

CPC4 webinar recording

(Colin Anderson) Good morning. And thanks, Joe. And thanks everyone involved at Strathclyde and CELCIS for getting us to this point and, particularly getting me set up with my technology, which doesn't always come easy to me. So thank you for that, as I just re-emphasise what Joe said there, this is part of a series of events that Child Protection Committee Scotland Neglect Subgroup has organised and is the fourth in the series. And as Joe said, part of the evaluation we're looking for is to hear what people think would be helpful if we did run another series into the beginning of next year. I have to say, however, that this particular subject was one which the Neglect Subgroup were really interested in taking forward. And I think the interest we've had in general, shows how important this is and how people are genuinely struggling to address some of the issues that Phil is going to cover for us.

I have a particular vested interest in this, because just at the end of last year, I did a case learning review on a young person who died of a drug overdose. And indeed, as is often the case, their own parents had also been a substance misusers. And that situation, really throws up all the issues about family support systems and the Children's Hearing System and associated issues around getting support and interagency involvement to address the issues. You will have seen the materials that came out and the focus that we are going to have about reflecting on what we know about adolescent neglect, including findings from research that took innovative approaches to measuring neglect.

And as you know, one of the things that we as a Neglect Subgroup are now really focusing on is the impact of the cost of living crisis, and the impact of poverty and inequalities. And we would now want to address neglect through a structural or societal approach.

So it's never been more important in terms of timing to look at that. So I'm really, really pleased to introduce Phil Raws, who's a senior researcher at the Children's Society. It's a charity that has a long heritage in England, but he's also very welcome Scotland, of supporting disadvantaged children and young people, advocating for change to improve their lives. Phil has been with the Children's Society for over 15 years having previously worked for the University of York, Leeds and Bradford. He has been involved in research in a broad range of topics including children care, leaving care, young runaways, child abuse and exploitation, neglect, and parenting of adolescents and children's well-being.

And as I said at the outset, this really, really chimes with where we are right now and the issues that we're trying to tackle here in Scotland. So without further ado, I will hand you over to Phil. Thank you, Phil.

(Phil Raws) Thank you, Colin, for that very warm welcome. And hi, everybody. I'm going to try to share my screen so that we can start with the presentation. Okay, so the presentation is called The Adolescent Neglect Conundrum. And how can we respond better? Before we get into that, I'm obliged to tell you a little bit about my organisation which Colin has already mentioned. But we do have a very long history, we've been working with vulnerable children and young people since the 1880s. This is a

picture of our founder, Sir Edward Rudolph, with two of the early charges in our residential care homes. You may know that lots of Victorian charities ran residential care homes and Edward Rudolph, I think he must have been a researcher at heart because he insisted that a photograph was taken of every child to be cared for. And there are very extensive case notes on all of them. And that's all available online in an archive. So if you're interested, do go to the hidden lives website (www.hiddenlivesorg.uk). In terms of what we do now, we have services across England for young people and families. And we have a big central function of which I'm part which effectively does influencing and campaigning and research to try to advocate for change and improve disadvantaged young people's lives. In the presentation this morning, I'm going to try to cover three things. I'm going to discuss what the concept of adolescent neglect is or what it means, I'm going to outline what we know from research on adolescent neglect, including on prevalence and the impacts that it can have and I'll also describe a study that the Children's Society has done which took a fresh approach to measuring neglect.

And then I'm going to try to outline what I think the evidence from research and practice offers to us in terms of progressing the agenda to respond. You'll probably notice me looking down - I've got some notes in front of me - I found this forum for presenting quite difficult actually, having got very used to big audiences. So sitting on your own and talking to yourself is quite tricky, so I've got some notes to try and keep me on track.

Okay, the Children's Society has studied adolescent neglect since around 2008, often working in partnership with colleagues at the University of York, including Professor Mike Stein, whom some of you might come across in relation to this, or because of his pioneering work on leaving care. For the webinar, I will draw on some of the research we've done together, but also on wider work on adolescents, parenting and disadvantage.

These are some of the publications that have flowed from our work. The one on the left is a book which summarised the state of play with regard to adolescent neglect. The other two are more recent publications, the troubled teens report in the centre there, which I'm going to refer to later in the presentation. And the other is a report which I'm going to refer to as well, which was commissioned by a local safeguarding children board in Luton in the south east of England. The two reports, one in the middle and the one on the right. They're available online freely. And I'm hoping that you'll get a handout after the webinar, which will give you lots of links to online resources so that you can have a look at this in more detail if you want to. So, you may be wondering why I gave the webinar the title, The Adolescent Neglect Conundrum. So I thought I should explain. As I just mentioned, in 2017, the Children's Society was commissioned by the Luton Safeguarding Children Board to work with it on a strategy around neglect. Most of the project consisted of reviewing literature and delivering training alongside a final report and findings. My report included a whole chapter devoted to the topic, *what is adolescent neglect?* And when I visited a board meeting to present the findings, one member looked at me askance and said, We know what adolescent neglect is, the point is to decide what to do about it. At the time, I was slightly taken aback - this wasn't really the forum for a debate about terminology, and the rationale for the report and its contents. But I could understand the degree of professional impatience and a desire to discuss solutions and move forwards. But at the same time, I also felt and I continue to feel that the comment encapsulated one of the main problems that we have in addressing the topic of adolescent neglect. I was putting forward the view - and I'm proposing that one again today,

that adolescent neglect remains poorly understood, that we still haven't really taken the time to think through what we mean by the term, and to explore the complexity that it presents.

The view that I'm putting forward has also been asserted by other researchers, as you can see in this quote from an article in 2016, but that's in relation to neglect in general. And I would argue that we still really need to look at the intersection of neglect and adolescents, something which I think significantly adds to the complexity of the issue. Research in particular, has failed to build an evidence base for effective policy and practice. As I'm going to go on to explain, there has I think, been some good theorization of the concept, but applying it in empirical studies has largely not happened. And extending it to consider young people who are over the age of 10, has also been a rare instance. As a consequence, what we know about neglect is limited and what we know about adolescent neglect to the more limited and piecemeal, so that's why the webinar has the title, The Adolescent Neglect Conundrum.

On a more positive note, though, I do think that we can draw on research and evidence and information from practice on all sorts of other allied topics to develop ways of working that can begin to address adolescent neglect. So I'm going to talk about these later too. So, to begin to consider what adolescent neglect is let's start thinking about adolescence. As you all know, adolescence is a period of profound change, including physiological, psychological, emotional and social aspects. A primary characteristic is an increasing drive for choice and autonomy. And part of this is manifesting active engagement with others and the world around, including with parents or carers to try and negotiate, debate and argue and assert individuality. This could also be referred to as exercising agency. And it's a very important part of growing up for young people. The Children's Society has done comprehensive work on children's wellbeing over the past 20 years or so, really. And we produce an annual report on the good childhood, which is something of a State of the Nation thing in England, on children's wellbeing. And we've consistently found that having a sense of choice and autonomy is really, really important and it's associated with higher levels of wellbeing. Also, in adolescence, peers become very important, as you all know, friendships and intimate partnerships can emerge. And the young person's relationship to family changes, something that requires a great deal of flexibility and adaptation on the part of parents or carers. One way of describing adolescence is that it has the goal of self-discovery. At the same time, there is increasing evidence that experience of adolescents in the 21st century, including the rapid expansion of the digital world, pose significant challenges to mental health and wellbeing. The period of adolescence has also been stereotyped as comprising mostly storm and stress. This was a phrase that was first coined in the early 20th century by an American psychologist called Stanley Hall, who portrayed young people as being mostly troublesome, self-obsessed and uncommunicative. When I'm doing this live, I ask members of the audience to offer me words when they see a picture of an adolescent. And these are some of the less positive ones that have arisen in those sessions. And the stereotyping of adolescent young people can have the effects that they're viewed by professionals as being imperfect victims, sometimes regarded as having some responsibility for their victimhood. Examples of this in recent times have included the response to young people, especially young women who were groomed and targeted for sexual exploitation in Rochdale, Rotherham, Telford and other towns and cities across the UK. The same is also true of young people who have become involved in county lines, drug dealing, and other forms of criminal exploitation. And although it's not on the slide, adolescents are also sometimes regarded as being naturally resilient. So they're less vulnerable, seen

as being less vulnerable to the impacts of neglect or other forms of harm than younger children. And this is a mistaken view clearly, but one that can reduce the likelihood of support.

So when is adolescence? Is another question we need to answer. It's another challenge. And if you look at these pictures in front of you, you might recognise them. They're photos of the star of a movie that was released in 2014, called *Boyhood*. And this was filmed over 12 years over the life of young man involved who was called Ellar Coltrane, as he grew up from the ages of six to 18. So these are the pictures of him between 10 and 18. And I wanted to show this slide because I think it's a very vivid demonstration of how much Ellar changed during that period of his life. And we can look at the physical side of it. But we're also I think, hopefully very aware of what's going on behind the face. Psychologists have proposed three distinct phases of development with adolescence: early adolescence from 10 to 13, middle adolescence from 14 to 18, and late adolescence from 19 to 24. And each phase is characterised by progression of different and particular aspects of physical, cognitive or social emotions. But it's also important to understand that individuals can progress at different speeds, and that individual traits like personality can have an impact on how development manifests. So the age range for adolescents is rather hard to pin down, and it's generally regarded as commencing with the onset of puberty. But this is by no means a fixed point in time, and can vary widely. And there's good evidence in recent years that the average age for the start of puberty is decreasing. Determining the interface between adolescence and adulthood, also poses challenges as well. Most research in the UK has taken the convenient route of using 17 as the cutoff. But legislation and life in general is rather more vague. As you might know, young people are sometimes regarded as being an adult at the age of 16, sometimes 18 and it's really quite a mess in terms of where the formal cut off should be, there are lots of debates ongoing about when someone can be said to be independent in post industrial societies, for example, because of the ongoing economic dependence of many young people often into their late 20s. And so this meant that some organisations including the World Health Organisation, and UNICEF, have extended their definition of adolescence to include young people up to the age of 19. And it's been argued that childhood could logically be extended to the mid 20s. Adolescence is then far from cut and dried in terms of how long it lasts. And it's a lengthy transition, neatly described by one academic as starting in nature, and ending in culture. Overall then, adolescence presents a range of challenges for conceptualization and understanding of adolescent neglect. In particular, the shifting needs that arise as a young person matures through the eight or more years of this period of development.

Turning to neglect, I'm going to assume that you're familiar with the official definition that's used in Scotland, so I'm not going to read it out. And it very much mirrors the one that's used in England in our working together guidance. We don't have time for a full critique of its contents. But I would suggest that there's much about it that that's not very helpful for defining the neglect of adolescence. And this includes things like the fact that there's a strong onus on physical aspects of neglect, that the definition is primarily framed around the needs of younger children. And that it suggests that persistence is key, that neglect is always chronic. But researchers have argued that significant single events such as young people being thrown out of home, or episodic poor parenting, perhaps linked with drug use or mental health should be regarded as being neglectful too. And it's perhaps worth noting that the requirement for persistence has been removed from the official definition used in Wales and Northern Ireland. One way of showing how tricky using this definition as the premise for practice is that there are

huge disparities between areas for the numbers of young people are registered for child protection plans for neglect in England. And I'm assuming that that's also true in Scotland.

Researchers studying child maltreatment have proposed typologies to unpack the overarching notion of neglect. So they include up to six categories as shown here, which make distinctions between things like supervisory and emotional neglect, for example. These are really helpful in offering a comprehensive overview of all the different ways in which neglect can be manifested. But unfortunately, much of this useful theory has remained in textbooks and articles. As yet it's rarely been applied to primary research. There's also research available on parenting. And that research has often been built on the theory of parenting styles which was developed in the in the 1970s and then refined in the 1980s. That theory proposes two distinct domains or dimensions of parenting behaviour, demandingness, and responsiveness or control and care, and proposes that the approach taken by parents comprises a combination of how much they behave in these ways. This can be described, for example, as authoritarian parenting, which means that there are high levels of control and low levels of care. And you can see that there are four types of parenting style. The theory has been refined over time. For example it now stresses, or recent research has begun to reinforce the fact that control can be a tangible and direct thing such as rules of negotiation, or it can be psychological forms such as intrusion or criticism and things like that. And there's been plenty of proof now that psychological control can be particularly harmful. This approach has been really useful and effective in describing and studying parenting, but, and it's quite a big but really, neglect has proven to be rather elusive in empirical studies. The three other parenting styles are identifiable in datasets, but neglect does not feature even in comprehensive, large, robust projects. For example, one recently published was based on something called the British Household Panel, which is also known as Understanding Society. And that tracks a large sample of families for over 30 years and regularly measured parenting. But when researchers did some analysis they couldn't locate a group that they described as being neglectful which seems very strange. In the light of the evidence from the other side of the table from maltreatment, which suggests that actually neglect is quite widespread. And this also highlights the fact that we're still some way from having good ways of searching, measuring and understanding neglect. It's pretty important, I think, to also consider what young people say in relation to adolescent neglect. Some time ago now the Children's Society conducted some research on young people's views, and we worked in collaboration with the NSPCC, this was published in around about 2011. The work comprise focus groups with 50 young people aged between 12 and 24, some of whom were known to have experienced neglect, but others who hadn't. We found that they define neglect, rather than more broadly than the official Child Protection definition. And they gave examples like being relied on for informal childcare, or for young people being allowed to become obese, or not being taught skills for independence. Young people often attach greater significance to things other than neglect. And they often struggle to distinguish between forms of harm, seeing a sort of broad spectrum of harm, all of which equated to a lack of care and support for them. In one part of the research, we offered them scenarios, and then talked about different ages. And there were things like when a young person could appropriately be left unsupervised, or when they might do their own washing or cooking. But what we found was that there wasn't a consensus between the young people on what the right age for these things was, as young people pointed out, quite rightly, this was probably relative to an individual's needs or capacity. And this was one of the main takeaways from the research, that what is neglectful depends on how parenting feels and affects each individual young person. I think you could perhaps

also argue that there are elements of what one might call absolute neglect. And that's with regard to some basic or fundamental things like nutrition and physical care.

Although the degree to which this is always the responsibility of parents or carers and not the state might be open to question, as already arisen in terms of some initial mentioning of the cost of living crisis. But almost all the other aspects of neglect for adolescents are somewhat relative to a young person's personality and their needs and their capacity, as well as the context they're living in. So to sum up, this part of the presentation, it is a roundabout way of explaining really, that neglect alone is a very complex issue and adolescence compounds this complexity. And it's really not surprising then, that the issue poses such big challenges for Policy Research and Practice. And that often our responses have been rather poor and not joined up. At this point, I'm going to add that I don't intend this to come across as any sort of criticism of what you or others do in practice. I'm very aware of how hard and stressful your work can be, and how passionate professionals are about supporting and protecting young people. In fact, if anything, I think you've been badly served by research, people in my line of work have largely failed to play our part in providing the evidence and the tools to shape and improve practice over time. So I think you should perhaps view this as something of an apology. Moving on, then. And having decried the world of academic research, I think it's still important to briefly explain some of what is known about adolescent neglect from the research has been published in recent years. And I've put the "know" on this slide in inverted commas deliberately, because evidence in this field is sometimes quite flimsy. And research should always be treated with caution. It's something of a cliché in this field to talk about the neglect of neglect. But it is worth restating. So I mean, that the neglect of child neglect was highlighted, first of all, really in an article that was published some time back, as you can see in 1984. And at the time, that was seen as being quite an important insight. But it's also sad to note that even the most recent publications, this one from 2020, which looked at the global challenge of child neglect, suggests that there hasn't been a great deal of change. And I'm going to give you just one example to sort of illustrate this. So a meta analysis was published in 2013 And that that brought together all the data and evidence that could be found to combine it to try and look at the overall picture. And this was done in terms of physical and emotional neglect. But the researchers found that between 1980 and 2008, which was the period that they were looking at, they could only find 13 studies, which estimated physical neglect, and 16 that estimated emotional neglect. And in contrast, over the same period, there were over 200 studies published which reported rates of sexual abuse. So that's quite a stark difference in terms of how much resource has been devoted to this topic.

Moving on to talk about the scale of neglect, as we know it, there are two ways to look at the scale of neglect. One is to consider how many young people are in the child protection system. Now I apologise, this is data on England. And the chart shows Child Protection registrations data between 1988 and 2016. And it's not for adolescents only, although the figures tend to mirror each other in terms of different age groups. And as you can see, the blue line is for neglect here, the green is for emotional abuse, the red is for physical, and the yellow is for sexual. And over the period of time, you can see that there were sort of slight peaks in registrations for the forms of abuse in the late night in the mid to late 90s. But then it's the trend sort of fell and is now relatively stable at quite a low level. But in contrast, for emotional abuse, and particularly for neglect, the curve has continued to climb. It's probably also important to say that the same seems to be true in all countries across the world.

I'm going to ignore that slide because there's a lot to explain there. Sorry.

I want to also highlight something that's also very important to stress though. And this slide covers some of the headlines from a study that was published in the states which looked at Child Protection data, and adolescent development. Now, the team who did this looked at over 300 records for young people aged nine to 12 when the research began, and they found that over 40% of cases had been registered for neglect sort of mirroring what we've already discussed. But when they looked at the detail in the notes, they felt that 71% had actually been neglected. And that only 5% of those who had been registered for neglect, had no other maltreatment experiences. And that the children who were neglected suffered more different types of maltreatment than those who weren't victims of neglect. So overall, this suggests a number of noteworthy features of neglect as it seems to manifest itself, including that it's often part of wider poly-victimisation in terms of maltreatment. So it's often combined with abuse. And the findings that they had led the team who did this to conclude that official classification shouldn't be used in determining interventions. Intervention should be individualised to address the complexity of children's experiences.

Something else I tend to do when I'm doing a face to face presentation is a quiz. And again, that probably won't work so well in this forum, but I thought I'd throw in a question anyway. So what do you think, is the proportion of young people who are found to have experienced neglect through research, and this is research that used what are called representative samples, so it's pretty, pretty robust. It's a random group, and it represents the spread of ages, gender, ethnicity, and so on and so forth, in the population. So do you think it's 11.6%? Do you think it's 13.3%? Do you think it's 18.4? Or 23.7%?

In fact, I'm afraid it's something of a trick question, because all of those different percentages, all of those estimates have been published in recent reports. And what that really demonstrates is that they're measuring slightly different things. All of them are looking at whether this has happened to a young person at any time in their life. So these are all Under 18s. The first two one was in the US. The second one was done in the UK. Some of you might have come across that one. It's the publication by the NSPCC in 2013. The Radford study it's often referred to as. The bottom two estimates, one is for emotional neglect at some point in their lives. And that's across international studies. And the final figure is for those who were physically neglected at some point before they were 18 - that was done in Germany. Oh, excuse me. But what I want you to take away from the figures is that significant numbers of adolescents suffer neglect, much of it goes unrecognised by child protection systems. And when you see figures in research, they're often slightly vary because they're showing different methodologies and different ways of measuring.

So I'm not going to move on, as I already have done, to talk about the contexts of neglect. So research has suggested that neglect is more likely to arise in situations where there's poverty or in materially deprived areas. Sometimes it's found that it's more often found in families headed by lone parents, especially during transitional phases in family structure for things like the introduction of step parents. It's been found to be more often in families where parents have problems. And that's things like substance misuse, mental health and domestic abuse. And disabled children are more likely to experience neglect. But it's also important to point out that these findings is evidence comes from studies that are based primarily on Child Protection data. So that's known and substantiated cases within the system. And they may not represent the wider picture for contexts, they can and it's important

to say, you know, this can skew some of the debates we have about neglect. And, although we talked about this a little already, but there is a core association between poverty and neglect. That's not to say that poverty causes neglect, that all children living in materially deprived households will be neglected. But it's a strong link. Evidence from the US and the UK suggests that young people living in affluent families may be more likely to experience emotional neglect. So again, it's kind of how you cut it can make a big difference. And on the slides there, it says that, you know, one of the factors to take in mind when you're looking at this is that a lot of methodologies measuring neglect have sort of been built within a model that looks at limited resources. And that obviously limits the scope of the study. The other thing that it's really important to say in terms of this is that using this sort of evidence can reinforce this difficult discourse that blames parents or carers in particular mothers and doesn't take account of a wider social responsibility around neglect. In terms of the impacts of adolescent neglect, it's been linked to mental ill health, poor general health and wellbeing difficulties in relationships, problems with education, risk taking behaviours, as I mentioned before poly-victimisation. So that's exposure to different forms of harm and abuse environments. And also, there are quite recently published studies that show more clearly that there's an intergenerational link in neglect. Some of the more noteworthy studies from the last 10 years or so have compared neglect to other forms of maltreatment. In adolescents sorry. And they found that neglect is more likely to predict teen birth than emotional, physical or sexual abuse. That was a study in the States in 2013. It is more likely to lead to substance abuse disorder, and it's more often linked to aggressive behaviours and involvement in crime.

In terms of the most serious impacts of adolescent neglect, one way in which these have been highlighted is through serious case reviews, as they're called in England, recently renamed as child safeguarding practice reviews. And I understand they're called Learning reviews in Scotland. Now after initially in been called significant case reviews. So there's been a lot of terminology hokey cokey there. But in England, the Department for Education Commission's a three yearly review of findings from case reviews and the authors of the review are academics from a number of universities who are experts on maltreatment, have regularly highlighted the omnipresence of neglect in the lives of adolescents who've been subjected to serious harm. In the most recent review, they reiterated and strengthen the messages on adolescent neglect, including that adolescents living in situations of neglect may be particularly vulnerable in having their needs and the risks that they face overlooked. So to sum up, we know that neglect is the most prevalent form of child maltreatment. And that's how have you measure it, whether it's child protection data or research. And there is some evidence that it's on the increase. Neglect has been associated with particular contexts, for example, in poor families. And we know that neglect in mid adolescence has been associated with mental health and a range of other problems and difficulties, and also that it's ubiquitous in situations of serious harm. But it's also important to know that different approaches to measurement give different results and should be treated with caution. That methodologies can show bias and prejudice. And there's a danger of reinforcing a narrative that blames parents or carers. And that even though I've talked about them briefly, there are rather few impacts or outcome studies, and the evidence is strong, but it's piecemeal. Okay, I'm going to take a slight sidestep now and talk about some research that we did that took a slightly different approach to measuring adolescent neglect. So it's called the Adolescent Neglect Research Programme. It began about 10 years ago, it's a partnership with the University of York. But it's also very much grounded in collaborative work that we've done with colleagues at York over a long period of time, which covers

issues affecting disadvantaged young people. The first output from this programme was called the troubled teams report that came out in 2016. We wanted to be able to ask young people about neglect, but as part of a survey in mainstream schools, so we were working with lots and lots of different constraints, including ethical considerations. So that meant that we couldn't ask direct questions on maltreatment, that would have been entirely inappropriate. So we developed a way of measuring neglect by association. And what we did was we adapted a measure that had already been developed in the states and us with young people. And I'm going to show you that on the next slide. But for the study, we surveyed around 1000 Young people in what's called year 10, in England, that's 14 to 15 year olds, and we asked them about their experiences of parental care and support at home. And then also, I mean, this was embedded in a wider survey on wellbeing, basically. So we asked them about their wellbeing, and we asked them about things like externalising behaviour. So that's things like truanting and drinking alcohol. And also, internalising things like having problems sleeping. And our hypothesis was that less care and support will lead to low wellbeing and more risk taking. So these are the sorts of questions that we asked in relation to parenting behaviours. So young people were asked, in the last year, how often their parents or the adults they lived with, had done a range of basic aspects of care and support, basically. And you'll see that grouped in categories for this table against it educational, emotional support, physical care and supervision. But what I want you to try, and what I'd like you to take away is that they're very clear, they're very straightforward. They're not difficult to think about. And young people were given the option to say whether this happened all the time, it often happened sometimes, hardly ever, or never.

And what we did was that, and I'm going to show you that briefly now is a young person would select their answer. So for this one, it's about emotional support. In the last year, did your parents help you with your problems, this young person has said always, so they tick the box, it's probably also worth mentioning, it didn't look like this in the survey. These questions were scattered around, they weren't in blocks. They weren't labelled, they were just in outline, like, like this. So this young person ticked these options. And behind the questions or the responses, there's a scoring system. So this young person would score a three, a three and a four for emotional support, which would sum to 10. And across the piece, this would mean that young people might score anything on a range from zero to 12, for each of those categories of parenting. And what we did with that is we use the schools and we combined them, and then we could group them, so then we would have group of young people who had a score of 2,3,4,5, etc, for all the different categories of parenting, and then we could do correlation. So we could look at the association between groups with different scores, and things like whether they smoked what they said about their life satisfaction, what they felt about the future and symptoms of mental ill health. So we did this big analysis, where we were basically cross referencing and looking at difference

Now this is just one example of findings, which I think is quite interesting. And this is talking about, again, the emotional support category. And it's looking at the differences in behaviour for young people who we would classify as being well cared for. So those who scored seven or above for emotional support, and those who were determined to be neglected, so they were scoring four or less. And as you can see, young people who were neglected, we're almost twice as likely to say that they'd got really drunk in the past few months. Again, almost twice as likely to say they'd ever smoked, and twice as likely to say that they truanted. So there's a significant difference there in terms of some of the externalising and risk taking behaviours for young people who've been neglected compared to their

peers. In some, the whole thing meant that we could work out thresholds and proportions, I'll show you a table in a minute. But what we were pleased about was that our hypothesis was shown to be mostly true. So more care did have positive associations with all the things we asked about and less care had negative associations, I put mostly in brackets there, because we did find the supervisory aspect was a bit tricky. I'll talk about that in a minute. And we found consistent patterns. So that was good, too. And all of that enabled us to do this, which was to have a sort of overarching scoring system for all the different types of parenting. So you can see that the green, the green column is the schools we had for cared for. And you can see it varies for different types of care and support, the scoring ranges were different. We had an at risk category in the middle there, where we felt there was danger that with a little bit less care, that would tip into neglect. And then our red column, there is the scores for neglect. And you'll also note that we couldn't determine an at risk category that was appropriate for supervision because the data didn't allow us to do that. And once we've done that, we could extrapolate back and find out headline proportions for the percentage of young people who were neglected. So for example, that was 8%, for emotional support, which is around about one in 12 young people according to our criteria. And also when you aggregated, we found the overall proportion who were experiencing at least one form was 15%. This is another finding, which I thought was interesting. I'm going to just cover it briefly. The two charts, you can see there are both for different aspects of subjective wellbeing. So they're for life satisfaction, and for feelings about the future. And how can I explain this? The Axis says mean score, which basically means the average, and the bars are dark, red, bright red, and grey, on my screen anyway. And basically, what we're what we're seeing here, the dark red bars are for young people, it's a group of young people who, who reported two or more forms of neglect. And this was the average score that they then gave for life satisfaction on the left, or feelings about the future on the right. Those who have experienced one form, that's the bright red, but are the average scores, they reported for life satisfaction or feelings about the future. And then those who didn't report any neglect. So this is this is the average, these are the average scores for everyone else. And you can see there are quite significant differences. So for example, young people who reported multiple forms of neglect their average score was only 7.6, when compared to 14.2. For those who hadn't been neglected, it also shows if you like sort of incremental harm, almost in terms of the effect that this can have on young people's wellbeing.

Okay, so learning to how we might respond to adolescent neglect. I'm going to outline the learning that I think flows from research on neglect, but also on child maltreatment, generally on adolescent development and risk working with young people and prevention science. So it's a bit of a blanket of things and it's a few top lines really. Now, I couldn't find a terribly neat way to do this. But I've tried to summarise and categorise because that's what researchers like to do. So I've proposed that the key messages for this sit within two main categories really in their systems and practice. And then there's process which relates to practice, but we're going to concentrate on the top two, I'm going to go through these individually.

Okay, first of all, then, in terms of systems, there should be an emphasis on preventing neglect from happening in the first place, or preventing recurrence or ameliorating longer term impact. And that suggests this sort of upside down pyramid of intervention really. So at the top level number one there, it speaks to the need for universal services, that can have a role in trying to make sure that neglect never happens in the first place. And that can involve a whole range of things. So it might mean parenting,

education and support. It might mean awareness raising among young people, of what parental care should be like, and what constitutes neglect. It might mean general work with the public on attitudes toward adolescents. The second level addresses the initial signs of neglect. So that's attempting to prevent escalation, that can include things like what's called early help in England, which is inputs to families who were shown having problems, it can include things like youth provision, and I've also put Functional Family Therapy in there, which is an intervention that there are some good evaluations of that. I should mention more broadly, when I'm talking about practice, in particular, we have very, very little evaluating evidence for targeted interventions that particularly address neglect in adolescence. So there's not a lot to go on with that. The third level is where statutory intervention kicks in. So this is the more significant work. And this is when neglect is kind of entrenched, it's happening. So it includes child protection work. But it's also important to say that it should include stuff that does the long term stuff that does the follow up, that looks at some of the effects of trauma and might include therapy, and so on and so forth. All of this is similar to what is also called a public health approach. And I know that that's been deployed in Scotland in relation to things like violence reduction, so some people might be familiar with that already. I'm just showing these briefly and I mentioned the project that we did with the safeguarding children board in Luton. Now they went on to develop their strategy and they also worked in partnership with the NSPCC. And these were some of the materials that they developed as part of their universal interventions. And you can see, well, they're young person friendly, and in fact that they were developed on the basis of consultation with young people. I think the one on the left is a guide, it's a leaflet about neglect that was circulated and disseminated, and the one on the right is a poster used in schools and other places. And, you know, to begin to sort of elevate awareness and understanding amongst young people. The second key message I have is that in terms of effective systems responses, we need to regard neglect in adolescence as being everyone's responsibility. There's a big role for the community in general in preventing neglect. And it can emerge in lots and lots of different ways. It can be the active side of volunteering and supporting young people. Or it can just mean taking care in the young people who live next to or in your neighbourhood. And it also extends to being kindly supportive of families who have adolescent children and taking their needs into account a little. The proverb that suggests that it takes a village to raise a child. I feel like that's a bit folksy, but I think there's some merit in that, particularly in extending it to our view of adolescence. And the importance of multi-agency collaboration and effective cross work, inter agency working around neglect is probably impossible to stress enough. As we've, as I've explained already in the presentation, I'm sure you're already familiar with this, all the complexities when neglect is actually happening within a family will almost always necessitate the input of a variety of professionals in order that that work is effective. And that means, for example, that the statutory sector needs to partner with others, including the voluntary sector, and that there needs to be sort of negotiated clarity and consensus across agencies about what neglect is, how professionals should combine their efforts and who does what who takes responsibility for what so there needs to be communication.

Two key messages in relation to practice are that anyone who works with young people should be aware of the possibility of neglect regardless of the context or background of the young person, and also that professionals need to understand the scale, scope and potential impacts and the nature of adolescent development. There could be lots and lots of different ways to improve awareness, knowledge and understanding among professionals. Perhaps the most obvious is the need to have comprehensive training available, but to keep that going to have it available on an ongoing basis, and it

needs to cover all the relevant topics. So I've talked about the scale and scope and impacts of neglect. But I think we also need to be very tuned into adolescent development, particularly those on the front line. And professionals also lose have skills to communicate with people. Again, I'll come back to that in a minute. I mean, the other thing I suppose I should mention in relation to the first of these, is that there needs to be an onus on what some people have called professional curiosity. So it's important that people working with young people, and perhaps others are sort of attuned, that they, they will take the trouble to listen a bit longer, or dig a bit deeper if they can. The next message is that although families are at the centre of this, it's unhelpful to focus too narrowly on them, especially if that means losing sight of a young person's needs. And parents have their own problems. This, this has resonance with the quote that I gave earlier, which is basically that, we should not get dragged into the label and get drawn into the agenda that might be dominating in the family. But you have to individualise your interventions and keep young people at the centre. At this point, for some audiences, I was introduced something called ecological systems theory, this is just a diagram, I'm not going to go on about it. But this is, I think, a very helpful theory, which suggests that there are a number of different different kind of aspects and factors and systems that can be having a bearing directly and indirectly on a young person's life. And they extend from values and national policies and things like that right down to what parents do, and what parents think, and what school is like, and so on, and so forth. Now, we don't need to concern ourselves too much with that theory, because there are ways that it's already manifesting in practice. This is a quick diagram from something called the assessment framework, which has been used in England quite extensively. And that sort of encourages practitioners to look across a whole range of different things on a number of dimensions, but keeping the child at the centre. When it was first launched it was accompanied by a set of resources, including booklets that were age appropriate that would steer a practitioner through a whole age appropriate assessment, taking into account all these things. Unfortunately, it's difficult to know how well or how widely it was used, because not a lot of follow up was done. But I think it's still out there. I'm sure some people still use it. But in spirit, it's great. And a helpful support to professional practice. But as far as I understand, you have something in Scotland called the My World Triangle, which performs a similar focus. And equally, actually underpinning that is systems theory and taking into account the diversity of things that might be having an impact and are important to a young person. So that's very encouraging.

The other message that's pretty important, you may not be surprised that I'm saying this given who I work for, is that young people should be worked with, and that professionals need to become more adept at communicating with them. The quote in the purple box there is from a publication by colleagues at research and practice from a little while ago, but it stands the test of time. And again, maybe not rocket science, but young people want to be listened to respectfully, to have account taken of their views and have a stake in decision making the work. It's important to regard them as assets and resources.

The thing about all of that, of course, is that it rests on sophistication in terms of how professionals work. It rests on sensitivity, empathy and a non-judgmental approach, and often a lot of patience and tenacity. So I'm happy to concede that it's quite a demanding ask, but one that's really cool to this sorts of work, I think. I think also specifically with regard to neglect, it's important. And the practitioners who are listening to this will already know this. But from the perspective of somebody who's done research on lots of sensitive topics, I think we shouldn't have an expectation that

necessarily young people are going to disclose and be upfront and be sharing. They're going to be private, they're going to be protective of their families, it may be a case of trying to look at the clues or what's behind what they're saying too. I've also noted on this slide just briefly that in some ways, there might be parallels in this to the role of an ally, in the sense of being someone who can become more than just a support worker, a helper or an advocate. But somebody who develops a bit of a relationship, there's a bit of a bond or some trust, and gives the young person a sense that this is a shared endeavour.

Final message, which I realised was missing from the table, when it was too late to add it yesterday, is that there's also a need to think about reticence, there is evidence that the professionals can be really reticent. A bit, you know, slow or unkeen, let's put it that way to identify neglect. And that might be from some of the factors we've already talked about, like an assumption about resilience that young people can be imperfect victims. But it also might be because there might not be a crisis, that there isn't a driver, there isn't a huge explosion of problem. And all these things can contribute to reticence on the part professionals. But also, and very importantly, I think often a sense that there might not be much of a response, and it might be not appropriate from others from other agencies, from colleagues. And so I suppose my take away from that is that it's really important within organisations to try and to develop a sort of, let's call it a receptive culture and attuned organisational culture so that everyone can feel confident, even if they feel like they might be speculating or the evidence isn't that strong, but that they can surface the prospect that neglect might be happening, and that a young person might be experiencing that. Before I stop talking, and the clock's pretty much there, I think for my time, and thanks for listening. I'm just going to give a quick plug. I think this is probably more at those who have a strategic role, although there is content in there for everyone. This is the report that flowed from the work we did for Luton. It's called thinking about adolescent neglect. And it included literature review and some interviews primarily. But what I'm drawing your attention to is that in the final chapter, there are a whole set of challenges that were posed to the Executive Board of the SCB. And it was all the ways in which they might want to question or think through the ways in which they were they could improve the ways they were responding to adolescent neglect. So that might be helpful for some of you and thinking through what you're doing. Again, that it's available online, but you'll get a link to it when you get the handout. And I think that's me. So I'm going to rejoin Colin.

(Colin Anderson) Thanks, Phil. We do have a few questions coming in. But can I kind of put one of my own first and that is in your handout, you refer to one of the first references This is to the Bywaters and Skinner work on the relationship between poverty, child abuse and neglect. And we in Scotland have worked a lot with the Bywaters team in Scotland in general, but in Glasgow, in particular, and I did reference the kind of impact of the costs of living crisis on neglect across the piece. From the work that Bywaters and Skinner has undertaken, do you think it's got particular relevance for working with adolescent neglect?

(Phil Raws) It's a great question, Colin, I'll say two things. The first is that I haven't read the report in depth yet. So I can't give you a granular response. Sorry. The second is I did attend a webinar about the report when it first came out. And I thought, I mean, it's clearly a fantastic and very insightful piece of work. It tells us lots of things that reinforce things we probably knew before, but it gives extra evidence. But sadly, also slightly reinforces the point that neglect is a bit of an orphan in this field, in

that there's still an absence of evidence around neglect itself. And particularly for this age group, I think we're still struggling to have this sort of detail that maybe would be helpful is what I would say. And that's the problem to some degree, we get the overarching findings that tell us plenty, but we don't really get to drill down. And that means that for topics as specific, although it's quite general, but as specific as older young people and their needs and what the contexts are that prompt and reinforce neglect, we don't know a great deal about them. So that's not a terribly it's not a terribly useful answer, perhaps. But you know, sorry.

(Colin Anderson) No, I don't think it's an area where there is an easy answer. If it was, would be, it'd be finding that out pretty quickly. Another question we have is, and it may be links into that theme I was developing: Do you think that removal of persistence from the Welsh and Northern Ireland definition of neglect will or has led to increased recognition and reporting of neglect?

(Phil Raws) I'll have to give an honest answer to that one, I honestly don't know. I don't I don't know. But I'm also not aware as to whether anybody has yet taken the trouble to look at the figures. So to do the analysis of child protection, registration and reporting, and see whether there's been an uplift for this age group. And I think the problem is, and this is something that researchers often say, it would be very difficult to then ascribe any changes, specifically to that. So almost in principle, it's a good thing to do, because I think it's clear that there are situations where acute things, events, things happening, can, can lead to that. And they probably things like bereavement or serious illness, or somebody losing a job or all these sorts of things. So they're not necessarily a, you know, they're a sort of a trigger event, or as I said in the presentation, a young person being forced to leave home. That's a pretty radical thing. And I think most people will say that was neglectful on the part of parents. Because it's often a blend of things going on. Looking at something like headline figures for Child Protection Registrations and saying, Well, we can see a change. And it's just because that happened, I think, I think it would struggle, a study would struggle to stand that up. Because you'd effectively you didn't have to effectively control for everything else that might be being able to identify better. So yeah, I don't think there's evidence of that. I'm not aware of any, but it would also be a bit of a challenge to really prove it.

(Colin Anderson) The next question is regarding the increased increasing rates of registration for emotional abuse and neglect? Do we know how much of this is linked to domestic abuse?

(Phil Raws) Again, that's a great question. So there is a body of work that has tried to unpick the relationship, the interface between emotional abuse and neglect. And I'm not sure it's come up with any clear answers. And I'm very aware that and I can only really speak about England, but in England, it would seem that often local authorities are, if you like, using their emotional abuse categorization to cover experiences of domestic abuse. So as you I'm sure, you know, it's not the child protection, it's not an explicit category. And some authorities are kind of advising their staff to put it under emotional abuse, when they're looking at a registration. Others maybe not, but this might be putting it in a multiple categories. There are five categories in England, basically and it seems that often emotional abuse is being used in a number of different ways. But then, again, you might argue that neglect is used in a variety of ways. And we don't have the detail under that headline for what it really means. And I have to say, I mean, it sounds a little bit trite sometimes. So forgive me if it comes across in that way. But I really often think that one of the ways we could improve things would be if we could separate out

different categories of neglect. We do it for abuse, it seems to be a logical thing for abuse, it helps us understand it helps us work with it. Why can't we why can't we break down neglect into different things and then we kind of begin to know better what we're talking about and what we're dealing with. And one of the reasons I advocate that and the slide that I didn't talk about there's something that we found and it really stood out actually, it was that for this age group, these mid teenagers, let's call them that. So taking a deep breath. What in effect we were doing in this study was we were looking at experiences of parenting care and support. So we tagged in neglect, we found a way to look at neglect through that. But we were looking at care and support of teenagers by their parents. And it was really clear for this age group, that the lowest numbers even outside our neglect road group, the lowest numbers were reporting that they felt they had emotional support, so support with problems and things. And when they were upset that their parents chip in and fewer young people were having that source of support anyway, a greater number were falling below what we determined to be in neglect threshold. And at the same time, across the piece, emotional support, when it was good, was very much associated with good wellbeing. So in those families where it's working well, it's great, it's a really good prop, it's a really good way of ensuring wellbeing for a young person. And where it's not, it was very strongly associated with negative well being. And I suppose one way of them squeezing that into a small box is saying, you know, it seems that there's probably quite a lot of emotional neglect going on within families, parents may not know or understand across the board that there's a need to carry on that support for their children as they grow. And we kind of need to get a handle on it better. Because maybe, I mean, it's a big, maybe also. But maybe some of the fallout of that is, you know, we have burgeoning levels of mental health amongst our teenagers. And, you know, it may be if we had a better handle on how families operate, and the need for the ongoing need for emotional support by young people that that would begin to ameliorate that. So there's a headline punt.

(Colin Anderson) Good, good, good, always good to get one of these. Next up, do you have any idea how we can progress with evidence based tools that support better analysis of neglect in adolescence, I guess that follows on from what you're saying there.

(Phil Raws) Well, the piece that I did for Luton, and I should stress that it was a few years ago now, so it was published in 2018. But the work for it was a couple years earlier. At that time, I was asked to look at assessment and measurement tools. And I did. And I looked across what had been used in research and what have been used in practice to measure and assess. And really the bottom line was that there are some tools that are of some merit in looking in assessing that sort of that assessment. There are some tools that are useful in terms of assessing neglect for younger children. And again, I don't know what the picture is in Scotland, but in England and Wales, a lot of people have been using the graded care profile. And that has been, you will know this, too. It was revised and revamped. And it's called Grade Care Profile 2 now and relaunched in 2018-2019. And I'm led to believe and from what I've read that that works pretty well, but only for younger children. And there's sort of been a slight, I think, in a way to try to be positive about things people have said, yeah, the great care profiles good, it's really helped us, it helps us talk to parents, it helps surface issues, we can we can use it in our practice, it's great. But they sort of sidestep the issue that the way it works is that it offers sorts of scenarios and ways of rating for supervisory care, and so on and so forth. And they're quite easy to do for younger children, you know, but where it falls away is when you try and make concrete those categories for older children. And so that's a long way round of saying I'm not aware of anything that's done that very

well. And again, I think it's a bit of a failing, and it throws us back into that thing. And I mean, there's also a danger in all of this, I always feel of, in effect not having faith in your practitioners. And I think you have to manage/balance a whole dynamic between having faith in practitioners trusting them to know, supporting them to make decisions and judgments, and giving them handholding and tools and detail and so on and so forth. But for me, we're kind of far away from currently having something that works well for young people as the resource as the handhold. And so there's a lot of reliance on professionals to do a lot of decision making with, you know, on the basis of their training, their experience, and maybe there are still gaps in that training, particularly for teenagers.

(Colin Anderson) I guess in Scotland, yeah, we do have variations of the graded care profile. And as a subgroup we'll be looking at that. Some areas and in particular my own area Glasgow, looked at an assessment of care Toolkit, which is very much about asset based and is mapping on to the work that's the Getting It Right For Every Child (GIRFEC) refresh which talks about wellbeing and, I think, studiously avoids using the word neglect. So, I would hope from that, particularly with adolescents and young adults, that asset based approach, how do you identify gaps in a child's wellbeing? And how do you then support families to address these gaps? And also look at that kind of societal aspect that you refer to in your presentation? How do you make sure that communities have got these support measures in place and can help build that resilience rather than, I think you refer to the kind of ticking boxes and scoring etc, etc, to identify, quote, neglect, unquote. Does that feel like an approach that might respond to some of the challenges you've given us?

(Phil Raws) I think it has a lot of merit, Colin, honestly, neglect is such a broad topic, you can cut it in so many ways, it's a real challenge to talk about it, present about it, think about it. But one of the things that that always highlights for me, is the language is difficult. You know, I talked about the triple teams report there. When my organisation was on the cusp of publishing it, the chief exec got called feet, and we pushed it back, or we decided not to go. And that was because there was a lot of concern that if we talked about neglect, and we appear to be blaming parents for things, it would be really bad for the organisation, it was a huge risk. And as the head of our media team said, at the time, there's nothing worse really is there than to be accused of neglect, you know, it just, it's just such an awful thought that one might not care for one's child. And so all I'm saying all of that, sort of reinforce it, but I think if you can find ways in perhaps like are research did to surfacing neglect, in a subtle way, you don't really need the labels. And, you know, I mean, I could, and there are links in the chain to doing it this way. But one of the things that we sort of thought about, but didn't go much further with, we use something called the good childhood index for our research on wellbeing. And it's just 10 questions. And young people aren't just asked to say how happy they are about different aspects of their lives. And the reason we use the index, sorry, it's a lot of work has gone into developing it and a lot of work in terms of finalising the questions and working out that they tell us as much as we need to know about well being as a whole raft of more detailed questions, basically. So it's a concentrated version, but it's proven to work. And we just asked you young people to rate their happiness on a scale of zero to 10, with their family, with their school, with their friends, with their appearance, and so on and so forth. And not only does that quite quickly and accurately reveal how their well being is. We also ask them briefly about life satisfaction. It's very intuitive for young people to complete, we've never had any problems with our surveys, young people like doing them. But if you were to use something like that, in practice on a very sort of, kind of basic and easy level, it can give you a platform, it can give you an opportunity as a

practitioner, or even a parent, I suppose, in some circumstances to sort of say, well, you've said that you're not very happy about school. Tell me a bit more. Or if you're a practitioner, you know, you said you're not so happy with your family? Can you tell me a bit more, and it's possibly quite an easy way in? And I've talked myself through in a position where I've kind of forgotten the original question. But if I recall correctly, it was something about how neglect is so loaded, that it can upset relationships in all sorts of ways. And yeah, maybe there are plenty of ways to get into it without actually using the terminology.

(Colin Anderson) I think the next question loops back to the reference we made at the start to the Bywaters, and Skinner's research it and that is the Children's Society involved in participation work around broader context of neglect. You've just talked about individual surveys, et cetera. And, you know, we've referenced the cost of living crisis and, and in the conundrum presentation, you looked at other issues, but is there anything that's ongoing just now, looking around these broader contexts and of neglect and how it how these societal factors impact?

(Phil Raws) Yes, we've just gone through a bit of a reorganisation, and we're sort of in the process of forward thinking and planning, and so on and so forth. I think there are things on the cards around particularly looking at how poverty, material deprivation is affecting the young people we work with. So that would potentially interface with something around neglect. But it won't be headlined as being about neglect. It'll be about how families are struggling and how young people's lives, and their experience has changed, or is changing.

(Colin Anderson) Okay, maybe positive doesn't headline on neglect?

(Phil Raws) Yeah. And, I mean, again, it's a bit tangential, but we're also looking, we've been dipping our toe to some degree in looking at issues around young people's digital lives. And part of that has been trying to begin to consider whether and how parents can appropriately support young people. And I suppose the flip side of that would be if you're not fulfilling that role as a parent or a carer, could that be considered to be neglectful to given the power of the digital world in young people's lives? I mean, that would be one way of looking at that. But we're also doing a lot of work on exploitation. Particularly criminal exploitation. And we might be moving our sights to look at something that we're calling financial exploitation, which I can't explain right now, because it would take a while. But again, a lot of a lot of the work that we do in terms of our research and policy work. And our direct practice throws up this tension for us, which we sometimes talk about, we sometimes discuss, we sometimes pursue, but it throws up this tension around well, if we're a charity that's focused on social justice and young people's needs, and working with them for them, how much do we then talk about the fact that they're primarily marooned at home? With their parents or carers until their 20s? How much do we do work with parents or carers? How much which should be promoting that and understanding it better. So all of that brings into play the potential issue of neglect. And I should also say, my portfolio of work, which has tended to focus on adolescents and youth at risk, basically. And we did headline stuff around neglect until two or three years ago, actually, it shifted more into looking at parenting, and more into looking at that as our organising concept really, for how we consider children's lives. So that might be an almost by default, shift away from using the neglect terminology because it sits well in child maltreatment and child protection work, but more broadly, perhaps it doesn't.

(Colin Anderson) Yeah, I think this will be a wrap up question. Because we're coming towards the end of our allocated slot. What advice would you give to social workers advocating for adolescents who interview require removal from home? Age seems to be a barrier to making teenagers safe. The damage is done, quote unquote.

(Phil Raws) I would struggle to feel I have the authority to give a social worker advice about a case that I didn't know much about. But if I was speculating a little, I suppose my default would be just the social worker know what the person thinks or feels about all of this? That would be a number one. And if there was a degree of ambiguity, which there often is around what the young person is going to think in that situation but the social worker was pretty clear, I suppose I would be encouraging the social worker when embolden themselves and to try to work with the young person and to try to lobby and advocate that they are removed from home because to be honest, it seems like otherwise you're writing off the prospect some change. And that sort of feels philosophically wrong to me. So one of the people who's written about, about neglect in an academic field for a number of years, and this might be useful. Even if a bit throwaway, he advocated many years ago of the need for feisty advocates, he called them feisty advocates around the issue of neglect, and he was talking very broadly. But I think it's probably particularly true for those who work with young people. And it goes back to all the stuff I talked about, about adolescence and being viewed as problematic and stigmatised and all that. So I think, you know, social workers can be feisty advocates for young people that will be a good thing.

(Colin Anderson) Thanks, Phil, and I'm sure your presentation has further empowered our feisty advocates in Scotland and giving them more ammunition going forward. You started off talking about the conundrum and how it was poorly understood. And I'm sure by the end of this process, people will have a much clearer understanding and what the key issues are. And just to thank you, once again, for that presentation. It's been really on the mark exactly for what we've been looking for and what people have been asking us for. And it will be I'm sure, my colleagues will tell me when but we have webinars of all our presentations, as soon as we have a discussion with yourself, and you're satisfied about what we're going to put up there for folks to come back and reference. And we do have your handout that we will circulate to people. And the slides are available as well. So it remains for me just to say thanks. Once again, Phil, it's been absolutely tremendous. I don't know whether Joe, there's anything you want to add in terms of a wrap up in terms of technical stuff, housekeeping.

(Joe McGinty) No, just to add to your vote of thanks, I think that was excellent. It was really thought provoking. I was amazed actually crammed into that 50 minutes chat in terms of the detail. And I think I just like to, again, to reiterate to people again, I think it's completely evaluations, and give suggestions for topics for future topics that would be really helpful for future planning processes, but absolutely brilliant. Phil, thanks very much.

(Phil Raws) And I should say thank you so much for having me. I genuinely quite like forcing myself to think these things through and represent and change the way I present. So it's, it's, I've enjoyed it. I want to just sort of encourage people, I've put my contact details on the handout, please don't hesitate

to email me if you've got questions or queries or you want to know anything else, I might be able to give you references, so on and so forth. Please just go for it.

(Colin Anderson) The gift that keeps on giving.