****

**United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child**

**United Nations Day of General Discussions on Children’s Rights and Alternative Care**

**Submission – Key Points**

**June 2021**

**Contact:**

**Karla Charles**

**Policy Manager, EPIC**

**karlacharles@epiconline.ie**

**John Murphy**

**Advocacy and Research Officer**

**johnmurphy@epiconline.ie**

**This submission is signed by Members of EPIC’s National Youth Council; Rory Brown; Jessica Duffy; Roisin Farragher; Mark Hennessy; Katelyn Kelly; Juliette Kurlink; Angelika Majer; Dillon Nolan; Clara O’Shea; Lauren O’Toole.**

**Key Points**

EPIC (Empowering People in Care) has focused on “recommendations for change where policies and practices have not been successful” and reflects the reality of our day-to-day work. We would like to draw the following issues to the attention of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child.

1. **Lack of Data and Research.**

EPIC calls for increased data gathering on children in care, aftercare and beyond. A longitudinal study on children leaving care was proposed as an action by the Health Service Executive in response to a recommendation by the Report of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse[[1]](#footnote-1). This action was subsequently included in the *National Strategy for Research and Data in Children’s Lives, 2011- 2016* (DCYA, 2011), but has yet to be carried out. Such a longitudinal study is a much-needed addition to the data currently being gathered by Tusla.[[2]](#footnote-2) The ability to analyse data for children in care and leaving care, over an extended period, and to be able to compare this to the non-care population would provide a level of insight and understanding that is currently unavailable.[[3]](#footnote-3) The lack of data for analysis stymies the ability of policy makers and practitioners to develop informed and robust measures to meet the needs of this cohort.

Many issues that EPIC deal with on a daily basis through its advocacy work have no empirical or independent reports to support this work. Examples of these include children in care living outside of Ireland; lack of independent community accommodation for those with a disability; lack of continuity of social workers; lack of engagement of young people in their care reviews; timely access to therapeutic supports; children being placed in homeless services under Section 5, Child Care Act 1991, and therefore not technically in care and then not entitled to aftercare. For improvements to be made and sustained for young people in care, research into all aspects of care must be regularly carried out.

1. **Aftercare.**

Aftercare in Ireland must be extended to the age of 26 in line with the age at which the average person leaves home. Barriers which hinder children in care accessing aftercare must be removed, and children must be appropriately supported in accessing the right kind of higher education or training which will allow them to be independent later on.

Aftercare legislation in Ireland,[[4]](#footnote-4) states the nature of the assistance “that *may* be provided”[[5]](#footnote-5) to the eligible child on or after they have attained the age of 18. A needs assessment will be carried out to determine eligibility, and considers factors such as need, age and length of time in care. Further barriers also apply in relation to young people who come into care shortly before their 18th birthday, as the current law requires that the young person must have spent at least 12 months in care between the ages of 13 and18.[[6]](#footnote-6)

“To qualify for an Aftercare Allowance at 18 years of age an eligible adult must:

* Have turned 18 in the care of the Child and Family Agency having spent 12 months in the care of the Agency between the age of 17-18 years
* Be attending an accredited education course, third level course or training programme as outlined in the young adult’s Aftercare Plan.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

The difficulty is not all young people leaving care go on to further education or entering training and therefore “access to aftercare is therefore not a guaranteed right for young people who have lived in State care”[[8]](#footnote-8) beyond the age of 21.

Tusla’s latest published figures outline 2,243 young people in the 18-22 age group in receipt of an aftercare service. However, only 1,697 are in education or training.[[9]](#footnote-9) This leaves 546 young people (24%) that are in receipt of an aftercare service but are not attending an education placement or in training. As a result, this cohort will not have supports beyond 21 years of age, and for many this will mean only basic employment options and limitations on their future prospects.

A member of EPIC’s Youth Council spoke with the homeless charity Focus Ireland on the eve of last year’s General Election. He stated that when he “turned 18, that stability ended. I came into the risk of homelessness and insecure housing because it was suddenly deemed, overnight, that I was an adult now and able to support myself independently. I was now an adult that had to learn about renting, learn how to live on my own and to actuallyhave a roof over my head. I also had to learn how to cope with loneliness when living on my own*.”[[10]](#footnote-10)*

Many of these issues are common among care leaver in EPIC’s experience and show that aftercare payments and supports need to be expanded to all who leave care. EPIC is also lobbying to have the age of aftercare supports and services extended to 26, an age more in line with the average age that young people in the general population leave home.[[11]](#footnote-11)

1. **Educational Outcomes**

Educational outcomes and training must be prioritised in order to achieve independence for young people leaving care. As a specific cohort, children in care have, on average, some of the lowest levels of educational attainment in comparison to their non-care experienced peers, and their outcomes continue to be a major concern in all the countries in which relevant data is collected. The implications of this are far reaching and extend beyond education, since the educational outcomes of children and young people with care experience are strongly linked to subsequent employment (Hook & Courtney, 2011), housing (Davison & Burris, 2014), mental and physical health (Dixon, 2008) and offending (Cusick et al. 2012). Under achievement at primary and secondary level means that young people who have been in the care system are significantly less likely to go to on to further and higher education than not only their non-care experienced peers, but also other disadvantaged cohorts of young people. Educational data in Ireland must be improved and published so that essential supports can be put in place.

1. **Sibling Access.**

EPIC calls for greater emphasis and resources for family access. One of the main recurring issues presented to EPIC for advocacy over the last number of years is family contact and sibling access. In EPIC’s last report, family contact was the third highest request for advocacy totalling 11% of referrals.[[12]](#footnote-12) Unfortunately no research is available regarding sibling access in Ireland. A recent study in Scotland “found very high rates of sibling estrangement with seven in ten relationships between a child in out-of-home care and a sibling classified as estranged and half of all siblings classified as strangers.”[[13]](#footnote-13) There is no reason to believe that the numbers and situation in Ireland would be significantly different.

Most children in the care system emphasise the importance of their sibling relationships.[[14]](#footnote-14) Benefits of sibling contact reported by children and carers include improved family relationships, reassuring a child of a sibling’s welfare, and the promotion of identity and belonging.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Indeed, the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse[[16]](#footnote-16) made the recommendation to ensure that **“**Children in care should not, save in exceptional circumstances, be cut off from their families. Priority should be given to supporting ongoing contact with family members for the benefit of the child.”[[17]](#footnote-17) This was an important recommendation as part of this report examined the loss of family contact and the impact that this had on children and as adults in later life.

Research into the area of sibling access must be a priority for Tusla[[18]](#footnote-18) and action to ensure that siblings have consistent and positive experiences of their time together must be undertaken.

The recommendations from the General Assembly are clear in relation to sibling access, and this should be reiterated.[[19]](#footnote-19)

1. **Privatisation of Care.**

The increase in privatisation of care in Ireland needs to be examined. The number of children in care placements provided by private providers has risen by over 75% in the last 7 years. Tusla’s first recorded figures from March 2014 stated that 417 children were in private placements.[[20]](#footnote-20) The number by December 2020 was 729.[[21]](#footnote-21) In 2014 a total of 6,504 children were in care,[[22]](#footnote-22) 6% were in private placements. In 2020 5,882 children were in care, and those in private care had doubled to 12%.[[23]](#footnote-23)

An Irish TD[[24]](#footnote-24) in an opinion piece to an online news platform expressed concerns when he acknowledged that “private companies recruit and support their own foster carers and charge Tusla to place children in care in one of the agency’s families. While these companies plug a gap in services, a gap that can leave children at risk, ultimately they lead to negative outcomes across the system.”[[25]](#footnote-25)

A total[[26]](#footnote-26) of €192,962,018[[27]](#footnote-27) was spent on residential care in 2019, and of that total €109,559,728[[28]](#footnote-28) or 57% of the total spend was on private residential services.

The rate of increase for private residential services over the four -year period 2016-2019 was 87%.[[29]](#footnote-29) Tusla has stated that the “basic private ‘mainstream’ placement rate increased from €5,000 to €6,000 per week. Dual occupancies were set at €8,500 and single occupancies at €13,500 per child per week.”[[30]](#footnote-30) A value for money analysis, as well and an evaluation of outcomes should be carried out.

1. **Statutory Care versus Voluntary Care.**

The use of voluntary care arrangements in Ireland, especially in the longer term, must be reviewed. The number of children in care under a voluntary arrangement is 1,532 or 26% of all those in care of the State.[[31]](#footnote-31)

The Ombudsman for Children’s Office (OCO) reported that “parents may not always fully understand what voluntary admission to care entails prior to making a decision. A number of cases suggest that there can be confusion about the differences between a placement with relatives and voluntary admission to care.”[[32]](#footnote-32) The potential imbalance of power leaves parents at a distinct disadvantage.

The OCO highlighted the Council of Europe document on rights of families of children in contact with social services.[[33]](#footnote-33) This report recommended that “[F]rom their first involvement with the social service system, children and families should be promptly and adequately informed and advised, inter alia, of: a. their rights to services including the instruments available to remedy possible violations of these rights; b. the range of services available and the procedure by which they are delivered; c. the role the child may exercise in different procedural steps and the actors that may accompany or support the child in her or his dealings with the social services.”[[34]](#footnote-34)

The Ombudsman then directly criticised the legislation for voluntary care and wrote that “[S]ection 4 of the 1991 Act provides legislative underpinning for the system of voluntary care. It does not provide for the right of the child or his or family to receive information and advice about the operation of the voluntary care arrangement.”[[35]](#footnote-35) This is an important intervention regarding the issue of voluntary care.

The OCO further recommended, and EPIC supports, that “Explicit statutory provision should be made for the right of children and their parent(s)/guardian(s) to receive timely, accessible and comprehensive information about any decisions or actions taken under the 1991 Act, which affect them.”[[36]](#footnote-36)

The Child Care Law Reporting Project demonstrated in a recent publication how legislation impacts on practice, stating the “[N]eed to formalise [the] situation of a girl in voluntary care for almost eight years”**[[37]](#footnote-37)**. This was the case of an almost eight-year girl who had been in a foster placement since she was two days old. When replying to the judge’s question of what would happen if an interim order was not granted, the social worker replied that “[F]rom an emotional point of view, [the child’s] attachment is to her foster parents and from a mental health point of view, [she is involved with] her school and friends. I can’t imagine the trauma it would cause.”**[[38]](#footnote-38)** The Guardian *ad Litem* who had been appointed also worryingly stated that “she was looking at the child’s files and noticed a certain level of drift in the case between 2011 and 2014.”[[39]](#footnote-39) The judge noted that “[V]oluntary care orders going on for this length lead to complications.”[[40]](#footnote-40)

A recent report published by the School of Applied Social Studies and School of Law at UCC also raised many issues. It stated that “voluntary care agreements are concluded between the parent (s) and Tusla with no independent oversight at the point of entry to care. Thus, there is no safeguard at the outset to ensure that the placement and care plan are adequate to meet the child’s needs.”[[41]](#footnote-41)

Concerns around the statutory obligations “have been raised [and] about the effectiveness of periodic reviews in voluntary care placements, particularly in long-term voluntary care placements, which may be less visible within the system than care order cases involving more complex needs or more serious abuse or neglect.”[[42]](#footnote-42)

As evidenced above, the concerns around voluntary arrangements are numerous, and this significant issue must be rectified.

1. **Mental Health and Therapeutic Intervention**

EPIC calls for mental health support and therapeutic support for all children in care as a matter of course, as well as continued therapeutic support in aftercare and beyond. The current access route is too slow, and often inaccessible to those who have aged out of care but still require support. Unresolved trauma can shape how young people respond to everyday life experiences, including how they respond to the services provided by professionals.[[43]](#footnote-43)

Trauma-informed practice is a framework that is based on knowledge and understanding of how trauma affects people’s lives and their service needs. Many children in care will have been removed from their family in very traumatic circumstances and will have experienced feelings of fear, rejection and powerlessness. Unfortunately, similar feelings re-emerge when children and young people prepare to leave care, and then leave care at 18. This highlights the need for priority access to mental health supports for children in care, leaving care, aftercare and ageing out of care.

1. **Conclusion.**

The care of children living out of home in Ireland still presents many issues for the young people and for organisations like EPIC who advocate for them. A lack of research creates many difficulties to show empirically the issues and the number of young people affected.

EPIC recommends greater resources to ensure aftercare for all young people turning 18.

A great emphasis much be placed on keeping families together and when this is not possible, to support sibling access.

In everyday care, more funding and accessibility for mental health services, therapeutic interventions and emphasis and supports for education must be realised immediately.

In broader terms, privatisation of care must be lessened, and a greater emphasis placed on children being in care under a statutory basis.

It is only when these are accomplished that children in care in Ireland can begin to have equality of opportunity with their peers.

EPIC welcomes the opportunity to highlight these issues to the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child.
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