

Witness name: Anna Jameson

Exhibits: AJ/01 – AJ/19

Dated: 26/08/25

THE SOUTHPORT INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF ANNA JAMESON

I, Anna Jameson, will say as follows:

1. I still work in social care in another Local Authority. I have been in this role since January 2021.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Southport Inquiry (the 'Inquiry') with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 24 July 2025.
3. Where the content of this statement is within my personal knowledge it is true. Where it is outside my personal knowledge and derived from other sources it is true to the best of my information and belief.

Personal background

4. I obtained a BA (Hons) social work degree in 2015, and I qualified as a social worker the same year.
5. I commenced employment as a social worker in 2015 with LCC, and I worked in various teams during my employment with LCC. At the relevant time I was a social worker in

Lancashire Children's Services Duty and Assessment Team. I left the organisation in December 2020.

Duty and Assessment Team

6. The Duty and Assessment Team are a team within LCC's Children's Services department. The team assesses situations where a child may be at risk of harm, and where required, provide support and intervention for children and families.
7. One part of my role in that team was to conduct Child and Family Assessments. The assessment gathers information from various agencies and sources in order identify any safeguarding risks and unmet needs of the child. During the assessment process, visits to the child and family would also be conducted. The assessment focusses on the child's own needs and welfare. The assessment informs decisions around where the child sits on Lancashire's Continuum of Need, the services needed, and actions to address any safeguarding risks and other unmet needs.
8. In addition, I had other duties and responsibilities whilst in that role, including but not limited to, conducting home visits, visiting children outside of the family home, working with parents, attending multi agency meetings and working with other agencies to safeguard children.
9. I exhibit at **AJ/01** - **LCC001768** Lancashire's Continuum of Need. This document is dated July 2017 however I recall this, or a similar version, being in place at the time of my involvement. The continuum of need has four levels:
 - a. *Level 1 is universal services. Needs and risks are met through universal services or simple specific agency response.*
 - b. *Level 2 applies where there is evidence of some unmet needs and low risk. There would be Targeted Service Provision via the Common Assessment Framework ('CAF') and/or Team Around the Family ('TAF'). This falls within LCC's Early Help services.*
 - c. *Level 3 applies where there is higher levels of unmet needs and medium risk. Children's Social Care ('CSC') would be the lead professional. In circumstances where a child meets the statutory definition of a Child in Need ('CIN') under section*

17 of the Children Act 1989 ('CA'), a CIN Plan would be created to outline the support, services and actions needed to meet the child's needs.

- d. Level 4 applies to children who have significant unmet needs and are high risk. CSC are the lead professional. Avenues under level 4 can include Child Protection (section 47 CA), Public Law Outline processes and Care Proceedings.*

December 2019 – March 2020

10. I do have some recollection of AR's case, however due to the passage of time, I cannot recall all my involvement and the steps taken. I have reviewed the notes and records prepared at the time in order to refresh my memory.

Allocation of AR's case

11. A safeguarding referral was received from Merseyside Police on 12 December 2019. I attach at **AJ/02 – LCC000230** the contact record. The record confirms that AR had been involved in an incident the previous day, on 11 December 2019, at the Range High School in Formby. The record states that AR had attended the school, where he had previously been excluded, with a hockey stick and a knife in his backpack. AR had attended the school to "*exact revenge*" on another pupil who he felt had bullied him in the past. AR had been arrested on suspicion of "*section 47 assault, possession of a bladed article on a school premises and possession of an offensive weapon*". AR had bail conditions imposed upon him by police.
12. There is also reference to intel from Prevent that AR was "*actively searching beheadings and other extremist material on his computer*". Further, it is stated that it was suggested that AR "*intended to kill a pupil at the school today*" (11 December 2019), and due to that pupil not being present, AR attacked another pupil.
13. AR lived in Banks, which is a small village near Southport. Banks is based in West Lancashire and therefore falls within LCC's geographical catchment area; however, it is on the boarder. The Range High School is in Formby, Merseyside. As the incident occurred at the Range High School, Merseyside Police were dealing with the criminal investigation.

14. The referral was reviewed and screened by LCC's MASH team. I exhibit the MASH assessment dated 12 December 2019 at **AJ/03 – LCC000231**. The assessment was completed by a social worker in the MASH team. In respect of previous CSC involvement, the record confirms there were no previous assessments for AR but there were two contacts on his brother's record (DR). It is also stated that AR may have had undiagnosed mental health issues, and he posed a risk to others, including his older sibling in the home address.

15. The MASH assessment notes that issues had been unresolved at previous levels, and it was felt that a multi-agency response was required via Child Protection processes under section 47 of the CA. A decision was made for the case to be transferred to CSC at level 4. As stated above, this applies in cases where there are child protection concerns and a child is suffering, or at risk of suffering significant harm.

16. A Practice Manager in MASH team, Adrienne Fox, reviewed the referral and assessment. Her comments confirm it was felt the case should progress at level 4 to enable a swift multi agency response/risk assessment of concerns.

17. Exhibited at **AJ/04 – LCC000232** is the document titled Transfer from MASH to LCS. This document lists the forms included with the transfer, including the details of the referral from 12 December 2019, the MASH assessment and the previous referral from 8 October 2019. The contact record dated 8 October 2019 is exhibited at **AJ/05 – LCC000229**. It had been reported by police that a referral had been received from ChildLine as AR had made concerning comments to them. The record states AR *"has been bullied at school and has taken a knife to school. Though he hasn't used it or got it out of his bag this shows potential for huge escalation. Whilst [AR] did appear understand the severity of the offence and potential repercussions the risk is high that he could again take a knife to school"*. The school were made aware AR's mother had taken appropriate action with regards the knives. AR needed support around the bullying issue and intervention around carrying knives. The concerns were assessed to meet level 2 on the Continuum of Need and AR's case was to progress to the Child and Family Wellbeing team ('CFW') in Early Help for support and sign posting.

18. In preparation for writing this statement I have reviewed all documents available to me. I note that the Transfer from MASH to LCS document states level 3 however, I do not

know why this is the case as the management oversight refers to level 4. I can only presume that this was a clerical error however, it did not affect the immediate course of action I took.

19. Following the case being transferred from the MASH, the case would have been allocated to me by a manager. Page 2 of CSC's chronology (exhibited at **AJ/06 – LCC000228**) confirms the case was allocated to me the same day, on 12 December 2019.
20. On allocation, I will have been able to access AR's case details, notes and documents via Liquid Logic, which is a case management system used by Childrens Service. I would have been able to review the referral from 12 December 2019, and I would have also had access to the previous referral (8 October 2019). I recall being able to access notes and documents prepared by Early Help via Liquid Logic during my time working at LCC, and I believe this was possible at the time of AR's case being referred to me. It would have been standard practice for me to review the documentation and information available to me once the case had been allocated.
21. As the case had been stepped up to CSC, it is standard practice for the case to close to Early Help services. It is a tiered system based upon the level of support and intervention needed. I attach at **AJ/07 – LCC000018** the Episode Closure prepared by Lucy Parkinson. Although the case had closed to Early Help, I would still invite colleagues in Early Help to attend meetings and provide information. If the previously allocated workers were not available, meetings would have been attended by their managers on their behalf as standard practice to ensure thorough handover.
22. Following allocation of the case, and whilst I remained the lead professional, various enquiries were completed by myself and team members. This was to ensure information was gathered in a timely way to assess the level of risk and take any action to put in place immediate safeguards. The initial steps taken are set out in CSC's chronology at **Exhibit AJ/06 – LCC000228**, AR's case notes at **Exhibit AJ/08 – LCC000227** and DR's case notes at **Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**. This included telephone calls with Acorns School and the Range High School, Sefton Children's Social Care, the Mental Health Liaison Officer, AR's father and the duty school nurse. Steph Hallaron, Mental Health Officer confirmed that AR had been referred to CAMHS

for an urgent assessment of possible ASD. The case note (**Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**) also confirms that Forensic CAMHS had accepted the referral and Steph Hallaron was also going to complete an ASD referral to the community paediatricians. A colleague of mine had also obtained a chronology regarding AR from Acorns school.

23. Following the initial enquiries made and due to concerns that there had been a second a referral from police within two months, a strategy meeting was arranged to bring all professionals together to assess the information held and formulate a multi-agency decision. As AR's social worker, I was the lead professional, and it was my responsibility to convene the strategy meeting. This would have been arranged following a discussion with my Practice Manager as strategy meetings need to be chaired by Practice Managers and they have overall oversight and give directions on a case. I exhibit at **AJ/10 – LCC001695** the email dated 13 December 2019 inviting various professionals to attend the strategy meeting on 17 December 2019.

24. In addition, I would have started work for the Child and Family Assessment from the point of allocation. This is to be completed within 45 working days from the date of the referral, as per statutory guidance - Working Together to Safeguard Children, July 2018. A home visit to the family was also completed prior to the initial strategy meeting.

First strategy meeting - 17 December 2019

25. I exhibit at **AJ/11 – LCC001769** a copy of Working Together to Safeguard Children, July 2018. This is statutory guidance which sets out a guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The 2018 edition was in place at the time of my involvement with AR. Page 38 to 41 of this document provides guidance for strategy discussions.

26. There has since been a further edition of the guidance, which was published in 2023.

27. Strategy discussions are used to share available information, agree the conduct and timing of any criminal investigation and decide whether enquiries under section 47 CA 1989 are required. Section 47 enquiries are formal investigations completed by Children's Services or the police to assess a significant risk of harm to a child.

28. In determining which professionals to invite to the strategy meeting, I would have considered the information available to me from the referral and notes and looked to identify the agencies currently involved with the family and those that would hold information on the family. Other professionals could have also recommend additional people to invite. Agencies that must be present at strategy meetings include the local authority social worker, health practitioners and a police representative, as set out at page 38 of Working Together to Safeguard Children guidance. Other relevant practitioners will depend on the nature of the individual case. I can see that in AR's case, there was an extensive list of professionals present at the strategy meeting, which would have enabled information sharing from various agencies.
29. The strategy meeting took place three working days after the referral had been received by LCC. There were bail conditions in place, which provided initial safeguards to the victims and prevented AR from attending the Range High School and a home visit was also completed during this period.
30. A record of the strategy meeting is exhibited at **AJ/12 – LCC000234**. I attended this meeting as AR's allocated social worker. The record confirms the following professionals were also present at the meeting:
- a) DC Paula Murray – Investigating Officer, Merseyside Police.
 - b) Skott Morgan – CAMHS.
 - c) Carmen Thompson – Prevent. The record incorrectly records their job role as 'Police Early Action Team'.
 - d) Laura Davidson – Team Manager, Early Help.
 - e) David Creegan – Designated Safeguarding Lead, the Range High School.
 - f) Sergeant Andy Bramhall – Community Safety Team at Lancashire Constabulary.
 - g) Jan Lewis – Acorns School.
 - h) Karen Wigan – Team Leader, School Nursing service.
 - i) Stephanie Hallaron – Mental Health Practitioner.
 - j) Matt Rowe – Practice Manager, CSC.
 - k) Joanne Hodson – Acorns School.
 - l) Paul Harrison, Community Safety Officer at Lancashire Constabulary.
 - m) Julie Hamill - Family Support Worker.

31. The meeting was chaired by my Practice Manager, Matt Rowe. Professionals were invited to provide updates and share information at the meeting. The meeting notes confirm the following:
- a) *Merseyside Police confirmed AR had been arrested, bail conditions were in place, AR had prepared a statement, he had been interviewed, electronic devices seized, and the case was with the Crown Prosecution Service ('CPS'). It was stated that there were some concerns with the interview where AR would laugh at inappropriate times and there was not really any challenge from his mother, who was the appropriate adult.*
 - b) *AR's wellbeing and mental health had been assessed by Ms Halloran in custody. Ms Halloran advised AR showed no remorse.*
 - c) *The Range High School confirmed at the meeting that AR started there in year 7 and he was initially a very quiet child with no issues being raised. Towards the end of year 8 and during the current academic year, there had been an escalation in his behaviours including being challenging and saying inappropriate things to teachers and other children. There had been minimal contact with parents however no major concerns raised. The main previous issue at the Range had been from 5 October 2019 when AR disclosed to ChildLine that he had been taking a knife into school and this had happened on 10 occasions.*
 - d) *It was stated that AR's father had expressed concerns to school about whether AR had Special Educational Needs ('SEN'). The school were not aware of any issues between AR and DR, or any incidents between them.*
 - e) *Steph Halloran commented that AR probably does have ASD and he was due to be assessed next year however the waiting lists for were significant.*
 - f) *AR had been referred to Sefton CAMHS and was due to be seen in the next week. It was confirmed that AR would also be referred to Forensic CAMHS, who specialise in assessing risk.*

- g) *The Acorns School confirmed AR had been attending there since 17 October 2019. AR began classes after the half term on 4 November 2019. AR was described as initially very quiet, but this then escalated, and he began to display strange behaviours, creating issues with other children and occasionally fixating on staff members. AR had also used the school computers to 'research' school shootings etc. It was stated that AR disclosed being bullied however this had not been evidenced when the school looked into this. The school had used a metal detector to check AR before he entered school and particular lessons, to ensure there is no risk to other pupils. The one main positive experience for AR during his time at the Acorns was attending Chester Zoo for around four hours. It is stated that during this time he was happy and engaging well with other young people.*
- h) *An update was also provided by Early Help regarding their involvement since October 2019. It was confirmed that they had initial difficulties contacting the family however when they did make contact, the majority of fathers concerns related to supporting AR to get back into education. AR's father confirmed they had been supported by Parenting 2000 in Southport and AR was being supported with counselling twice a week. AR's father was also due to engage with a parenting course and work on building resilience in families. It was reported the family had reported some of the counselling themselves.*
- i) *Julie Hamill and I provided an update following our visit to the family the previous day, on 16 December 2019. It was confirmed that the family engaged with the visit, however it appeared that AR was quite a force in the household, appearing to dominate discussions and at times shout down his parents who did not appear keen to challenge his opinions. This required further exploration and visits to speak to parents and DR separately. It was confirmed that AR had informed us that he had taken the knife to school for protection. We were also of the view that AR presented with traits of ASD to a high level. Parents stated they did struggle at times with boundaries. Overall, it appeared that parents potentially didn't understand AR's additional needs and how to best parent him. There were no concerns regarding neglect or any sense that parents posed a risk to AR, and there had been no reports of risk from AR to DR.*

- j) *Prevent confirmed an assessment was to be completed regarding AR and they would be considering whether a referral to the channel programme would be appropriate for him.*
- k) *It was agreed that there was a risk of re-offending from AR however at that stage, there was no evidence that the children were at risk of significant harm. There were positives to consider regarding parents engagement and willingness to work with the local authority as well as their reported attempts to gain support for AR through parenting 2000.*
- l) *The outcome of the meeting, as recorded in the minutes, was for agencies to proceed with their assessment work and reconvene when more professional knowledge of the family had been obtained. It was acknowledged that there was a possibility that risks may escalate through the highlighted actions and assessments. The police investigation was continuing, and a follow up strategy discussion was arranged for 6 January 2020. The agreed actions included:*
- CSC to continue their assessment including seeing DR and parents by themselves.*
 - Prevent team to commence an initial assessment.*
 - Skott Morgan to complete an initial CAMHS appointment.*
 - DPA*
 - AR not to return to school at this time, work requested to be sent home from Acorns.*
 - Update to be sought from Parenting 2000.*
 - Follow up strategy meeting to be held on 6 January 2020 following updates being gained from the above enquiries.*

32. The role of professionals attending the strategy meeting is to establish whether the children were at risk of significant harm in accordance with legislation, national guidance and policies. This analysis is based on the multi-agency information presented during the strategy meeting. As stated, it was agreed that further information was required to make an informed decision to establish if the children were at risk of

significant harm at that stage. Therefore, the above actions were set, and a follow-up strategy meeting was arranged.

33. I have identified an error with the record of the meeting in respect of Carmen Thompson's role, as listed on the attendee list. Carmen Thompson was the representative from Prevent, as identified above. The record incorrectly states 'Police Early Action Team'. Further, it is my belief that Anne Cookson, Senior Practitioner in Early Help, was present at the meeting as my Child and Family Assessment refers to an update being provided by her. However, she is not listed on the attendee list. Lastly, it is stated that the follow up strategy meeting was arranged for '06/01/2019'. This should read 2020. My notes are a summary of what was discussed and agreed at the meeting. The remainder of the notes of the meeting are complete and accurate, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

18 December 2019 – 5 January 2020

34. A meeting invitation for the follow up strategy meeting was sent by email on 19 December 2019. This invitation was sent to professionals from various agencies including police, healthcare, education, Early Help, CAMHS and Prevent. I attach my email at **AJ/13 – LCC001695**
35. I attach the email sent to Andrew Bramhall of Lancashire Constabulary on 19 December 2019 at **AJ/13 – LCC001695**. Andrew Bramhall was a Police Sergeant in Lancashire's Community Safety Team at the time. This email confirms that I did not send the invitation for the follow up strategy meeting to PS Bramhall and PC Paul Harrison, due to it being considered that there was no further role for their agency at that time as Merseyside Police were now leading with the police investigation due to the offence occurring in Merseyside. I understood that the outcome of the police investigation was pending.
36. As part of my Child and Family assessment home visits were completed by myself and the family support worker. The case management checkpoint completed by my Practice Manager, Matt Rowe, on 2 January 2020 (**Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**) discussed my initial visits and that the current assessments did not highlight any immediate safeguarding issues, parents had responded appropriately to the concerns raised

within the referral, and it was thought likely that AR's suspected additional needs, namely ASD, had influenced his behaviour at the time. The review strategy meeting was planned to gather and review the multi-agency actions set within the previous strategy meeting.

Follow up strategy meeting - 6 January 2020

37. The follow up strategy meeting took place on 6 January 2020. I exhibit the record of this meeting at **AJ/14 – LCC000235**. This is the note I prepared of the meeting. It states the following professionals were also in attendance:

- a) Matt Rowe – Practice Manager, CSC.
- b) Carmen Thompson – Prevent. The record incorrectly states their job role as 'Police Early Action Team'.
- c) Skott Morgan – CAHMS.
- d) Pita Oates – Pupil Attendance Supervisory Support Worker, Lancashire County Council.
- e) Sharon Sanderson – Area Pupil Access Officer, Lancashire County Council.
- f) Stephanie Hallaron – Mental Health Practitioner, Criminal Justice Liaison and Diversion Team.
- g) Jan Lewis – Acorns School.

38. I note from the contents of the meeting note that a contribution was provided by the police and information was shared. I have also had sight of the Acorns meeting minutes (**Exhibit AJ/15 - LCC000031**) which states Merseyside and Lancashire Police were present.

39. Matt Rowe, Practice Manager in CSC, would have been responsible for chairing this meeting. Updates were obtained from the professionals present and a discussion was held, as follows:

- a) *It was confirmed that CSC had completed home visits to see AR and DR, both children had engaged well and discussions with parents had been positive. There was no evidence from a safeguarding point of view of continued risk of harm to the*

children, however it was clear that there were some outstanding support needs to be addressed following assessment and actions from all agencies.

- b) It was confirmed by CAMHS that AR had been seen and his presentation was described as very autistic however a diagnosis was outstanding. AR felt his actions were in retaliation and he had a sense of injustice about what happened. Advice was given to parents about having 1:1 time with AR. CAMHS did not feel that AR had any mental health issues and he was not experiencing psychosis.*
- c) The Criminal Justice liaison and Diversion Team confirmed AR was on the cancellation list for his autism assessment, and the best clarity that could be gained was that he would be seen that year. AR had a further appointment with Forensic CAMHS on 21 January 2020, which was to focus on his potential risks.*
- d) Prevent confirmed that AR had been seen by the team and it was not felt that he had any issues regarding the Channel/Prevent programme. Further, there were no concerns that AR was being led into criminality or radicalised. It was noted that he showed no remorse for the incident. The assessment was to be shared.*
- e) The update from the police confirms AR's case remained with the CPS regarding a decision as to whether to charge AR. His medical records had been requested as part of the decision-making process and a request was made that this was fast tracked.*
- f) An update was also provided on AR's education. An alternative education provision was being looked at for AR, including possible 1:1 tutoring. A risk assessment was required regarding the potential risk to other pupils before AR could be re-introduced to school. A request was to be made for an Education, Health and Care Plan ('EHCP'). Parents were identified as being best placed to complete this however it was also possible for school to do this. It was felt that there needed to be a request for a statutory assessment and a referral to SENDO. CAMHS were to support this request. AR's school were to write to parents advising on the steps that would be taken to provide AR with education during this process.*

g) The outcome of the strategy meeting was that professionals agreed there was no ongoing evidence that AR or DR were at risk of significant harm however it was accepted that there was a risk to AR of further criminality. There were also concerns around his lack of education provision and a perceived gap in support for his underlying health needs and the support currently available to him. The police investigation and Child and Family Assessment were ongoing.

40. In preparing for this statement, I have reviewed the notes prepared by Acorns school of this strategy meeting (Exhibit AJ15 – LCC000031). The notes refer to an update provided by social services and state “[DR] states that [AR] has extreme views”. Due to the passage of time, I do not have any recollection of this comment or its context. My own notes of the meeting do not refer to this. I am therefore unable to comment further.
41. My role as the allocated Social Worker following the meeting was to complete the Child and Family Assessment. As part of all Child and Family assessments I completed as author, I would complete a full analysis of the multi-agency information gathered, to include any potential risk of harm posed to or by the young person.
42. In respect of the risk of further criminality, there was the ongoing police investigation led by Merseyside Police, AR was open to Forensic CAMHS and they confirmed he had an upcoming appointment, and it was anticipated that the Youth Offending Service would become involved following the conclusion of the police investigation. Prevent had identified no evidence of AR having any ideologies at that time that would require support from the Prevent programme and/or Channel.
43. In respect of AR’s other identified needs, there was a plan in place for addressing AR’s education and the Pupil Access Team were involved, and AR was on a waiting list for an ASD assessment.
44. I have identified an error with the record of the meeting in respect of Carmen Thompson’s role, as listed on the attendee list. Carmen Thompson was the representative present from Prevent. The record incorrectly states, ‘Police Early Action Team’. In addition, there is an omission as no representative is listed in the attendees from the police. The meeting notes are a summary of what was discussed and agreed

at the meeting. The remainder of the notes of the meeting are complete and accurate, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Professionals meeting with Forensic CAMHS – 21 January 2020

45. I am aware that I was present at a meeting with Forensic CAMHS on 21 January 2020, as I have seen a record of the minutes prepared by Acorns School. I exhibit a copy of the minutes at **Exhibit AJ/15 - LCC000031**. There is also reference to this meeting in my Child and Family assessment, dated 19 February 2020, which is at **Exhibit AJ/16 – LCC000027**. Due to the passage of time, I cannot recall exactly what was discussed at the meeting.

46. My Child and Family assessment states *'On the 21 January 2020 a professionals meeting was held with FCAMHS, Children's Social Care, Acorns and the Criminal Justice Liaison and Diversion Practitioner. It was highlighted that Axel would likely benefit from psychologically informed interventions to address his high-risk behaviour delivered with him taking into consideration his likely diagnosis of ASD. In considering reducing the risk of Axel engaging in interpersonal violence he would benefit from such interventions being focussed on improving his ability to think consequentially; improving his capacity for an empathic response; developing a range of alternative strategies to anger and developing strategies to managing stressors in his life. These interventions should focus on emotional recognition and regulation. Skott Morgan will liaise with colleagues in CAMHS and make comment at the forthcoming meeting as to how this need may be met. I have attached the FCAMHS report to this assessment.'*

Child and Family Assessment – 19 February 2020

47. I completed the Child and Family Assessment on 19 February 2020 (**Exhibit AJ/16 – LCC000027**) and this assessment was signed off by my Practice Manager, Matt Rowe.

48. Various sources of information and other agencies were consulted during the process of preparing my assessment, including:

- a) Merseyside Police
- b) Lancashire Constabulary

- c) Prevent
- d) Healthcare
- e) Acorns School
- f) The Range High School
- g) CAMHS
- h) Forensic CAMHS
- i) The Pupil Access Team
- j) Early Help
- k) The child's voice – AR and DR
- l) Parents

49. The aim of a Child and Family Assessment was to consider any safeguarding risks or other unmet needs, as underpinned by national guidance (Working Together to Safeguard Children) and assess where AR sat on Lancashire's Continuum of Need. The assessment focused on AR and DR, as the children within the family.

50. As part of my assessment, I met with the children separately including outside of the family home, met with parents, completed home visits, considered assessments prepared by other agencies and information shared, and considered the outcome of the police investigation which had resulted in a 10-month Referral Order for AR to work with Youth Justice.

51. I analysed the needs and risk, with consideration to Lancashire's continuum of need and considered all the information available. My assessment concludes *"it is felt that there are still ongoing needs in respect of [AR], specifically around his educational and social needs. There is no evidence at this time that either child is at risk of significant harm. There is an acknowledged need for multi-agency support and assessment on various areas of need and a level of risk based on [AR]'s offending and how this is managed in the future. There is a meeting scheduled to take place on the 4 March 2020 consider the future risk and further plan the assessment. It is therefore considered that this meet Level 3 on Lancashire's Continuum of Need and a Child in Need Plan is required at this time"*.

52. The outcome of the assessment is confirmed as provision of services under section 17 CA. Section 17 sets out the provision of services for children in need, their families and others.
53. Supporting the family with a CIN plan for a short period of time enabled a social worker to remain involved initially to ensure there was a clear plan to meet the outstanding needs identified and coordinate the support from other agencies. For example, it allowed time for the Youth Offending Team to commence their work with AR.
54. At the end of the assessment, there is reference to “CIN categories”. These are risk indicators which would be considered during the assessment. Two factors were identified – learning disability and socially unacceptable behaviour. This relates to concerns around AR having an undiagnosed learning disability and awaiting an assessment for ASD. The socially unacceptable behaviour relates to the offence committed by AR in December 2019. I did not consider that AR fit into any other category. The check list is used for auditing purposes and data reporting for LCC.

Child in Need ('CIN')

55. I exhibit a copy of the CIN plan at **AJ/18 – LCC001346**. This was plan was effective from 20 February 2020. A CIN plan is a package of support for a child and their family, to address identified issues, concerns and needs. The CIN plan sets out the actions and support that was in place to reduce the needs identified, as follows:
- a) *AR had been made subject to a 10-month Community Order for ABH and possession of an offensive weapon. Anna Croll of the Youth Offending Team had been allocated to work with AR, and he was to be assessed by that team. The desired outcome was for AR to be assessed and managed in the community by the Youth Offending Team.*
 - b) *AR was on the roll at Acorns School however he was not currently attending the premises due to concerns. AR was continuing to receive schoolwork from Acorns and Education/Pupil Access were to identify and support AR's education needs. The desired outcome was for AR to have his education needs met.*
 - c) *There were concerns that AR had traits of ASD and was undiagnosed at this stage. AR had been referred to the Community Paediatrician for an assessment of ASD.*

AR was to be supported with his emotions by CAMHS and Forensic CAMHS were to continue to offer support and advice. The desired outcome was for AR to be assessed for ASD.

56. Parental and/or child consent is needed for a CIN plan. The parents engaged with the CIN plan and agreed with the actions identified. AR's views were that he wished to be in school when possible.
57. During the period AR's case remained open to me on a CIN plan, I remained the lead professional, and I was responsible for coordinating the services, ensuring information was shared and the unmet needs were being addressed. Visits and direct work were also conducted, including by my colleague Julie Hamill, Family Support Worker. On 20 February 2020 Julie Hamill and I took AR out into the community to assess any risk that he may present and AR's ability to cope with being out of the house. I also recall Julie Hamill taking AR out into the community on her own. AR's behaviour was appropriate throughout and he was not considered to be a risk or unmanageable (**Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**).
58. There were regular supervision and case management checkpoints by my Practice Manager. The entry by Matt Rowe on 27 February 2020 (**Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**) states a CIN plan had been identified to ensure multi-agency working comes together to enable AR to continue to access education, and direct work had been conducted with AR with a view to evidencing he did not pose a risk to professionals.
59. A CIN meeting was held on 4 March 2020. CIN meetings are usually held every four to six weeks when a child remains subject to a CIN plan.
60. I made a note of the CIN meeting in DR's case notes. I can see that this note is incomplete however due to the passage of time, I am unable to recall why this note was not finalised. I am also unable to recall why a note was entered on DR's case notes only. It would have been my usual practice to enter case notes on all of the children's files.
61. The note confirms the attendees to be myself, Julie Hamill (Family Support Worker), Laura Davidson (Early Help Manager), Anna Croll (Social Worker, Youth Offending

Team), Pita Oates (Pupil Access), Acorns and The Range High School. The note also refers to there being a referral to Early Help Services. This was the outcome of the CIN meeting.

62. I have also seen reference to the CIN meeting within Acorns records and attach at copy at **Exhibit AJ/18 - LCC001346**. The record confirms that other professionals were also present including Stephanie Halloran (Criminal Justice Liaison Team, Liverpool) and John Hicklin (Forensic CAMHS).
63. Early Help were invited to the CIN meeting as part of the handover process as it was anticipated the case would be stepped down.
64. Parents could not attend the CIN meeting; however, their views had been obtained prior to the meeting. An email was sent by parents the day before the CIN meeting, on 3 March 2020, setting out their concerns (**Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**). This was shared at the CIN meeting.
65. At the meeting, professionals agreed that the threshold of CIN was no longer met and agreed to step down to Early Help. The case would have therefore been moved from level 3 to level 2 at this point.
66. Following stepping down, the allocated worker in Early Help would become the lead professional and continue to coordinate the services and actions identified. The case would then close to CSC.
67. Positively, there were various services still working with AR following his case stepping down to Early Help. The Youth Offending team were involved, and AR was subject to a 10-month Referral Order. The Youth Offending team were addressing the identified risk of socially unacceptable behaviour and further criminality, AR was being supported by CAMHS, he was due to be assessed for ASD at Alder Hey Childrens Hospital and he was being supported by Acorns School and the Pupil Access Team for his educational needs. Early Help were also to assist parents with applying for an EHCP and addressing the families social isolation within the community.

68. The following day (5 March 2020) I had a telephone call with AR's father regarding the closure to CSC and the referral to Early Help services, as their consent would be required. AR's father agreed with this (**Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**).

Step down to Early Help

69. As stated above, a multi-agency decision to step down the case was taken on 4 March 2020 in the final Child In Need Meeting.

70. I attach the closure record dated 25 March 2020 at exhibit **AJ/19 – LCC000041**.

71. On stepping down to Early Help, the case was allocated to Andrea Fontaine. I had a telephone call with Andrea Fontaine on 24 March 2020 regarding the needs of the family, handover and her allocation (**Exhibit AJ/09 – LCC001701**). The Early Help team would also have had access to information on Liquid Logic including assessments and previous plans.

72. Following AR being closed to CSC, should agencies have any new concerns, they would need to make a further referral to MASH.

73. I did not have any further role beyond the case closing to CSC in March 2020. I left employment with LCC in December 2020.

74. I did not receive an email from David Cregeen at the Range High School on or around 1 February 2021, as I was no longer employed by LCC at this time.

Involvement with other agencies

75. As set out within this statement, I consulted and worked with numerous professionals and external agencies during my period of involvement with AR's case. This included agencies such as:

- a) Merseyside Police
- b) Lancashire Constabulary
- c) Prevent

- d) Healthcare
- e) Acorns School
- f) The Range High School
- g) CAMHS
- h) Forensic CAMHS

76. I also worked with and shared information with other departments and teams within LCC including the Child and Family Wellbeing team (within Early Help), the Pupil Access Team and the Youth Offending team.

77. As the lead professional during my period of involvement as AR's allocated social worker, I was responsible for coordinating the other agencies and the services provided. Multi-agency meetings were held; information sharing took place and multi-agency decisions were reached on next steps and actions required.

Reflection on events and improvements

78. I left the organisation in December 2020. I was not involved in any steps taken by LCC or CSC following 29 July 2024 to identify and assess prior dealings with AR.

79. Following receipt of my Rule 9 request, I was provided with a copy of the Rapid Review document dated 30 August 2024. I had not received a copy of this document previously and I did not contribute to this as I had left the LA.

Improvements

80. I had left LCC's employment prior to the events. I am therefore not aware of any improvements that have been made by CSC since these events took place.

Disclosure

81. I am not in possession of any additional material relevant to the inquiries Terms of Reference.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

Signed:

Signature

Dated:

26/08/25

Index to the Witness Statement of Anna Jameson, CSC

Exhibit No.	Inquiry reference no.	Document Description
AJ/01	LCC001768	Lancashire Continuum of Need (July 2017)
AJ/02	LCC000230	2019-12-12 1548_ Contact Record by Sayda Miah - CSSH MASH EHM (2702438)
AJ/03	LCC000231	2019-12-12 1553_ MASH Assessment by Adrienne Fox - MASH Central EHM (2702440)
AJ/04	LCC000232	2019-12-12 1553_ Transfer to ICS by Adrienne Fox - MASH Central EHM (2702441)
AJ/05	LCC000229	2019-10-08 1239_ Contact Record by Susan Smith - CSSH MASH EHM (2702439)
AJ/06	LCC000228	Chronology
AJ/07	LCC000018	2019-10-08 0000_ Episode Closure by Lucy Parkinson - CFW - West Lancs (2702787)
AJ/08	LCC000227	Case notes (<i>AR – Children's Social Care</i>)
AJ/09	LCC001701	Case notes (<i>DR – Children's Social Care</i>)
AJ/10	LCC001695	Email from Anna Jameson regarding initial strategy meeting
AJ/11	LCC001769	Working Together to Safeguard Children (July 2018)
AJ/12	LCC000234	2019-12-17 0000_ Record of Strategy Discussion by Anna Jameson - Assessment _ Safeguarding Team_ West Lancs (2718674)
AJ/13	LCC001695	Email from Anna Jameson regarding follow-up strategy meeting
AJ/14	LCC000235	2020-01-06 0000_ Record of Follow Up Strategy Discussion by Anna Jameson (2811194)
AJ/15	LCC000031	RO - 1566276 - EHC Request.pdf
AJ/16	LCC000027	C and F Assessment - no plan_2020-02-20-125702
AJ/17	LCC000236	2020-02-20 0000_ Childs Young Person's Plan by Anna Jameson - Assessment _ Safeguarding Team_ West Lancs (2831698)
AJ/18	LCC001346	ar_cpoms_confidential_20240730-1-qczcrj.pdf
AJ/19	LCC000041	Closure Record_2020-03-25-090902

