

## **Jake Summary of Case and Learning**

### **Background and Context**

Jake was 17 when he died. The following concerns were identified as cause of death: diabetic ketoacidosis, hyperglycaemia, diabetes mellitus and bronchopneumonia. He hadn't been diagnosed with diabetes when he was alive.

Jake died on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March 2021. The events leading to his death are as follows:

On Friday the 19<sup>th</sup> of March, Jake was feeling nauseas and asked that he be taken to hospital. He wasn't taken to hospital. On Saturday morning, the 20<sup>th</sup> of March, Jake said he was feeling dizzy and asked for a fizzy drink. His father said he couldn't have one, but his brother brought him one. His family checked on Jake during Saturday. He fell asleep on the sofa in the evening. The family checked on Jake during Sunday morning offering him food and drink which he refused. At lunchtime, Jake appeared to be sleeping and was moving in his bed. When Jake's brother checked on him at dinner time (17.40), he found his brother wasn't breathing. An ambulance was called, paramedics attended and pronounced Jake to be dead at 17.46.

It has been confirmed by the paediatrician that Jake's death would have been prevented if health care had been sought over the weekend that he was ill.

Jake was a vulnerable young person with unmet learning needs. At the time of his death, he was living with his father. There had been a breakdown in his relationship with his mother nine months prior to him moving in with his father. This was because Jake didn't want to follow his mother's rules and boundaries. Whilst he was living with his father, Jake didn't attend school/education. He hadn't been in education for the nine months prior to his death. During these nine months, he became sedentary and reclusive with no friends, only socialising online. He spent his nights gaming and daytime sleeping and never left the house. He hadn't accessed a GP for many years and wasn't registered with a new one when he moved to live with his father.

### **Chronology of Events**

#### **2013**

CAMHS involvement and indication of a risk of violent behaviour, involvement of LA Behaviour Support service, SEN support and EP involvement.

#### **2014**

Youth Justice Team involvement, spring 2014.

## **2015**

### **Jake is attending School 1**

**5/10/2015**

Risk assessment completed by Headteacher. Risk assessment refers to physical restraints being used, SEN support and Behaviour Support Service involvement.

## **2015/2016**

### **Managed Move to School 2**

No other agency involvement at the time and no ECHP completed. Information from the school records highlights safeguarding concerns yet no social care or early help involvement recorded.

## **2017**

### **Jake is attending School 3**

**5/12/2017**

Risk assessment completed by School 3. SCC write to GH's father regarding permanent exclusion from School 3.

### **Risk Assessment**

States that inappropriate sexualised behaviour, offensive language, threats to adults and pupils and criminalised behaviour have been evident. States that Jake has threatened to hit someone on a number of occasions, has sent threatening blackmailing messages to school and staff and that the language in the messages was offensive, threatening, sexualised and inappropriate. Jake threatened to bomb the school, made attempts to gain naked photos of staff and threatened to harm members of staff if his demands weren't met. This led to Police involvement and arrest.

**18/12/2017**

Pupil Discipline Committee decision to permanently exclude Jake. Letter sent to father. Referral for out of school tuition.

**20/12/2017**

Managed move via IFAP and passenger transport request completed to support Jake's move to school 4 from 9/01/2018.

## **2018/2019**

### **Jake is attending School 4**

**19/12/2018**

School 4 make decision to permanently exclude Jake with effect from 8/01/2019.

**19/12/2018**

Letter sent to Jake's father informing him of the decision. Excluded for possession of an offensive weapon and for drawing swastikas on school whiteboards.

**7/01/2019**

Inclusion referral form completed by school 4 and submitted to the Local Authority. Form states that Jake was at SEND support stage and states no social care or early help involvement. No pupil or family views recorded.

**8/01/2019**

Local Authority write to Jake's mother and father notifying them of the school's decision to permanently exclude Jake.

**11/01/2019**

Online Learning referral completed by Family Services Co-ordinator to support Jake to complete Year 11. Referral states that Jake has started working with the Youth Justice Service. Referral also made to FE College to 14-16 study programme. West Suffolk state they can't offer Jake a place because he poses too much of a risk.

At school 4, Jake did receive additional support from the SEN team.

**17/01/2019**

Inclusion Service risk assessment completed by school 4.

**28/01/2019**

Pupil disciplinary hearing held. Father telephoned twice but no reply and father didn't attend the hearing.

**29/01/2019**

School 4 write to Jake's father to inform him of the decision to permanently exclude Jake due to possession of an offensive weapon.

No places available in Key Stage 4 PRUs so Jake is offered online learning for the remainder of Year 11.

**31/01/2019**

Early Help Young Person's Worker (YPW) made enquiries with family services regarding completion of a CAF.

**11/02/2019**

YPW records state that family services confirm exclusion was upheld 28/01/2019 and that as Jake has had two permanent exclusions within two years, a further place at a mainstream school couldn't be offered. Jake is living in Haverhill with father.

**15/04/2019**

Alternative Tuition service report states Jake's attendance is 83% and that lessons are not completed fully, question's part answered or not attempted at all.

**10/06/2019**

Jake is seen by YPW at Haverhill House with Youth Justice Service worker and mother. Jake given a caution for possession of a knife in school. Careers advice given and possible provision and options discussed. Mother indicated that Jake wasn't engaged with online

learning provision and that she had been trying to get support with Jake's learning needs for years. YPW agreed to contact course tutor.

YPW contacts the course tutor who said that Jake hadn't engaged in online learning and had not made contact with the tutor since early March. YPW provided information to Jake and his mother about what he needed to complete by the end of June.

#### **11/06/2019**

Early Help open a CAF and YPW had a further conversation with mother about lack of support for his learning and his challenging behaviour. Agreed to explore post 16 options and get back to her.

#### **20/06/2019**

YPW met with Jake and older brother and Youth Justice Worker at home. Jake has decided to live in Norfolk with his mother and she was picking him up the following day. Information about Nova Training provided. They would be able to help him find a work experience placement and help him to gain English and Maths qualifications. YPW agreed to contact his mother to discuss Nova Training in more detail.

#### **21/06/2019**

YPW contacts mother and mother agreed to arrange a visit to Nova Training. YPW agreed to keep in touch but also agreed that if further support was needed, they would need to refer to Norfolk.

#### **5/09/2019**

YPW check in call with mother. Jake started at Nova Training and transport was provided by them.

Jake attended Nova Training for the academic year 2019/2020 but he didn't return to Nova Training for the following academic year because he moved back to live with his father in Suffolk. Norfolk County Council tried but failed to track him so was classified amongst Norfolk's young people whose EET destination was unknown.

### **Worries/Concerns**

1. Jake was a vulnerable young man with unmet learning needs and learning disabilities.
2. When living with his father, Jake was living a reclusive and sedentary lifestyle which wasn't questioned or checked by his father.
3. Jake didn't want to follow rules and boundaries.
4. Jake displayed very challenging and disturbing behaviour including criminal offences which weren't addressed by any of the schools he attended.
5. When living with his father, Jake didn't attend education. He hadn't been in education for the nine months prior to his death.
6. Jake had attended seven schools; he was excluded from three of them and dropped out of Nova Training in Thetford to go and live with his father.
7. He wasn't recorded as NEET.
8. It wasn't clear as to what the educational plan for Jake was.
9. Health care wasn't sought for Jake before he died even though he had indicated that he felt he needed to go to hospital.
10. Jake's father took a strict and rigid view with regard to food and eating. His father believed that boys and men should be thin.

11. Jake's father took the view that health services didn't need to be accessed and that 'everything will be ok'. As a consequence, the health needs of the family had been overlooked.
12. Jake had behavioural issues throughout his childhood and had multiple CAF plans following multiple referrals.
13. He was receiving support from the Child Development Centre but unknown what the concerns were and what support he was receiving for these concerns.
14. His cousin was open to CiN but it is unclear if the plans included Jake and his siblings or if there had been alignment with the Early Help team in relation to the CAF plans.
15. During the nine months prior to Jake's death, CYPs were involved with Jake's cousin and Jake's father but Jake doesn't appear to have been seen or considered.
16. His father worked long hours and wasn't at home very much.
17. He received poor supervision and parenting throughout his childhood.
18. Concerns for father's mental health and parenting capacity. His father's parenting was controlling and absent.
19. Jake had been involved in theft in 2015 and received a Community Resolution.
20. Jake was exposed to domestic abuse from a young age.

### **Learning – What Should have Happened/Could Have Been Done Better**

1. Since 2015, Jake's vulnerabilities and learning disabilities don't appear to have been taken into consideration by any of the school's he was attending with the exception of school 4 where he was receiving additional support from the SEN Team.

#### **Learning**

Schools should always pay specific attention to children with vulnerabilities and learning disabilities and consider that these children will require additional or specific support and services.

2. Jake's behaviour and unmet learning needs weren't addressed or resolved, with no consideration given to the rationale for his threatening and challenging behaviour or as to how he could be supported to remain in school by the four schools he attended since 2015.

#### **Learning**

Deeper consideration should have been given to the rationale behind Jake's threatening and challenging behaviour. There is nearly always a reason or underlying need which explains why children display challenging or threatening behaviour.

3. Safeguarding concerns were highlighted by the schools but no referrals for Early Help or Social Care support are mentioned as considered or sent. Neither was an ECHP completed, given the knowledge of his learning disabilities and vulnerabilities.

#### **Learning**

The number and extent of the concerns across the four school's recording systems should have prompted referrals to Customer First and MASH and at the same time, led to the completion of an ECHP. History and patterns of concerns on school recording systems should always be monitored and referrals made as a consequence.

4. Very little contact/dialogue took place between the schools and Jake's parents and Jake's mother noted her concern about the lack of support for his learning and challenging behaviour.

### **Learning**

Schools should always contact and communicate with parents when they have multiple and serious concerns regarding children's behaviour and prior to implementing an exclusion.

5. Because Jake hadn't attended school since 2019, no service 'had eyes on him'; he therefore was not identifiable as needing a service or help and support. No service knew he had returned to Suffolk, and Norfolk failed to track him, so he was given a destination of unknown.

### **Learning**

The Alternative tuition service Jake was receiving should have given deeper consideration and shown more curiosity to Jake's lack of commitment and engagement to online learning and the fact that he hadn't completed any online learning for nearly four months. SCC should give greater consideration to the implications of excluded children with vulnerabilities and challenging behaviour becoming invisible to services and effectively 'going under the radar'.

6. Social Care didn't consider Jake as part of their work with Jake's cousin who was under a special guardianship, open to CiN and living in the family home. Nor did they consider or explore any concerns regarding poor parenting, parenting capacity and the mental health of Jake's father and include Jake and his brothers in that consideration or question why Jake was never leaving the house, not attending school and living a sedentary and reclusive lifestyle.

### **Learning**

Social Care should have 'noticed' the other children in the house and considered the risks and concerns for them and the implications of poor parenting and parenting capacity whilst they were living with their father.