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Executive summary

Of the 90,000 children that are arrested every year, most are questioned by police. Their replies can often form the basis of a case against them. The vast majority of these children are suspected of minor offences and, as a result, are questioned by a police officer or staff with no training in questioning children. Obtaining reliable evidence from a child, especially one in trouble with the law, is a challenging process. Child suspects are often from deprived backgrounds and there are high incidences of psychological and psychiatric difficulties, which can be exacerbated by detention in a police station and go unnoticed. Therefore, there is a pressing need to improve the process for questioning children in trouble with the law to avoid potential miscarriages of justice.

On 30 November, the University of Plymouth organised a multidisciplinary symposium to look at how to tackle this significant shortcoming in the criminal justice system. Experts in youth justice, psychology, policing and law from around the UK and from Europe convened in Plymouth. They were joined by experienced local police officers, appropriate adults, judges and solicitors. The aim was to identify problems in obtaining reliable evidence from child suspects, and ideas of how to address these issues so that any decisions made in respect of these children was based on sound evidence.

The event generated several proposals, which may now be taken forward into further research and policy:

- Easily transferable and practical training using the existing models (PEACE and ABE) for all officers who interview child suspects;
- Multi-level screening process for child suspects to identify mental, physical and situational vulnerabilities to occur as soon as a child arrives in custody;
- Greater clarity for the role of appropriate adults and a national standardised system;
- Legal advice for child suspects to made compulsory;
- Introduction of judicial oversight of decisions to detain; and,
- Allowance for suspects, legal advisors and appropriate adults to record events in the custody record.

The event was organised by the School of Law, Government and Criminology at the University of Plymouth. It was funded by ISPER and the British Society of Criminology.

Piers von Berg
Symposium organiser
piers.vonberg@plymouth.ac.uk
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Introduction

The questioning of child suspects is an underdeveloped area compared with the care and protection given to children who are witness, victims and even defendants. For example, substantial guidance in questioning vulnerable witnesses has been developed in the Achieving Best Evidence Guidance (ABE). In order to rectify this lack of attention, a symposium was held at the University of Plymouth on 30 November 2018 to investigate what the obstacles were to obtaining reliable evidence from child suspects and what opportunities existed to tackle them (please see agenda of the event at the end of this document). It was organised by Piers von Berg of the School of Law at the University of Plymouth. The symposium brought together a wide variety of professionals including, lawyers, police officers, academics, psychologists and other youth justice professionals. Several notable experts attended including Professor Ray Bull and Professor Becky Milne, who helped develop the investigative interview model used by UK police. They agreed that there was a need to reform policy for interviewing child suspects due to a number of specific issues relating to inadequate assessment of children, insufficient training of interviewers and unsatisfactory legal safeguards. As there is comparably little work in this field, it was thought necessary to preserve in a report the issues they raised and the potential solutions they suggested so that it may stimulate and assist others who work in this area.

Research presentations

The first session involved presentations of ongoing and recent research in law, psychology and policing. The first presenter was Miranda Bevan, who is a former criminal barrister and worked at the Law Commission on their unfitness to plead report. Her PhD research focuses on the experiences of children detained as suspects in the police station. She spoke about the different factors that may make a young person vulnerable in police custody, including mental health, learning disability, natural developmental immaturity, adverse experiences and situational vulnerability. Her study was based on interviews of young people with recent experience of police custody. She argued that a child suspect’s fitness for interview is rarely assessed adequately, and that the criteria for that assessment, set out in Annex G of Code C, Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE), are infrequently applied by custody sergeants. Young participants’ accounts of their custody experiences were very negative; they found detention extremely alienating and often distressing. In this context, their accounts of ‘tactics’ used by officers in interview raised concerns about the fairness of relying on their responses to questioning.

Miranda was followed by Martin Vaughan, who is a former interview trainer for the police and is completing a PhD on the role of interview managers with vulnerable suspects. He explained that there is currently no research at all on links between interview planning and the problems of young suspects. For example, it was surprising to hear that there is no training provided at all for interview managers. After examining the Authorised Professional Practice (APP) provided by the College of Police, he concluded that there is no specific guidance for officers

when interviewing child suspects. He demonstrated that the current processes in place for establishing whether child suspect is fit for an interview can be brief due to time pressures and a lack of manpower.

Lesley Laver, a teacher of psychology at Bournemouth University who is completing a PhD in this area, then focused upon how vulnerability is assessed in custody. The custody officer is responsible for the safe and appropriate detention of a young person. Under Code of Practice C of PACE, the custody officer has a responsibility for initiating an assessment of risk in regards to the young person, but there is limited guidance available to officers on what such assessment should include and what is available for officers is not fit-for-purpose (see PACE Code C sections 3.6-3.10). Custody officers are able to consult other relevant parties when making assessments, but there is little in the way of training or process that would help a custody officer to determine when a further assessment from a third party might be appropriate. Lesley argued that a young person may be vulnerable in a number of different ways (physically, mentally, situational) to a number of different harms (health and safety, reduced engagement, injustice) and that there was currently no procedure that assessed all these risks. The danger of this was the potential to overlook significant communication issues that are not necessarily diagnosable or immediately apparent but could nevertheless lead to miscarriages of justice if not accounted for properly during interview. Misunderstandings of rights, acquiescence to suggestion and false confessions are all more likely where a communication need goes unnoticed. This can inevitably lead to inappropriate outcomes for the child including a failure to engage with proceedings and the missed opportunity to reduce re-offending. Some such vulnerabilities highlighted in Lesley’s recent research included a heightened risk of suggestibility in impulsive or anxious individuals and heightened risk of compliance in those with low-self-esteem or poor confidence in their own memory – traits that were all found to be much stronger in younger interviewees. Impulsivity in particular was a vulnerability that she felt special attention should be focused, given it’s known association with age, offending and also poor-decision making in interview and legal contexts. Despite some attempts to bring short screening tools or checklists into custody, there does not appear to be any comprehensive, evidence-based assessment carried out by any party in custody that considers all the appropriate risks involved in the detention and interview of young people. The potential for children with additional communication needs to “slip through the net” and be interviewed in a way that is inconsistent with their rights and fair process is high. Initial and further assessment of young people and all potentially vulnerable suspects across UK custody is in serious need of review.

Piers von Berg gave the final research presentation of the morning. Piers is a former public and family law barrister, who specialised in judicial review claims arising out of treatment of children in the criminal justice system and edited one of the first practitioners’ guides to this area (von Berg 2014). He focused on the legal safeguards under PACE 1984 governing the interview of a child suspect. Using statutory provisions, case law and Code of Practice C, Piers demonstrated how the current system provides very little guidance to interviewers. He presented his research with Dr Kate Gooch which used responses to requests under the Freedom of Information Act to all police forces in England and Wales for information on policy, guidance and training in interviewing child suspects. The data showed that a large majority of police forces were dependent on the scant guidance in PACE Code C. It also showed that

---

2 See www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/investigations/investigative-interviewing/#interviewee.
3 University of Leicester.
most, if not all, police forces did not consider interviewing a child a specialist skill; a great majority considered that an officer could interview any child suspect. Forces allocated interviewers based on the seriousness of the allegations not with consideration of the vulnerability of the suspect. Therefore, it is possible that a highly trained officer would interview a child suspected of a serious offence, who may lack any difficulties in participating for a child of their age, and officers or staff without any training in interviewing children would interview children suspected of volume crimes (e.g. shoplifting), who may have severe difficulties in participating in the interview. Piers and Kate’s data showed there is no correspondence between the level of training and an interviewee’s ability to participate (unless an assessment alerted officers – see above). This echoed Bevan’s research that many children were in police custody for non-serious offences and interviewed by junior officers. As a result, the legal safeguards under PACE are hugely problematic. This was illustrated with case law where children had been convicted on the basis of confused or highly suggestible responses in interview. Consequently, Piers argued that we need to rethink the legal safeguards around the interview process. He suggested that the principle of effective participation established in human rights law that has helped to improve the questioning of defendants in court should be applied to the questioning of suspects. This would require interviewers to take into account a suspect’s background in order to facilitate their participation in the interview process. The European Court of Human Rights has explicitly applied this principle to police interviews in the case of Panovits v Cyprus. However, domestic courts have not gone as far and further work is needed to theorise how the principle, which is normally understood in the trial setting, applies to the police interview. Later the panel agreed with Professor Penny Cooper’s suggestion of whether we should think in terms of effective participation rather than vulnerability.

Both Lesley Laver and Miranda Bevan highlighted the need to change the process in relation to liaison and diversion assessment. The main issues were i) whether an assessment by liaison and diversion was triggered in time for an interview because liaison and diversion often saw suspects after an interview, and, ii) whether the assessments that take place are fit-for-purpose. The argument was that for a service to be diversionary, it would need to engage with the suspect before detention and interview, as these are both substantial elements of the criminal justice process that can have significant effect on a suspect and the outcome of their case.

Piers von Berg tried to summarise the issues facing police when a child enters custody for an interview as knowing the individual needs of the child. This involves having the tools and resources to determine how a child should be interviewed, recognising when additional expertise is needed and the presence of effective incentives and requirements for custody officers and investigating officers to make such assessments prior to interview. Although, Lesley Laver observed that one should be careful not to overly compartmentalise the issues that young suspects might be facing and categorise people, when in fact their spectrum of difficulties and the way that individual and situational factors interact to affect communication needs can be unique to each individual and situation.

**Plenary discussion**

The research presentations generated a lot of questions during the plenary discussion, which was chaired by Professor Ray Bull. The key issues that arose were: the use of an appropriate
adult; training (or lack of it) for the police; legal requirements and safeguards; the age of criminal responsibility; and the assessment of vulnerability. Professor Miet Vanderhallen recognised that currently there are no training packages available from the College of Policing including child suspects. This raised a question as to whether there was an ideal model that could be used. Chris Bath, Chief Executive of the National Appropriate Adult Network, said that the current police risk assessments focus on self-harm and suicide but explained that the National Police Chief’s Council (NPCC) Custody Forum currently has a working group looking at the possibility of an improved risk assessment. Ray Bull commented on how the UK is admired for having Appropriate Adults. He also argued for the advantage of something simple that is easier to run and less catastrophic when it goes wrong. In other words, the UK has a very complex system that can been seen as world leading and so may not need further complication. It is more challenging to agree or establish a process which could work globally and Ray talked about his work with the United Nations to agree such a basic worldwide protocol.

An issue was raised during the discussion with regard to non-native speakers and how having an interpreter present during the interview changes the dynamic. More research is needed in this area. One potential problem is if a suspect’s interpreter has played a role in the crime, for example in cases involving human trafficking. There are also difficulties if a suspect and/or an interpreter cannot read or write. There is a related issue of AA’s who sometimes need an interpreter and may rely on the suspect to act as one. This in turn led into a discussion around AA’s.

Family members such as parents are the AA’s during the interview do not always know their child’s legal rights. It was agreed that not all AA’s are good or appropriate. Chris Bath argued that for resource reasons, it is not currently possible to have all the desired professionals (e.g. solicitors, psychologists, intermediaries) present throughout detentions for all children. Trained AA’s can make a positive difference in many cases but also need to know their limits and highlight when professional intervention is required due to greater needs.

Commentary: youth justice perspectives

The afternoon was devoted to defining some of the obstacles identified by the presenters and any corresponding reforms of the system. It began with a broad perspective on developments in the youth justice system by Dr Patricia Gray of the University of Plymouth. She explained that statistics show a dramatic shrinkage in numbers of young people in the youth justice system based on a lack of cautions and convictions. This led to two possible reasons for such a dramatic drop, either it is a response to improvements in diversion and/or reoffending following research, or it is due to the cuts in public spending as it is expensive to prosecute. There were several factors to consider including diversions and higher levels of personal and social problems. In 2016, the UN condemned the UK for its lack of compliance with the UNCRC.

These statistics produced a lot of discussion surrounding the low age of criminal responsibility and how compared to European countries we are seen as a “laughing stock”. Patricia Gray mentioned the ‘Child First’ movement that sought to have children in the criminal justice system treated as children first and offenders second. Using a ‘child friendly’ approach to youth justice, Piers von Berg made the point that under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
(UNCRC), children have a right to be heard and not to be discriminated against, among other rights. Some of the practices already discussed in police custody could be construed as discriminatory, for example, not tailoring the interview for a disability. Indeed, other practices in police custody such as strip searching of girls and placing children in adult cells raise questions about possible adverse treatment on account of protected characteristics or failures to make reasonable adjustments.

**Roundtable discussion**

This then led into a roundtable discussion facilitated by Professor Becky Milne. The group established the main issues that need to be dealt with to improve the current system. Police officers and other professionals argued that there was a clear need to provide, or improve training and tools with regard to assessing vulnerabilities, and determining if a young person is fit for interview. In order to be able to assess vulnerabilities, it becomes necessary to identify what it is we mean by ‘vulnerability’, and what this includes. Whilst many officers may be trained in the ABE style of interviewing, and this approach can cater for some vulnerabilities pertaining to youth in the interview room, it is not tailored to the specific needs of suspects and cannot simply be transferred across to this group.

**Group sessions**

A set of issues emerged from the roundtable discussion and the final session focused on these in separate groups. These groups identified problems and suggested ideas which would provide solutions to their respective areas. The session facilitator, Dr Ching-Yu Huang, proposed the structure for the participants of the issues that had emerged from the day’s discussions as follows:

1. The agents in the investigative interview  
   a. Children and their vulnerabilities.  
   b. The actors in the interview – police interviewer, lawyer, AA, intermediary and interpreter (this was connected to police training and practice, and, the interview model).
2. Situational or environmental factors that affect the interview  
   a. Length of detention (custody timing).
3. Structural or process factors  
   a. The judicial and legal issues.  
   b. Safeguarding.  
   c. National guidance.
4. Tools that can be utilised to instigate change  
   a. Media.  
   b. Technology.  
   c. Law.  
   d. Funding.  
   e. Interview guidelines.
The participants then raised the following issues in their groups.

1. **Training**

The need for more effective training for interviewing child suspects was discussed at length. This includes training on how to deal with different vulnerabilities and what to look out for. Quality assurance was also needed. Not all vulnerabilities are obvious and can be situational. It was also apparent that the more serious the crime the more experienced the officer was who dealt with the interview (see Piers von Berg research presentation above). The need for cooperation from police forces nationally is vital to making the training effective. During the discussion it was said that the police do not read PACE unless they have to.

Potential solutions included, where possible, to ensure that an officer with the required training carries out the interview. The training would need to be easily transferable, practical and not just theoretical. It was suggested that we could use the ABE and PEACE models in terms of its principles and apply it to child suspects and adults with vulnerabilities. Another notion was to triage suspects on arrival so they are interviewed by a specifically trained officer. It was considered that there may be issues regarding funding for more training.

2. **Appropriate Adults**

The AA framework generated a lot of debate. One of the main issues was that not all AAs are good or appropriate. There were systematic issues with the process and there is insufficient guidance in PACE with regard to the role of an AA. It was concerning to learn that one YOT had identified gang leaders attempting to position themselves as a child’s AA in a ‘county lines’ case. With so many different perspectives it becomes impossible to have just one person in the interview room. Potential solutions discussed included:
• Excluding parents from interviews while keeping them fully informed and asking them for any information that may be relevant to the child’s needs.
• Making AAs subject to legal privilege, rather than relying on case law and common law to protect the child during a private consultation.
• Making legal advice compulsory for child suspects.
• Improving police training on / understanding of the AA role.
• When a child is arrested and taken to the police station, an AA is called immediately (as required by PACE Code C), so children do not have to be detained any longer than they have to.

In order to achieve any of this, it is important to provide a greater clarity on the role of the AA for the police and ensure they are aware than an AA is not just for interview but for the whole of detention. It was thought that a national standardised system is possible.

After the conference, Chris Bath provided a thoughtful note about the role of the AA. He believes that we need to do more to inform and advise untrained AAs so that they understand their purpose, understand that they have a choice as to whether to take on the role, and they are not reliant on police for an explanation of how to safeguard the child against the abuse of police powers. The key risks in interview are more subtle than in the 1970s (where the roots of the AA role lie). This requires us to reconsider the skills levels of the people responsible for mitigating these risks. More needs to be done to ensure that everyone, including the police, provider organisations, funding organisations and AAs understand that the role of the AA is much more than being present for the interview. The strongest argument for the AA role is that they are present during custody, in a way that a professionals realistically cannot be. If AA’s only turn up shortly before interview like lawyers often do, there is a real question about what impact they are having. We should more clearly spell out that the risks are for all children, including both those who are vulnerable for reasons of age and those who have additional vulnerabilities.

3. What is vulnerability?

‘Vulnerability’ always exists in relation to something – it is not a status that exists without another party, situation or context that gives rise to a potential consequence of that vulnerability. Trying to define ‘vulnerability’ in isolation from its context (in order to generically label an individual as ‘vulnerable’) is therefore extremely challenging and as some argue, inappropriate. It was suggested that to improve identification of potential difficulties with detention and interview, officers/assessors should perhaps not think in terms of labelling the individual as ‘vulnerable’, but rather think in terms of ‘difficulties with engagement’, ‘risk of misunderstanding/injustice’, or ‘likelihood of agreeing with statements that are untrue’. Directly assessing what a suspect is vulnerable to is not only more specific, but it is more pragmatic and operationally effective, as it helps to identify exactly what procedural risks need to be mitigated and what the appropriate action is likely to be. As ‘vulnerability’ is also contextual and variable over time, such an approach would also ensure that assessment and resulting action taken is directly relevant to the particular interview taking place.

As was highlighted in the talks at the beginning of the day and discussed in this group, there are very significant issues with risk assessment in terms of both the methods used to assess and the parties who are responsible for assessment. Whilst a number of services might be consulted by a custody officer in order to determine fitness for detention or interview, arguably most of these services have insufficient expertise/training to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the relevant factors. Most worryingly, unless an officer’s suspicion is aroused that a suspect is facing a significant issue, it is unlikely that they would be referred to anyone for an assessment anyway. With custody officer’s initial screening questions being
inappropriate/not fit-for-purpose, many significant difficulties go unnoticed. It was therefore suggested that a revision of procedure, together with an appropriate, evidence-based, streamlined full risk assessment tool in which an appropriate member of staff is trained, would alleviate this problem. A basic flowchart on which to begin revising the process of assessing vulnerability was proposed in the presentations, then built upon in this group discussion (indicated below).

Custody process at present:

![Flowchart of current custody process]

Early draft of a revised custody process:

![Flowchart of revised custody process]

4. Legal safeguards

The legislation has been described as having no teeth. PACE safeguards are also routinely ignored. Legal advisors are not always reliable or available and take up of legal advice among child suspects declines with younger children. There is a real lack of accountability in police custody. One of the problems is with the police disciplinary process. It is internal and officers have been heard to comment to researchers that they would prefer to face a senior officer than a judge. Thought could be given to judicial oversight of authorisation of detention, review and extension. This could avoid unnecessary detentions and restore some confidence in the system by having an independent oversight of those coming into police custody. In particular, with some vulnerable suspects, an interview could be arranged at a later date to allow for assessment and planning of the interview. A stipendiary magistrate could conduct this remotely.

The custody record should no longer be the preserve of the custody officer. Suspects, AA’s and legal advisors should be allowed to make entries on it. A rather intriguing idea was discussed with regard to the custody record and the amount of time it takes officer to log everything. The idea was that a tablet like device was available in the cells for the young person to ask for a drink, speak with their lawyer etc. Then this would automatically get logged.
on the custody record. However some said that suspects have a tendency to keep pushing
the button for attention, so this may not be practical. Although there was generally optimism
about the idea.

In terms of research going forward, it would be helpful to update the data on the take up of
legal advice, the profiles of detainees and the way in which detention is authorised and
extended. It would also help to explore how the principle of effective participation as
understood by the European Court of Human Rights in Article 6, the right to a fair trial, applies
to the police interview.

After the event, another avenue of investigation was thought of, which is to update the
research done by Roger Evans (1994) which identified the potential for miscarriages of justice.
Although he did not examine interview records forensically for legal flaws, he found good
reason to believe that because of poor training for police officers and consequently problems
in conduct of interviews that there were miscarriages of justice in many cautions administered.
He pointed out the important problem of a lack of interview transcripts for cautions and the
lack of any transcript in other cases until prosecutions were well underway.

**Concluding observations by Rebecca Harris (symposium reporter)**

Overall I left the conference with a good feeling that progress had been made. All points were
discussed diplomatically and promptly, it was all rather refreshing. However, I was concerned
at what I had discovered about the interview process (or lack of) involving child suspects. It
was troubling to think that there are currently no specific guidelines setting out how to interview
child suspects and the potential vulnerabilities they suffer, and the harmful effects such an
event can cause. Throughout the day, I noted several observations, including, the possibility
that some young people may not be able to read and write, how would they understand what
they are being told to read (such as the Codes of Practice governing their detention). I was
made aware that people can volunteer to become an AA. However, I was concerned that,
even if there is an interest, it must be ensured that the volunteer is capable of dealing with
these types of situations.

It became apparent that we needed to establish what it was we mean by the term vulnerable.
This made me think about what it can mean to young people. The statement vulnerable has a
negative connotation, and be portrayed as a weakness. I can see how it can be quite
disempowering for a young person. Therefore using a more positive phrase such as sensitive,
or susceptible, might change general attitudes (see group session above which discussed
terms such as “difficulties with engagement”, “risk of misunderstanding/injustice”, or “likelihood
of agreeing with statements that are untrue”). With regard to the issues raised concerning the
AA, I am not entirely sure that we resolved the issue of building a relationship through the use
of the AA with regard to the young person.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Tea and coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30am</td>
<td>Welcome – Professor Rod Sheaff, Director of the Institute for Social, Policy and Enterprise Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45am</td>
<td>Research presentations chaired by Professor Miet Vanderhallen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fitness and fairness? Reassessing child suspect interviews in the light of young people’s experiences – Miranda Bevan, LSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment of child suspects – Lesley Laver, Bournemouth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Managing investigative interviews with child suspects – Martin Vaughan, University of Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Legal safeguards in the interview of a child suspect – Piers von Berg, University of Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>• Professor Becky Milne, University of Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professor Miet Vanderhallen, University of Antwerp and University of Maastricht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Major Crime Investigator Paul Cashman, Devon and Cornwall Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chris Bath, Chief Executive, National Appropriate Adult Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Commentary on youth justice perspectives: Dr Patricia Gray introduced by Dr Oliver Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15pm</td>
<td>Roundtable discussion with all participants chaired by Professor Becky Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45pm</td>
<td>Tea and coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Group work facilitated and led by Dr Ching-Yu Huang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30pm</td>
<td>Wrap up and summary of the day by Professor Ray Bull and plans for future events and collaborations by Piers von Berg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45pm</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>