities	Percentage of local authorities
Less than 30%	8	9%
31-40%	2	2%
41-50%	1	1%
51-60%	7	8%
61-70%	7	8%
71-80%	12	14%
81-90%	17	20%
91-99%	13	15%
100%	19	22%
Grand Total	86	100%

Although the broad range of offer rates for looked after children placed out of area is concerning, it is positive that more than a third of local authorities (37%) offered an interview in response to more than 90% of missing incidents.

Completed return interviews

Not all offers of return interviews will be taken up. In the 88 areas able to provide this information, there were 8,266 missing episodes involving looked after children living out of area which were addressed in a completed interview. The average completion rate per local authority was 52%. Again there was a huge amount of variation in the proportion of completions, ranging from 8% up to 100%.

Percentage of missing incidents addressed in a completed return interview	Number of local authorities	Percentage of local authorities
Less than 30%	23	26%
31-40%	9	10%
41-50%	11	13%
51-60%	16	18%
61-70%	7	8%
71-80%	8	9%
81-90%	4	5%
91-99%	7	8%
100%	3	3%
Grand Total	88	100%

Children placed from other local authority areas

Although the responsibility for providing return interviews lies with the placing local authority, it is important we better understand the processes, both for delivery and for information sharing in the host local authority. Children who have gone missing in an area far away from home may have travelled back to the area they know; however, they may also have spent time in their host area and in which instance it would be more important for the local police force and host authority to understand what has happened.

It is also vital that all local authorities generally have an accurate picture of children going missing in their area, without this it is impossible to understand vulnerability and potential threats.

Numbers of 'other local authority' (OLA) looked after children placed in their area

Only 85 local authorities (71%) were able to provide the number of looked after children placed in their area by another local authority. In total, these 85 local authorities reported 18,504 children placed in this way, giving an average of 218 per local authority.

It is possible that this shows a level of under reporting as those same local authorities had placed 21,662 out of area, 17% higher. It is not possible to draw concrete conclusions from this as the

proportion of children placed elsewhere against the number placed from other areas will vary because of geographical differences, however this difference suggests there may be some discrepancies in how many children are known to the host local authority.

Return interviews

Almost half of the 120 local authorities do not have any return interview provision for other local authorities' children placed in their area. Only 17% provide RHIs for all of these children, while a further third make decisions about whether to offer on a case by case basis.

Do you provide RHIs to children placed out of area in your area?	Number of local authorities	Percentage of local authorities
No	57	48%
Case by case	40	33%
Yes	20	17%
Not stated	3	3%
Grand Total	120	100%

Nearly two thirds of local authorities (74 of 120) were unable to identify the number of other local authority children placed in their area who had received an RHI in 2017/18. Across the 46 local authorities that were able to provide this information, a total of 453 return interviews had been completed. When we consider that these same authorities had 8,493 other local authority children placed in their area¹³ and the typically high proportions of out of area children who go missing, this seems a low level of RHI completion. These small numbers suggest that relatively few local authorities are spot purchasing from other area's return interview service, despite 32 saying that they consider spot purchasing when a child goes missing.

It is concerning that there is so little information known about the return interviews being delivered for children placed out of area by the local authority in which they actually live, particularly as this means that:

- The professional carrying out the interview is unlikely to know anything about the local context where the child has gone missing. They therefore may not understand the significance of information disclosed during the interview.
- Any intelligence gathered from the interview is not being used to inform mapping of vulnerabilities and risks in the host area.
- It is possible that the information is not being shared with professionals in the host area who will have a role in the child's care.

¹³ 4 of these 46 authorities were unable to provide an estimate of the total number of other local authority children placed in their area so the actual figure would be higher than 8,493.

Ability to report

There were some significant challenges in collecting this FOI data from local authorities, with some local authorities only able to report some of the data requested. Reasons that local authorities gave for not being able to report on the data was that they did not specifically record it, or section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, which provides an exemption based on the time or cost of providing the data. This exemption was used where each individual case file would have needed to be checked to provide the data. Others could not provide this information as distinct from their total number of missing children.

“Information not currently available in a reportable format and would require a manual search that would exceed the cost limit under Section 12(1).”

“We do not hold specific data on this, and we currently cannot differentiate through our statistics/data collection between missing children placed outside and those placed in borough.”

Ofsted inspects local authorities on some of the questions Missing People asked in this FOI so local authorities should be able to provide this data in an easily reportable format. However, some local authorities were not able to do so:

- 14 of the 120 authorities (12%) were unable to, or did not, provide information about how many of their looked after children placed out of area went missing
- 34 of 120 (28%) were unable to, or did not, provide information about how many RHIs were offered in relation to the number of missing incidents for these children
- 29 of 120 (24%) were unable to, or did not, provide information about how many of these offered RHIs were accepted

In addition, local authorities were considerably less likely to be able to provide figures relating to other local authority children placed in their area. 35 of the 120 authorities (29%) were unable or did not provide information on the total number of children placed in their area while 74 (62%) did not provide figures for the number who received an RHI.

It is problematic that local authorities cannot easily provide this data. There is inconsistency in the way in which data is collected and recorded across local authorities which raises concerns about how, at a local and national level, those working in this area are able to understand trends and strategically respond.

Working well, barriers and changes to guidance

The FoI asked local authorities what they thought was working well, what the barriers were to effective provision, and what they would like to see change to ensure good practice in the delivery of return interviews for children placed out of area.

81 local authorities responded to these questions with varying levels of detail. The following is a summary of the key issues raised. As these were open questions it is possible that local authorities who did not respond may have similar experiences, or there may be other issues faced by the local authorities who did respond that have not been identified.

What is working well

Some local authorities specifically mentioned that multi-agency working is key to effective provision. The comments associated with this largely talked about effective information sharing protocols that ensured the police were provided with relevant intelligence; and involved the child's placement provider in effective safeguarding following the interview.

Other positives included:

- Advocacy
"The team offers advocacy within our service therefore we are best placed to deal with any issues that arise from the RHI offering the YP an advocate who can support them going forward to resolve any issues"
- Mapping of all missing incidents, including those placed from other areas
- Multi-local authority commissioning: arrangements between different local authorities to jointly commission services to ensure that children placed in surrounding areas are receiving a consistent service
- Agreements with other local authorities
"Reciprocal agreements are in place with several other Local authorities for return interviews to be completed on our behalf for individuals we have placed in that area and we will do the same for individuals from those LA's placed here"
- Monitoring missing episodes of children placed in their area
"[The] team have developed a system to monitor missing episodes of young people placed in [our local authority] by other local authorities"
- Interviewers receiving regular training
- Referrals/interviews coordinated through central point to ensure consistency
- Reviewed for quality assurance
"The RIF is returned to the Missing and Absent Team (whether or not the interview successfully took place) where it is quality-assured for completeness, that all relevant risks and safeguarding issues have been identified, and that the identified actions have been taken."
"Quarterly return interview auditing is evidencing improvements in the quality of return interviews"
- Provide same service to all children in the area

“We offer children looked after by other local authorities the same service as our [local authority] children, the RHI is then shared with that child’s social worker and local risk and intelligence information fed into our local Police and MASH teams”

Who should deliver return interviews for children placed out of area?

16 local authorities included comments about who they thought was best placed to deliver return interviews to children placed out of area:

- Some local authorities emphasised the importance of the child having a choice in who delivers the interview
“One of the biggest barriers we face as an authority is the reluctance of children to engage in the interview process therefore we look at alternative ways of doing this such as messaging, telephone interviews, etc. and by speaking to the Children themselves to ask who they would like to speak with”
- Other authorities suggested that interviews should be done by services in the placement area as local context is important
“When other Local Authorities do not do these in their own area they fail to identify risk and the unsafe networking which is not then linked to other concerns in the local area which could be identified very quickly within a Return Interview”
- Local authorities also stated that whenever possible children who go missing repeatedly should be able to see the same worker
“Where possible, all young children see the same Missing Person Officer to gain trust and confidence for the young person”
- Other local authorities stated that a trusted person would be best placed
“For children placed out of area we will identify the most appropriate professional to offer a RHI, who is not the allocated Social Worker. This may be a Targeted Youth Support Worker or a professional within a voluntary agency, who has a positive relationship with the child, or we will allocate a worker from the Return Safe Team”
- Others suggested the following:
 - It should be someone independent
 - Someone the child feels comfortable with
 - A third sector organisation
 - Social workers

Barriers

Providing return interviews within 72 hours

The most common issue identified by local authorities was timeliness and completing return interviews within the 72-hour timeframe as a challenge. This was exacerbated when children are placed long distances away from the responsible local authority as the travel and resource involved to visit the child could mean a quick turnaround is challenging.

“The 72 hour timescales to offer RHI interviews is unrealistic, especially if a child goes missing on a Friday, child’s availability upon return, given some of the young people can be placed quite far away this has to be planned in advance as it can take up a lot of time in one workers diary”

“Children who are reported missing need to receive a timely response following a missing episode (72 hours is the target). It is not possible to achieve this when a child is out of area.”

Notifications

Local authorities also discussed problems with notifications when a child is placed in their area. The problems raised included no notification being made at all when a child is placed; or no or very slow information sharing when a child is reported missing. Solutions suggested by a few local authorities were a single system for notifications and alerts across local authorities; or further guidance to better establish at a national level the responsibilities of placing and host local authorities.

Other barriers

A smaller number of local authorities mentioned limited resources and capacity as presenting a challenge in the delivery of return interviews, particularly when children are placed at distance, so the geographical area workers have to cover is unmanageable.

Other responses mentioned the lack of information shared by responsible local authorities if they carried out the return interview, despite the fact that any disclosures or information could have an impact on the understanding of vulnerability and risks in their area. One other mentioned frustration with information sharing the other way: local authorities who do provide a service to every child placed in their area not keeping the placing local authority informed of any information from the interview.

Other problems mentioned included:

- Different processes in different areas causing confusion
- Low engagement from children, or declines when return interviews are offered

National change

The final question in the FoI asked local authorities whether they would like to see any changes made to national guidance regarding return interviews and their provision for children placed out of area. 33 local authorities responded to this question.

The most common suggestion was the need for clearer national guidance outlining a more coordinated approach. This was considered in a number of different ways including:

- Guidance on who should deliver return interviews for children who were placed at a distance. Two local authorities suggested this should always be a service in the host area, others stated that the guidance needs to be clearer.
- National agreement on notifications for out of area placements and missing episodes
- A national register of services that local authorities could use to provide return interviews or better options for spot purchasing
- Clearer guidance on how all local authorities should be sharing information after a return interview has been completed
- Two local authorities suggested that the responsibilities should be legislated to ensure that all local authorities comply but acknowledged this could present a challenge so suggested stricter guidance could work

The next most common recommendation was for clearer information to be provided on the expectations for placing local authorities to consider how return interviews will be done, as well as ensuring the process for notifications, *before* the placement begins.

Other suggestions included changing the 72-hour timeline in statutory guidance and allowing a more flexible approach to how return interviews are delivered that is based on the child's needs:

"Specifically with regard to OOA placements, National guidance to encourage a coordinated approach for service provision would be very welcome. Otherwise, a system remains where some local authorities have agreements in place while others try to manage their own caseloads but do not support children placed locally by other authorities."

"We would like to see that it is a requirement in national guidance for the responsible Local Authority to share information with the Local Authority where the young person is placed. In [this local authority] we have a clear process on sharing relevant information and intelligence following return home interviews. This has resulted in us obtaining a richer picture and understanding the issues and concerns for young people that are missing in our area."

"The current guidance is weak on RHI for out of area (OOA) placements and leaves authorities having to broker and/or undertake these directly if they can't engage the local 'host' authority to do this. Costs vary as does quality. The flip side is that authorities that are net importers of OOA placements will feel a burden of resource etc. perhaps guidance should indicate that initial and second RHI should be done by local CS arrangement but then after this it should be the home authorities responsibility to undertake given that they would presumably need to re-assess the placement in any event?"

"An effective way of improving a national response would be to incorporate guidance if not legislation."

Conclusions and recommendations

The responses to this freedom of information request show that the provision of return interviews for children placed outside of their home local authority area is inconsistent and there is significant confusion amongst local authorities regarding their delivery and how the information provided in interviews is shared and used.

It is vital that return interviews are offered to every child, and that they are of high quality, for a group that are at increased risk of going missing and can therefore face significant risks and harms.

Recommendations

1. Children placed out of area are more likely to go missing than those placed within their home area. The Department for Education, Ofsted, ADCS and local authorities should consider the recommendations within the soon to be published APPG for Runaway and Missing Children and Adult's Inquiry into out of area placements to ensure that children are not placed out of area unnecessarily and therefore put at greater risk of going missing and the associated harms.
2. Local authorities should ensure that children they have placed out of area are offered a choice in who provides their return interview, including an option of someone independent of their care.
3. The Department for Education should provide clearer guidance in 'Children who run away or go missing from home or care' regarding local authorities' responsibilities to notify host authorities when a child placed in their area goes missing; to inform them when return interviews have been carried out; and to share relevant information with the host authority and police force. Consideration should be given to the possibility of introducing a single system for all local authority notifications. Guidance should also include a requirement for host local authorities to record this information and use it to inform risk mapping and safeguarding.
4. The Department for Education should also use the review of 'Children who run away or go missing from home or care' to provide greater clarity on how return interviews should be delivered for children placed out of area considering the interviewer's need for contextual knowledge of the area in which the child has gone missing.
5. Ofsted should include greater scrutiny of the provision of return interviews for children placed out of area in their inspections. This should include oversight of:
 - Whether pre-placement planning included consideration of how return interviews would be delivered and information shared with the host local authority
 - Whether children are provided with a choice in who delivers the interview
 - On occasions when a return interview has been carried out, whether information was effectively shared with the host local authority and the police

Appendix

Freedom of Information request

ECRC Freedom of Information Request

December 2018

Out of area placements

1) How are Return Home Interviews (RHIs) delivered to looked after children who are placed outside of your local authority area? **(please tick)**

- a) RHIs are completed by the third sector organisation that also deliver them to children within our local authority area
- b) RHIs are completed by someone in our children's services but never their social worker
- c) RHIs are completed by someone in our children's services and that could be their social worker
- d) RHIs are completed by the young persons' social worker
- e) We spot purchase from the host local authority's RHI service
- f) We spot purchase from another service
- g) We do not offer RHIs to this group
- h) Combination of the above
 - i) If yes please provide further information:
- i) Other
 - i) If yes please provide further information:

2) a) How many children in the care of your local authority were placed out of area between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2018?

b) How many children who were placed out of area went missing between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2018?

c) Of that figure how many were offered a RHI?

d) How many received a RHI?

3) Does your local authority offer RHIs to looked-after children from other local authorities who are placed in your local authority area? **(please tick)**

a) Yes

b) No

c) On a case-by-case basis

i) If so please give more detail:

4) If you selected 'yes' or 'case-by-case' to the previous question please could you tell us which agency is responsible for delivering RHIs to this group of young people?

a) A Third sector agency **Yes/No**

b) A team based within your local authority **Yes/No**

c) We provide a spot purchasing service **Yes/No**

5) a) How many looked after children and young people were placed in your local authority area by other local authorities between 31 March 2017 and 1 April 2018?

b) How many of these children and young people received a RHI?

6) Please tell us more about your return interview service for children placed out of area. Would you like to see any changes in national guidance? What are the barriers to effective provision? What is working well in your area?

Additional Freedom of Information Request

April 2019

- 1) How many missing incidents were reported for looked after children who had been placed outside of your local authority area between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2018?
- 2) For how many of those incidents was a return interview offered during the same time period?
- 3) For how many of those incidents was a return interview completed during the same time period?