Consortium for the Regional Support for Women in Disadvantaged and Rural Areas

Response to: 'Co-operating to safeguard children and young people in Northern Ireland: a draft document for consultation'

Issued by: Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety for Northern Ireland

August 2015

Prepared by:
Dr Caroline Walsh
Women's Support Network
policy@wsn.org.uk

Foyle Women's Information Network

Women's Regional Consortium: Working to Support Women in Rural Communities and Disadvantaged Urban Areas

1. Introduction

1.1 This response has been undertaken collaboratively by the members of the Consortium for the Regional Support for Women in Disadvantaged and Rural Areas, which is funded by the Department for Social Development in Northern Ireland and the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development in Northern Ireland.

1.2 The Women's Regional Consortium consists of seven established women's sector organisations that are committed to working in partnership with each other, government, statutory organisations and women's organisations, centres and groups working in disadvantaged and rural areas, to ensure that organisations working for women are given the best possible support in the work they do in tackling disadvantage and social exclusion.[1] The seven groups are as follows:

- Training for Women Network (TWN) – Project Lead
- Women's Resource and Development Agency (WRDA)
- Women's Support Network (WSN)
- Northern Ireland's Rural Women's Network (NIRWN)
- Women's TEC
- Women's Centre Derry (WCD)
- Foyle Women's Information Network (FWIN)

1.3 The Consortium will be the established link and strategic partner between government and statutory agencies and women in disadvantaged and rural areas, including all groups, centres and organisations delivering essential frontline services, advice and support. The Consortium will ensure that there is a continuous two way flow of information between government and the sector. It will ensure that organisations/centres and groups are made aware of consultations, government planning and policy implementation. In turn, the

[1] Sections 1.2-1.3 represent the official description of the Consortium's work, as agreed and authored by its seven partner organisations.

Consortium will ascertain the views, needs and aspirations of women in disadvantaged and rural areas and take these views forward to influence policy development and future government planning, which will ultimately result in the empowerment of local women in disadvantaged and rurally isolated communities.

1.4 This response is informed by women's views and perspectives articulated at focus groups organised at FWIN and Greenway Women's Centre (as facilitated by WSN) on the 21 and 27 July 2015, respectively. Appendix 1 provides further detail on this engagement.

2. General comments

2.1 The Women's Regional Consortium appreciates the opportunity to respond to the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety for Northern Ireland's 'Co-operating to safeguard children and young people in Northern Ireland: a draft document for consultation'.[2]

2.2 Research affirms the different ways in which the individual's experience of 'harm' as a child or adolescent (whether abuse, neglect or exploitation) can profoundly impact her development and well being, variously constraining life chances and later life outcomes in areas such as health, education, employment, lifetime earnings and social mobility.[3] Research also affirms that the effects of such harm can be transgenerational. For example, the experience of child abuse is associable with stress in later life that may adversely impact foetal and child development as well as later health outcomes for the child of the abuse parent.[4] Research also evidences myriad

[2] DHSSPSNI, 'Co-operating to safeguard children and young people in Northern Ireland: a draft document for consultation', DHSSPSNI: Belfast, 2015

[3] See, for example, K. W. Springer et al., 'The long-term health outcomes of childhood abuse: an overview and a call to action', *Gen. Intern. Med.,* 18(10), 2003: 864–870; also, J. Currie and C. S. Widom, 'Long-term consequences of child abuse and neglect on adult economic well-being', *Child Maltreat.,* 15(2), 2010: 111-120.

[4] G. N. Neigh, L. A. Ritschel and C. B. Nemeroff, 'Biological consequences and transgenerational impact of violence and abuse', *Psychiatric Times*, November 17, 2010. [Online]. Available at: http://www.psychiatrictimes.com/ptsd/biological-consequences-and-transgenerational-impact-violence-and-abuse

cross-sectoral challenges to safeguarding, whether at the level of policy, practice, the structural or the cultural.[5]

From this perspective, the Consortium welcomes this consultation exercise as indication of the Executive's intent to develop cross-departmental strategic policy, which, precisely by seeking to address factors underlying such challenges, aims at 'ensur[ing] children and young people are safeguarded as effectively as possible'.[6]

That said, clearly it is imperative that the proposed policy framework is developed and implemented in such a way as to properly capture and remedially address the complexity of the interacting issues at stake in this debate (whether in terms, say, of the mutually affecting factors underlying the risk of harm and its prevention, or the differentiated nature of the experience of harm and its cumulative impact). *Yet, in a context of ongoing and extended austerity, we remain concerned about the potential of the proposals to meaningfully realise this imperative in sustainable ways.*

Particular concerns centre around the potential impact on safeguarding delivery and/or outcomes of the following interacting austerity-related factors: constraints on cross-sectoral and inter-agency resourcing associable with prolonged exceptional fiscal constraints; reduced/depleted third sector capacity correlated to intensified competition for scarce public funding and/or funding withdrawal; and, the relationship between austerity-aggravated poverty and the risk of harm.

Participants in the focus group engagement articulated these concerns and raised associated misgivings, as will be shown in the remainder of the paper.

[5] See, for example, K. Martin, J. Jeffes and S. Macleod, 'Safeguarding children - literature review', Local Government Association, Slough: 2010.
[6] DHSSPSNI, op. cit., p.6

3. Specific comments

Safeguarding practice under extended austerity

3.1 Research evidences that extended austerity in the United Kingdom case and beyond 'is contributing to inequality that will make economic weakness *longer-lived*', affecting increased poverty and vulnerability among the already most vulnerable.[7] Longer-lived economic weakness of this kind may be associated with the prolongation of fiscal constraints. And, the latter may, in turn, be associated with the extension of severe retrenchments in social expenditure.

In combination, these associations may conceivably further intensify cross-sectoral competition for already scarce public resources, among actors with comparably compelling priorities, reflecting different kinds of vulnerable cohort perspectives, interests and needs across contrasting section 75 categories. The substantive point here is consequently this: as research suggests, such an exceptionally constrained funding environment may ultimately threaten cross-sectoral service delivery and outcomes for such cohorts, with possible attendant safeguarding implications.[8] This section and the next will concentrate largely on potential public sector and community sector ramifications.

Austerity and public sector safeguarding

Research illuminates how ongoing austerity-associated cross-sectoral budgetary constraint in the United Kingdom case is adversely impacting vital frontline statutory safeguarding provision, threatening safeguarding outcomes for the most vulnerable: 'funding is being withdrawn from many critical preventative and early intervention [public sector] services that play an important role in the lives of vulnerable children'.[9] Particularly affected areas

[7] J. Stiglitz, quoted in Oxfam, 'Oxfam briefing paper summary: a cautionary tale - the true cost of austerity and inequality in Europe', Oxfam: London, 2013, p.2.

[8] On this, see, for example: NICCY et al., 'Report of the UK Children's Commissioners UN Committee on the Rights of the Child; examination of the Fifth Periodic Report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland', NICCY et al., 2015. [Online]. Available at: http://www.niccy.org/about-us/news/latest-news/2015/july/01/fear-of-further-rises-in-child-poverty-in-northern-ireland/

[9] Ibid., p.6.

include social work and mental health. For example, it has been suggested that ongoing austerity-related retrenchments in social work expenditure, in combination with 'record' service demand, may be 'putting children at risk'[10] by contributing to the raising of interventionist thresholds to save time and money.[11] In consequence, affected social services are reportedly 'able to focus *only on the very worst cases*'.[12]

Commenting on the Northern Ireland case, despite acknowledging some improvement in safeguarding by public authorities in recent decades, focus group participants also anecdotally evidenced the adverse impact of such austerity-aggravated statutory underprovision on the everyday lives and well being of affected individuals, citing examples that related not only to social work but also health visiting.

Compounding contextual factors in the jurisdiction include severe underprovision in mental health. Mental health services for vulnerable children and adolescents in Northern Ireland remain 'woefully under-funded',[13] despite stark mental health indicators, which emerge when the region is compared to other jurisdictions in the region. For instance, in 2012, the five-year average rates of suicide in Northern Ireland for 15-19 year olds were four times higher than comparatives for England and Wales, while the equivalent rates for 10-14 year olds were seventeen times higher.[14] Discussants consequently called for remedial action to effectively address such underprovision, mitigate its impact and so deliver enhanced prevention and protection, including more effective early intervention and family support. This call was informed by the

[10] K. Dutta, 'Social work budget cuts are putting children at risk, says NSPCC', *The Independent,* 31 March 2014. [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/social-work-budget-cutsare-putting-children-at-risk-says-nspcc-9224796.html

[11] C. Pemberton, 'Community care survey exposes how rising thresholds are leaving children in danger', *Community Care*, November 19, 2013. [Online]. Available at: http://www.communitycare.co.uk/2013/11/19/community-care-survey-exposes-rising-thresholds-leaving-children-danger/

[12] Dutta, op. cit.

[13] NICCY, 'Fear of further rises in child poverty in Northern Ireland', NICCY, 1 July 2015. [Online]. Available at: http://www.niccy.org/about-us/news/latest-news/2015/july/01/fear-of-further-rises-in-child-poverty-in-northern-ireland/

[14] NICCY et al., op. cit., p. 25.

widely held view that: ‘support early on may be all [an at-risk] family needs’ to prevent matters escalating (FWIN focus group).

Against this backdrop, it is alarming that the consultation document fails to specify a dedicated budgetary commitment attached to the overall implementation of the proposed policy framework. The latter will apparently require a resource-dependent regional updating of procedures across government departments, their agencies and arms-length bodies. Yet the consultation screening document acknowledges a dearth of such resourcing across implicated public sector organisations.[15] So, for example, it is noted that the Safeguarding Board for Northern Ireland *does not have sufficient resources to deliver change to regional multi-agency operational procedures as required under the framework*.[16] For obvious reasons, this shortfall in requisite implementation funding represents a fundamental threat to the realisation of intended aims under the framework.

To further compound matters, leading commentators in this field project that the anticipated model of extended austerity is likely to threaten child service provision across all four jurisdictions of the United Kingdom still further, with associated adverse implications for child rights fulfilment across increasingly vulnerable cohorts.[17]

Despite this projection, and the correlation at hand underlying it, between austerity-associated budgetary constraints and actual/projected risks to child outcomes, as research affirms, the Executive neither (i) routinely reports on how much it spends on children services;[18] nor, (ii) routinely undertakes child rights-based analysis of its budgetary and economic decision-making.[19] Again, for obvious reasons, disaggregated data gaps of this kind may

[15] DHSSPSNI, ‘Equality screening, disability duties and human rights assessment template: a safeguarding policy for children and young people in Northern Ireland’, DHSSPSNI: Belfast, 2015, p.3.
[16] Ibid., loc. cit.
[17] NICCY et al., op. cit.
[18] That said, we understand that the Executive has been involved in a fund mapping exercise commissioned by NICCY and Atlantic Philanthropies, which is due to be published in October 2015. Ibid., p.6.
[19] Ibid.

potentially frustrate realisation of government ambition for meaningful and effectual *evidence-based* policy development, implementation, monitoring and review in this area.

Recommendation

The Consortium recommends that the Executive consider further the nature of the actual/projected relationship between extended austerity and effective public sector safeguarding, seeking therein to identify and take proper account of any adverse correlation between fiscal exceptionality and safeguarding capacity/delivery, while also (i) ensuring that implementation of the proposed framework is properly underpinned financially; and, (ii) supplementing that undertaking with transparent child rights-based analysis of all budgetary decision making processes across both extant and emerging initiatives.

Austerity and underprovision at the level of the community

3.2 We turn now, briefly, to consider the question of austerity and underprovision in safeguarding at the level of the community.

The consultation document rightly acknowledges the significant safeguarding role played by the third sector in Northern Ireland: '[the sector] contribute[s] to safeguarding children through ... provision of services to children generally, as well as providing more tailored support to families to assist them in keeping their children safe'.[20] Participants anecdotally evidenced this contribution, positing strong associations between family support in the third sector and the prevention of harm. The document's recognition of this role is, of course, to be welcomed. However, the important point here is this: *in setting out the intended delivery framework, the document also presupposes the continuity of that role under the lifetime of the framework, which is problematic in a context of extended austerity*.

[20] DHSSPSNI, 'Co-operating', op. cit., p.24.

The realities of an austerity-aggravated funding status quo for the sector, as characterised by intense competition for increasingly scarce resources, are such that the continuity of that role cannot – and should not - be taken for granted. That status quo is such that, in some instances, integrated services at the level of community, such as childcare and education, have been depleted, while in others they have been withdrawn altogether.

Participants affirmed this trajectory, complaining that, in a context of increasingly constrained funding, government expected the sector to assist with the implementation of this - and other - social policy developments without proper public subsidy for that assistance. On this view, as one discussant put it, government expected that the sector should 'do more with less to help implement its policy' (Greenway Women's Centre focus group). It was forecast that safeguarding in the community for vulnerable cohorts could be fundamentally jeopardised as a result. And, an appeal was consequently made for appropriate public recognition and subsidisation of such assistance. This view was summarised by one discussant thus: 'if government wants a quality [service], then it should have to pay for it' (Greenway Women's Centre focus group).

There is clearly urgency inherent in the question of how such reported depletion in delivery at the level of community might cumulatively impact vulnerable children and adolescents, and how any such impact might best be remedially addressed. Best practice would suggest that addressing this relationship between austerity-aggravated underprovision and safeguarding outcomes in more effective and meaningful ways will require properly joined-up, collaborative approaches across public authorities and beyond, and discussants consequently called for more substantive collaboration of this kind, to include more meaningful inclusion of the third sector at different stages of prevention, protection and intervention, such as post-referral.

In sum, against a challenging backdrop of, inter alia, austerity-aggravated actual/projected vulnerability among children and adolescents, cross-sectoral retrenchment and service depletion, we remain concerned at the capacity of

the Executive to realise its intent of ensuring 'effective' safeguarding under the proposed framework.

Recommendation

The Consortium recommends that the Executive take proper account of the relationship between fiscal exceptionality and safeguarding capacity at the level of the community, seeking to effectively mitigate any and all adverse effects therein, while also taking seriously enough the wider, cumulative safeguarding impact of cross-sectoral service depletion and retrenchment.

Harm prevention in a context of welfare reform

3.3 Research points to a glaring, fundamental inconsistency in Executive policy development in respect of the targeting of safeguarding outcomes, which relates to previous comment on the potential safeguarding impact of ongoing austerity. On the one hand, the consultation document emphasises the centrality of harm prevention in prevailing safeguarding discourse and policy development. But on the other, of course, also under consideration at the legislature is welfare reform, which the literature cites as correlated to 'disproportionate harm' to children and adolescents.[21]

The latter has, in large part, been attributed to the potential of the reform to aggravate poverty among at-risk and vulnerable cohorts, poverty which may have previously been aggravated by already implemented austerity.[22] That potentiality is evidenced by research that indicates 'harsh consequences [of such reform] for vulnerable people... affect[ing] all disadvantaged

[21] E. Dugan, 'Vulnerable young people should stay in care until they turn 25, says Children's Commissioner', *The Independent*, Wednesday 8 July, 2015. [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/vulnerable-young-people-should-stay-in-care-until-they-turn-25-says-childrens-commissioner-10373519.html

[22] Stiglitz, op. cit. On this, see, for example, Fawcett Society, 'The impact of austerity on women, policy briefing', Fawcett Society: London, 2012; L. James and J. Patiniotis, 'Women at the cutting edge: why public sector spending cuts in Liverpool are a gender equality issue', Liverpool John Moores University: Liverpool, 2013; J. Portes and H. Reed, 'Austerity has hit women, ethnic minorities and the disabled most', *The Guardian*, 31 July 2014; A. Power et al., 'The impact of welfare reform on social landlords and tenants', JRF, London: 2014; and, M. Aylott et al., 'An insight into the impact of the cuts on some of the most vulnerable in Camden', Young Foundation: London, 2012.

communities'[23] associated, variously, with a reported 'widespread increase in poverty'[24] as well as anxiety, debt and health problems.[25]

It is projected that the financial loss of proposed welfare reform to Northern Ireland, per adult of working age, will be 'substantially larger than in any other part of the [United Kingdom]'.[26] And, it has consequently been forecast that 'the government's expenditure plans [in respect of welfare reform] run the risk of having *a further huge impact* on child poverty' in the jurisdiction.[27] Levels of persistent child poverty in the jurisdiction are already higher than in the remainder of the United Kingdom,[28] with further significant increases in relative and absolute child poverty predicted by 2020.[29]

The adverse impact of child poverty on child and adolescent well being as well as later life outcomes has been extensively documented in the literature. Family income can 'in some instances [have] *quite substantial* [adverse] effects on child and adolescent well-being'.[30] For instance, children in lower-income families may have 'worse cognitive, social-behavioural and health outcomes *in part because they are poorer*',[31] while outcomes tend to remain worse for those in persistent poverty.[32]

Although abuse and neglect of children can, of course, occur at any income level, research evidences a 'strong association' between 'economic stress' and child neglect, and that low-income parents are four times more likely to feel chronically stressed than parents with higher incomes.[33] Participants

[23] Power et al., op. cit., p.1.
[24] Ibid., p.5.
[25] James and Patiniotis, op. cit.
[26] C. Beatty and S. Fothergill, 'The impact of welfare reform on Northern Ireland: a research paper', NICVA: Belfast: 2013, p.5.
[27] NICCY, op. cit.
[28] Ibid.
[29] J. Browne, A. Hood and R. Joyce, 'Child and working-age poverty in Northern Ireland from 2010 to 2020, IFS Report R78', Institute for Fiscal Studies: London, 2013.
[30] J. Brooks-Gunn and G. J. Duncan. 'The effects of poverty on children', *Children and Poverty*, Vol. 7, No. 2 – Summer/Fall 1997, p.55.
[31] K. Cooper and K. Stewart, 'Does money affect children's outcomes?' LSE and JRF: London, 2013, p.1.
[32] Brooks-Gunn and Duncan, op. cit.
[33] I. Katz, J. Corlyon, V. La Placa and S. Hunter, 'The relationship between parenting and poverty', Joseph Rowntree Foundation, London: 2007, p.23.

anecdotally reported escalating austerity-related economic stress in the jurisdiction, aggravated by some of the structural and other threats to emotional well being (stressors) that can be particularly prevalent in the most deprived areas, such as economic inactivity and benefit dependency. On this view, in so far as welfare reform might contribute to poverty and financial vulnerability conducive to economic stress, and the latter may be associable with neglect, then such reform threatens to adversely impact safeguarding.

The projection of 'disproportionate harm'[34] to children and adolescents under welfare reform raises the social justice question of how the Executive might prevent such harm following any introduction of such change in the Northern Ireland case. The Department for Social Development has already set out plans intended to help 'mitigate... the negative aspects' of any such eventuality.[35] Yet the austerity-constrained/responsive nature of any such mitigation should be noted, since ongoing austerity-associated fiscal constraints will seemingly continue to frame and, ultimately circumscribe, substantive decision-making and budgetary allocation.

Recommendation

As it takes forward these proposals, and in the advent of any introduction of welfare reform in the jurisdiction, the Executive should commit to mapping and *meaningfully* mitigating the relationship between poverty and harm to children and adolescents associable not only with such reform, but also all emerging strategies, policies and programmes under planned wider and extended austerity.

Collaborative working: addressing 'tensions'

3.4 As the document illustrates, the actors involved in, and the implications and demands of, safeguarding are such that the nature of this policy area is best understood as intrinsically cross-sectoral and cross-departmental, with effective safeguarding fundamentally relying on properly integrated,

[34] Dugan, op. cit.
[35] DSD, 'Ministerial letter to the church leaders' group', DSD: Belfast, 2014. [Online]. Available at: http://www.dsdni.gov.uk/church-leaders-group-oct14.pdf

collaborative working. We have already touched on the question of collaboration between third sector and public authorities, and this section focuses specifically on inter-agency arrangements.

As research affirms, inter-agency collaborative endeavour can present significant challenges to effective safeguarding, particularly cultural and operational variants. For example, in terms of the cultural, collaborative enterprise in safeguarding has historically been frustrated by skewed provider perspective: 'there has been a perception [among providers] that safeguarding children is the responsibility of children's social care, *rather than everybody's responsibility*'.'[36]

In terms of the operational, notable challenges to collaborative ambition have included problems with inter-agency accountability and perspectival conflict. For instance, research suggests that lack of clarity across collaborating bodies, about who precisely should take responsibility in safeguarding, may result in 'dysfunction at both operational and strategic levels'.[37] Related challenges include impediments to the cultivation of shared understanding and shared approaches across *different kinds* of agencies, resulting in operational 'tensions', such as those that have arisen from contrasting perspectives on safeguarding between adult and children's service providers.[38]

Unfortunately, the document only contains one short paragraph on collaborative working, which neither directly addresses the issue of inter-agency conflict nor provides for the arbitration of same. Such issues around collaborative working reinforce the requirement for robust multi-actor operational procedures across agencies and beyond on a regional basis, and the documentation proposes an update of such procedures. Yet, alarmingly, as previously observed, the documentation also notes that the body charged

[36] Martin, Jeffes and Macleod, op. cit. p.14.
[37] Ibid., p.13.
[38] Ibid., p.14

with developing such regional procedures *'do[es] not have sufficient resources'* to fulfil that brief.[39]

Recommendation

The Consortium recommends that, in developing the document, the department give further consideration and clarity under 8.1 to (i) the issue of barriers to effective inter-agency collaboration in safeguarding; (ii) the tackling of same in pursuit of improved practice and behaviour; and, (iii) the question of funding for the development of robust regional multi-agency operational procedures.

Awareness-raising and cultural change

3.5 We note with particular interest that one of the principal aims of the proposed framework is to 'embed a culture which recognises the child's or young person's fundamental right to be safe';[40] while a related aim is to 'prevent harm occurring by increasing public awareness of harm and its effects'.[41] While we, of course, welcome both aims, we have reservations about the government's potential to meaningfully realise them in an austerity-driven context of exceptional fiscal constraint.

Research suggests that while public awareness campaigns 'can make a significant contribution to the prevention of abuse', they are 'more effective if backed up by information and advice about where to get help and ... services to respond'.[42] Worryingly, however, anecdotal evidence from discussants cited significant gaps in awareness at the level of the community in respect of safeguarding information, advice and delivery, affecting different kinds of stakeholder: inter alia, community organisations, children, adolescents and parents/guardians.

[39] DHSSPSNI, 'Equality Screening', op. cit., p.3.
[40] DHSSPSNI, 'Co-operating', op. cit., p.7.
[41] Ibid., loc. cit.
[42] Social Care Institute for Excellence, 'Report 41: prevention in adult safeguarding', SCIE: London. [Online]. Available at: http://www.scie.org.uk/publications/reports/report41/publicawareness.asp

A plethora of remedial actions was consequently proposed, which included the following: improved networking and informational opportunities for the wider safeguarding sector; stakeholder workshops; and, more direct engagement and consultation with children and young people through such initiatives as school visits, information days and innovative use of social media, aimed at addressing a range of reportedly 'escalating' issues (such as grooming and peer on peer harm involving cyber bullying, sexualised misbehaviour and an absence of respect for diversity). The need for intervention in respect of peer on peer harm was judged particularly urgent. As one discussant put it: 'more preventative work needs to ... funded and delivered so at an appropriate age young people understand what's right and wrong and where appropriate boundaries lie' (FWIN focus group). Such initiatives were also identified as a potential means of effecting requisite cultural change in the promotion of effective safeguarding, addressing such problems as stigmatisation around referral.

On this view, realisation of the government's ambitions for awareness-raising and cultural change under the proposed framework would require the development of a substantive and robust multi-dimensional campaign of stakeholder engagement underpinned by appropriate resourcing. Yet, in a context of extended austerity it, of course, remains to be seen whether any such support will be made available, particularly in light of other extant resourcing gaps in implementation of the framework, as noted above.

Recommendation

Effective delivery under the proposed framework will intrinsically rely on effective campaigning to realise meaningful change in attitude, knowledge, understanding, perception and normative outlook in respect of safeguarding. The Executive is urged to commit to devising, implementing and properly resourcing such an initiative on an integrated regional basis.

4. Conclusion

This paper has explored the nature of the relationship between extended austerity, the constrained cross-sectoral funding status quo in the Northern

Ireland case and safeguarding across vulnerable cohorts, which, as we have seen, is well established in the literature. As we have also seen, the literature provides important insight into the nature of what is at stake in this debate by documenting the fundamental risk to safeguarding posed by austerity and the cumulative – at times, intergenerational - impact of the experience of harm.

Building on that insight, an urgent social justice case has been made for more meaningful policy development and service delivery in this field, calling on the Executive to take due account of this risk and that impact *in all its guises* on a properly integrated, coordinated and sustainable cross-sectoral basis.

Bibliography

Aylott, M. et al. (2012). 'An insight into the impact of the cuts on some of the most vulnerable in Camden', Young Foundation: London.

Beatty, C. and S. Fothergill. (2013). 'The impact of welfare reform on Northern Ireland: a research paper', NICVA: Belfast.

Brooks-Gunn, J. and G. J. Duncan. (1997). 'The effects of poverty on children', Children and Poverty, Vol. 7, No. 2 – Summer/Fall.

Browne, J., A. Hood and R. Joyce. (2013). 'Child and working-age poverty in Northern Ireland from 2010 to 2020, IFS Report R78', Institute for Fiscal Studies: London.

CEDAW. (2013). 'Concluding observations on the seventh periodic report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland', UN: Geneva.

Cooper K. and K. Stewart. (2013). 'Does money affect children's outcomes?' LSE and JRF: London.

Currie, J. and C.S. Widom. (2010). 'Long-term consequences of child abuse and neglect on adult economic well-being', *Child Maltreat.,* May; 15(2): 111-120.

DHSSPSNI. (2015). 'Co-operating to safeguard children and young people in Northern Ireland: a draft document for consultation', DHSSPSNI: Belfast.

DHSSPSNI. (2015). 'Equality screening, disability duties and human rights assessment template: a safeguarding policy for children and young people in Northern Ireland', DHSSPSNI: Belfast.

DSD. (2014). 'Ministerial letter to the church leaders' group', DSD: Belfast. [Online]. Available at: http://www.dsdni.gov.uk/church-leaders-group-oct14.pdf

Dugan, E. (2015). 'Vulnerable young people should stay in care until they turn 25, says Children's Commissioner', *The Independent*, Wednesday 8 July. [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/vulnerable-young-people-should-stay-in-care-until-they-turn-25-says-childrens-commissioner-10373519.html

Dutta, K. (2014). 'Social work budget cuts are putting children at risk, says NSPCC', *The Independent,* 31 March. [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/social-work-budget-cutsare-putting-children-at-risk-says-nspcc-9224796.html

Fawcett Society. (2012). 'The impact of austerity on women, policy briefing', Fawcett Society: London.

Hinds, B. (2010). 'The Northern Ireland economy: women on the edge - a comprehensive analysis of the impacts of the financial crisis', WRDA: Belfast.

James, L. and J. Patiniotis. (2013). 'Women at the cutting edge: why public sector spending cuts in Liverpool are a gender equality issue', Liverpool John Moores University: Liverpool.

Katz, I. et al. (2007). 'The relationship between parenting and poverty', Joseph Rowntree Foundation, London.

Martin, K., J. Jeffes and S. Macleod. (2010). 'Safeguarding children - literature review', Local Government Association, Slough.

Neigh, G. N., L. A. Ritschel and C. B. Nemeroff. (2010). 'Biological consequences and transgenerational impact of violence and abuse', *Psychiatric Times*, November 17. [Online]. Available at: http://www..com/ptsd/biological-consequences-and-transgenerational-impact-violence-and-abuse#sthash.7VNZpPCO.dpuf

NICCY. (2015). ‘Fear of further rises in child poverty in Northern Ireland’, NICCY: Belfast. [Online]. Available at: http://www.niccy.org/about-us/news/latest-news/2015/july/01/fear-of-further-rises-in-child-poverty-in-northern-ireland/

NICCY et al. (2015). ‘Report of the UK Children’s Commissioners UN Committee on the Rights of the Child; examination of the Fifth Periodic Report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland’, NICCY et al.: Belfast. [Online]. Available at: http://www.niccy.org/about-us/news/latest-news/2015/july/01/fear-of-further-rises-in-child-poverty-in-northern-ireland/

Oxfam. (2013). ‘Oxfam briefing paper summary: a cautionary tale - the true cost of austerity and inequality in Europe’, Oxfam: London.

Pemberton, C. (2013). ‘Community care survey exposes how rising thresholds are leaving children in danger’, *Community Care*, November 19, 2013. [Online]. Available at: http://www.communitycare.co.uk/2013/11/19/community-care-survey-exposes-rising-thresholds-leaving-children-danger/

Portes, J. and H. Reed. (2014). ‘Austerity has hit women, ethnic minorities and the disabled most’, *The Guardian*, 31 July.

Power, A. et al. (2014). ‘The impact of welfare reform on social landlords and tenants’, JRF, London.

Springer, K. W. et al. (2003). ‘The long-term health outcomes of childhood abuse an overview and a call to action’, *Gen. Intern. Med.,* Oct., 18(10): 864-870.

Appendix 1

Women's Regional Consortium: Focus Group Detail
DHSSPSNI's 'Co-operating to safeguard children and young people in Northern Ireland: a draft document for consultation'

Focus group locations and dates

- FWIN-facilitated event at its Derry premises, 21 July 2015.
- WSN-facilitated event at Greenway Women's Centre, Belfast, 27 July 2015.

Participants' profile summary

- Overall composition: included some venue staff, board members, volunteers, service users and, more generally, women living and working in different localities, including parents, young and older people.