KEY		
EFH	Extra-familial harm
CSE	Child sexual exploitation
CCE	Child criminal exploitation

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SYSTEM REVIEW TRAFFIC LIGHT TOOL

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SCALE UP PROCESS

LEVEL 1

System response to children, young people and families

REFERRAL	ASSESSMENT	PLANNING	RESPONSE
Contexts associated to experiences of harm or protection are not recorded when young people are referred into the system	Assessment for young people and families affected by EFH focus on their behaviour and the capacity of their parents to safeguard them in the future	Planning meetings, and plans put in place to support young people, do not consider or attend to contextual factors undermining their safety	Interventions delivered to young people do not engage with contextual factors and may be undermined by them without reflection or further attention
Practitioners/teams/meetings inconsistently log locations of harm and any relevant peer associations when young people are referred for support – there is no established mechanism for logging	Attempts have been made by individual practitioners to contextualise assessments for young people and families affected by EFH, but this is variable and is not associated to a service-wide approach to assessment – particularly in terms of parental capacity	When planning support, the weight of influence that different contexts have on a young person are sometimes considered to prioritise interventions – there is not established set of ways to achieve this and is not necessarily used by meeting chairs	Interventions are delivered to young people with some recognition of contextual factors – but the factors themselves are not also always attended to or recommended for further work
System consistently logs locations of harm and any relevant peer associations to a young person who has been referred into children's services	Assessments of young people and families consider how peer, school and neighbourhood dynamics around them impact on parental capacity	When planning support, the weight of influence that different contexts have on a young person are considered to prioritise interventions	Interventions support a young person and family to understand contextual dynamics and recommend actions to address them

TARGET

The safeguarding system targets the contexts, and associated social conditions, of EFH. It achieves this by identifying those contexts, assessing them and where required intervening with them to build safety

REFERRAL *The point(s) in a system where referrals for support are received/made*

ASSESSMENT *The point(s) in a system where needs, safety and risk are assessed*

PLANNING *The point(s) in a system where plans are developed, agreed and monitored*

RESPONSE *The point(s) in a system where responses are delivered*

LEVEL 2

System response to young people's peers, schools and public spaces

REFERRAL	ASSESSMENT	PLANNING	RESPONSE
The system can consistently receive and screen referrals for peer groups, schools and locations	The system can consistently assess peer group, schools and locations where young people are thought to be at risk of harm and uses an agreed set of frameworks to achieve this	The system can coordinate plans that target contexts and groups associated to EFH to increase safety, and reduce risk, in contexts where young people are at risk of harm	The system can coordinate/commission/ instigate interventions designed to increase safety in contexts that compromise young people's welfare
Practitioners/teams/meetings inconsistently identify/flag peer groups, schools and locations where EFH has occurred which at times prompts a contextual response – there is no established mechanism for logging or referring contexts	Assessments of contexts are attempted in the system but often lack an agreed and consistent framework. Some contexts – e.g. peer groups may be assessed while others – e.g. schools, may not	The system features some efforts to coordinate plans that target contexts or groups associated to EFH but there are not mechanisms in place to monitor/review this plans, or record them in a consistent manner	The system has coordinated, commissioned or instigated interventions designed to increase safety in contexts that compromise young people's welfare, but this has not happened on a consistent basis or via a clear mechanism – it is an ad hoc rather than common feature of safeguarding
Contexts associated to EFH are not identified anywhere in the safeguarding response to this issue	Contexts are not the target of welfare-based assessments in the safeguarding system	There are no meetings/mechanisms for developing plans that target peer, school or neighbourhood contexts	Interventions do not target contexts – or the social conditions of contexts that facilitate abuse. Instead, they target individual young people in contexts

KEY

EFH	Extra-familial harm
CSE	Child sexual exploitation
CCE	Child criminal exploitation

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SYSTEM REVIEW TRAFFIC LIGHT TOOL

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SCALE UP PROCESS

LEVEL 1

System response to children, young people and families

LEGAL & POLICY FRAMEWORK

The local response to EFH is overseen by a safeguarding partnership with a clear role for children's social care in coordinating responses to significant harm in extra-familial contexts

LEVEL 2

System response to young people's peers, schools and public spaces

---

REFERRAL *The point(s) in a system where referrals for support are received/made*

ASSESSMENT *The point(s) in a system where needs, safety and risk are assessed*

PLANNING *The point(s) in a system where plans are developed, agreed and monitored*

RESPONSE *The point(s) in a system where responses are delivered*

LEVEL 1

REFERRAL

- Young people and families affected by EFH are not recognised as in need of support from children's services and referrals are not made on this basis
- Referrals for some young people and families affected by EFH are received by children's services – for example for CSE or CCE, but other forms of EFH remain largely a concern of youth justice or community safety referrals
- Referrals for young people and families affected by EFH are received by children's services

ASSESSMENT

- Young people and families affected by EFH are largely screened out of children's social care at the point of referral and so are rarely assessed. Or assessments focus on young people and families only and so fail to recognise the social work role in EFH
- Assessments for young people and families affected EFH are conducted by children's social care, however the language/tone in assessment can on occasion focus on crime/behaviour as opposed to young people's needs
- Assessments for young people and families affected by EFH are centred around child welfare/protection

PLANNING

- Children's social care do not play a role in planning responses to EFH – these cases remain largely overseen by community safety, youth justice or voluntary sector partners
- In some cases of significant EFH, children's social care have oversight of plans but queries and inconsistencies remain – for example the role of children's social care is unclear when young people affected by EFH are open to youth justice services
- Planning activity for cases of EFH have the oversight of children's services

RESPONSE

- Young people affected by EFH are not in receipt of welfare-based intervention or support
- Some welfare-based interventions are available to young people affected by EFH but they are inconsistently delivered either in terms of harm-type or in terms of statutory oversight
- Interventions are focused on safeguarding the welfare of young people and families as the primary objective

---

LEVEL 2

REFERRAL

- Extra-familial contexts are referred into systems designed to protect young people (not solely those concerned with community safety, crime prevention or policing)
- Extra-familial contexts are identified and raised by children's services practitioners but a number remain primarily a concern for community safety structures
- Extra-familial contexts, if considered at all, are only referred through crime prevention and community safety structures

ASSESSMENT

- The welfare of children and young people are at the heart of system assessments of extra-familial contexts rather than solely measuring the likelihood of crime or anti-social behaviour
- Children's social care contribute to assessments of extra-familial contexts but overall these assessments are not always welfare-based or lack a welfare-based framework
- Contexts affected by EFH are not assessed and are responded to solely through a tasking mechanism or via a community safety assessment of need only

PLANNING

- Plans that target contexts and groups associated to EFH are convened under frameworks designed to coordinate support for young people and families – with a shared focus on safeguarding the welfare of young people across the partners who are involved
- Children's social care play a role in planning around extra-familial contexts and may play a leadership role in relation to peer groups, but community safety and other partners retain ownership in a number of cases
- Children's social care do not play any role in planning responses to contexts beyond families

RESPONSE

- Interventions are focused on creating sustained pathways for safety in contexts or with groups where there have been concerns about child welfare- building guardianship capacity and securing safety in environments where young people spend their time
- Interventions levelled at contexts or with groups where there have been concerns about child welfare make some impact on the welfare of young people but this is inconsistent – disruption/criminal justice/community safety interventions may still be dominant
- Contexts and groups in which EFH occurs, or is associated, is managed via criminal justice and community safety interventions only

KEY

EFH	Extra-familial harm	
CSE	Child sexual exploitation	
CCE	Child criminal exploitation	

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SYSTEM REVIEW TRAFFIC LIGHT TOOL

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SCALE UP PROCESS

LEVEL 1

System response to children, young people and families

Referral (red): Partners operating in, or with reach into, extra-familial contexts are unable to recognise young people as vulnerable and/or are not aware that they should raise welfare-based concerns. They may focus on contacting community safety

Referral (orange): Some partners who have contact with young people in extra-familial spaces:
– are alert to the signs of EFH;
– can refer concerns to children's social care; and
– provide contextual information on an ad hoc basis when doing so

Referral (green): All partners who have contact with young people extra-familial spaces:
– are alert to the signs of EFH;
– can and do make referrals; and
– when doing so, provide contextual information via a consistent referral format

Assessment (red): During assessments of young people and families affected by EFH, partner agencies are only asked for, or only provide, information on the individuals concerned and instead of wider information about contexts in the EFH is occurring

Assessment (orange): During assessments of young people and families affected by EFH some partner agencies provide information on contexts impacting safety/risk as well as the individuals affected – this is inconsistent and not always achieved

Assessment (green): During assessments of young people and families affected by EFH, partner agencies provide information on contexts impacting safety and risk, as well as the individuals affected

Planning (red): Partners, including young people, parents and their wider communities, and those who work in extra-familial contexts, are not involved in planning support in cases of EFH – such partnership may not be valued and/or may not be facilitated

Planning (orange): Partners, including young people, parents and/or wider communities have, on occasion, been seen as partners in building contextual plans when they are affected by EFH

Planning (green): Partners, including young people, parents and their wider communities, and those who work in extra-familial contexts, are involved in planning support in cases of EFH

Response (red): Partners are largely focused on criminalising or dispersing young people affected by EFH rather than seeing them as young people in need of support and/or offering interventions that build safety around them

Response (orange): Interventions have on occasion worked with peers, parents and/or young people as partners in safeguarding. Some partners with a reach into extra-familial contexts have delivered interventions to increase safety around a young person in an ad hoc rather than consistent fashion

Response (green): Interventions work with peers, parents and young people as partners in safeguarding – and those with a reach into extra-familial contexts – deliver interventions to increase safety around a young person

PARTNERSHIPS

Safeguarding responses to EFH are delivered in partnership with the people and organisations who can influence extra-familial contexts and relationships – including partnerships with young people and their families

REFERRAL *The point(s) in a system where referrals for support are received/made*

ASSESSMENT *The point(s) in a system where needs, safety and risk are assessed*

PLANNING *The point(s) in a system where plans are developed, agreed and monitored*

RESPONSE *The point(s) in a system where responses are delivered*

LEVEL 2

System response to young people's peers, schools and public spaces

Referral (green): Partner agencies are alert to contexts where young people are at risk of or affected by EFH, and are supported to notify children's services of these concerns

Referral (orange): Some partner agencies are alert to contexts where young people are at risk of or affected by EFH, and have made efforts to notify children's services of these concerns

Referral (red): Partner agencies are not aware that they can refer contexts affected by EFH into children's services and/or do not know/recognise when to do this

Assessment (green): During assessments partner agencies provide information and access to data that can be used to build a picture of safety and harm in contexts

Assessment (orange): During assessments some partner agencies provide information and access to data that can be used to build a picture of safety and risk in contexts. This happens in an ad hoc fashion and/or there isn't a consistent mechanism to support this

Assessment (red): Partner agencies that could assist in assessing a context affected by EFH are not included in the assessment process and/or asked information about social/contextual dynamics that may be facilitating harm

Planning (green): Partners who have a reach into extra-familial contexts are involved in building plans to increase safety in those contexts

Planning (orange): Partners, including some who work in extra-familial contexts, have been involved in planning support to affect contexts themselves. On occasions this has involved offering community guardianship or safe spaces; in other cases it has been focused on disruption and dispersal. Young people, parents and/or wider communities may not always feature as partners

Planning (red): Partners who have a reach into extra-familial contexts, as well as parents, young people, and their wider communities are not involved in building plans to increase safety in those contexts

Response (green): Partners who have a reach into extra-familial contexts deliver, or oversee, interventions that increase the safety of young people and reduce the risks they face

Response (orange): Some partners who have a reach into extra-familial contexts have delivered, or oversee, interventions that increase the safety of extra-familial contexts – this is ad hoc rather than consistent. In some instances partners request, or deliver, interventions that disperse risks rather than build safety

Response (red): Partners do not seek to intervene in ways that builds safety in contexts. Interventions are largely enforcement based, disrupt individuals and/or make environments hostile to young people rather than the abuse

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SYSTEM REVIEW TRAFFIC LIGHT TOOL

CONTEXTUAL SAFEGUARDING
SCALE UP PROCESS

KEY

EFH	Extra-familial harm
CSE	Child sexual exploitation
CCE	Child criminal exploitation

LEVEL 1

System response to children, young people and families

OUTCOMES

The safeguarding system measures the contextual impact of practice/policy responses to EFH alongside impacts on individual young people

LEVEL 2

System response to young people's peers, schools and public spaces

---

REFERRAL *The point(s) in a system where referrals for support are received/made*

ASSESSMENT *The point(s) in a system where needs, safety and risk are assessed*

PLANNING *The point(s) in a system where plans are developed, agreed and monitored*

RESPONSE *The point(s) in a system where responses are delivered*

LEVEL 1

REFERRAL

- When young people affected by EFH are referred into children's social care only individual measures of concern/risk/safety are recorded (e.g. rates of missing, exclusion, offending etc.)
- Contextual information is sometimes recorded at the point of referral against which to track contextual impact from assessment onwards – this is not formalised or system-wide, and often in general notes
- Contextual information is recorded at the point of referral against which to track contextual impact throughout the system response

ASSESSMENT

- Assessments for young people affected by EFH do not include contextual measures against which to track later impact. Assessments focus on individual elements of need or risk against which to measure outcomes
- Assessments for young people affected by EFH provide a partial baseline record of contextual dynamics relevant to EFH. Sometimes these elements are recorded in case notes rather than through a formalised and reportable assessment framework
- Assessments for young people affected by EFH record baseline, and later changes to, contextual dynamics relevant to EFH to give an accurate account of safety

PLANNING

- Plans focus on routes to changing young people's behaviour without changing the contexts in which those behaviours are displayed
- Some plans focus on creating sustained contextual safety for young people and families – other remain focused on risk reduction or principally measure outcomes in relation to the actions of the young person without reference to context
- Plans are focused on creating sustained contextual safety for young people and families

RESPONSE

- The success of interventions is only measured with reference to their impact on individual behaviour and do not consider how contextual factors may impact individual outcomes
- The success of interventions is sometimes measured in regards to whether contexts around a young person have become safer – and not solely the individual who features in a plan. This is ad hoc and there is evidence of some success being measured in a solely individual way
- The success of interventions is measured in regards to whether contexts around a young person have become safer – and not solely the individual who features in a plan. Their behaviour change is also measured in a contextually informed way

LEVEL 2

REFERRAL

- At the point of referral, contextual concerns are documented so as to create a baseline against which the impact of interventions can latterly be measured
- At the point of referral, contextual concerns are sometimes documented. This provides the foundation for baseline capture. Further work is required to build consistency so a more accurate baseline can be generated
- If contexts are referred into the system at all, crime and disorder measures – rather than child welfare – are reported undermining the ability to track outcomes in the future

ASSESSMENT

- Assessment of context provide partners with a route to identifying the elements of the context most in need of attention (guardianship, group dynamic, wider environmental factors) as a means of tracing impact
- Assessments of contexts provide partners with some information regarding why a context is in need of attention (guardianship, group dynamic, wider environmental factors) – this has acted as further baseline for tracking impact. The practice is inconsistent and/or is not supported via a framework
- Contexts are rarely assessed and when identified are responded to via tasking interventions intended to impact the issue that prompted a referral (such as an ASB complaint), as opposed to assess and then track child welfare in the context

PLANNING

- Plans that target contexts and groups associated to EFH are used to agree priority actions against the factors in the context that most require attention – and set the ambitions for intervention (this is the change we expect to see as a result of the plan)
- Some plans that target contexts and groups associated to EFH feature priority actions to address the factors in the context that most require attention – and set the ambitions for intervention (this is the change we expect to see as a result of the plan). This is ad hoc and in some cases, plans are focused on individuals in a context rather than the context itself
- Contexts are not the subject of detailed plans (rather they are targeted with discrete interventions) and/or interventions are planned around crime prevention and community safety

RESPONSE

- Interventions are aimed at having contextual impact – and this is what is recorded when plans are reviewed. Interventions that impact individual young people, but in which contextual risks persists, will be insufficient in the system
- Some interventions are used to make contextual impact. This is sometimes recorded on plans; on other occasions it is more informal. Some contextual interventions are measured by the behaviour of individuals in the context rather than the culture/norms of the context
- Interventions that target contexts are largely measured with reference to rates for crime or anti-social behaviour statistics rather than in relation to child welfare

---