Welcome

Learning from Serious Case Reviews - Neglect
The aim of the day....

• Local serious case reviews
• Findings and Learning
• Local good practice and resources
• Networking and practitioner discussions
What is the Safeguarding Children Board?

- **Created by:** Children’s Act 2004
- **A formal board** (network) of organisations
- **Members:** police, social care, education, NHS, probation, district councils...
- **Includes:** lay members and community representation

*Aim:* to improve how local organisations work together to ensure children stay safe
Who is part of the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board?

What is the OSCB?

Please visit our website: www.oscb.org.uk...
What is the role of the OSCB?

- Safeguarding & Child Protection Procedures
  (available on the OSCB website: www.oscb.org.uk)
- Multi-Agency training
- Quality Assurance: checking and scrutinising
- Communicating & raising awareness
- Serious Case Reviews
The executive group

Children in Care Council
Oxfordshire Youth Parliament
Sounding Boards
Safeguarding forum

Chief Executive of the County Council

Health & wellbeing Board
Children’s Trust
MAPPA
Community Safety Partnerships
OSAB
Domestic Abuse

Comms
• Area groups
• Education
• Health

Multi agency working
• CSE
• Procedures
• Disabled children

OSCE
Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board

Review of cases (CRAG)
Quality assurance & audit
Training
Harrow Local Safeguarding Children Board has produced a short film sharing learning from a recent learning and improvement case review.

It is based on a child's point of view and illustrates the importance of a 'team around the family' approach to work with children and families.

Harrow LSCB Child's Perspective
Serious Case Reviews

LSCBs are responsible for commissioning a serious case review (SCR) when there has been a death or serious injury to a child/children.

A panel decides whether an SCR should be undertaken. Each agency involved is required to provide a report detailing their involvement with the child/young person or parents.

An independent author produces an overview from all these reports, highlighting learning points and making recommendations for the agencies.
Serious Case Reviews - Neglect

Neglect is the on-going failure to meet a child’s basic needs.

Neglect is the most common reason for children being on child protection plans in Oxfordshire and nationally.

Local serious case reviews featuring neglect;

- Child H
- Child R (Partnership review)
- Children K-S
National Findings from SCR’s:

* The NSPCC report in 2013 found neglect in 60% of the 139 serious case reviews between 2009-2011
* Neglect can be life threatening and needs to be treated with as much urgency as other categories of maltreatment
* Neglect with the most serious outcomes can occur across all ages
* Prevention and early support for children and families are crucial, but so too is later stage help for older children living with the consequences
SCR Local and National Findings

National Findings from SCR’s:

(Example of Daniel Pelka 2012)

* Poor quality of assessments
* Professionals should be more curious and focused to address specific concerns
* Neglect and Abuse often go hand in hand
* Professionals make assumptions about the actions of others without checking
* Opportunities are missed for more urgent and purposeful interventions to consider abuse as a possible causation of problems
* Failure to engage/acknowledge significant male figures and to see the wider picture
* The lack of ability to address domestic abuse issues
Local Findings from SCR’s:

- Parent placing their own needs before those of the child
- Long term involvement with services but little evidence of sustained improvement
- Little professional challenge to lack of progress against plans or agreed actions
- Effort and attention paid to neglectful parent led to the focus on the child often being lost
- Lack of professional’s curiosity about self reported information
- Over confidence in parents capacity to improve without regular professional support
Good Practice – Ensure that you are using all available tools and resources, and take advantage of all relevant training.

Be Proactive – Ensure you are aware of the other organisations and professionals working with the child/family and that you understand the interventions.

Support the parent/s to engage with services for their own needs which will help them in their parenting.

Deal with fact - Do not automatically take the parent/individual’s information as fact – Be curious and evidence it.

Assess the level of risk – This will change throughout the family’s engagement and non-engagement.
See the client as a parent – Remember that behind your client could be a child/ren at home affected by the adult’s behaviour

Good Practice – Ensure that you are using all available tools and resources, and take advantage of all relevant training

Be Proactive – Ensure you are aware of the other organisations and professionals working with the child/family and that you understand any plans or orders on the child

Deal with fact - Do not automatically take the parent/individual’s information as fact – Be curious and evidence it by speaking to children’s services

Assess the level of risk – This will change throughout the family’s engagement and non-engagement
Andy Ryan – Neglect from a Police perspective

Clare Rowntree – Neglect Pilot in North Oxfordshire

Patrick Neil – Engagement
Thames Valley Police

- 2.2 Million people live in TVP
- 6 million visit every year

- Employs 7,900 people

- 4250 Police Officers
- 500+ PCSOs
- 3150 civilian staff

- 908 Volunteers
- 408 Special Constables
- 500 Police Support Volunteers

- CAIU TVP = 65 Detectives
- 15 covering Oxfordshire
Section 1 Children and Young Person Act 1933

- Person over 16
- Has responsibility for a child
- **Wilfully** neglect
  (or to cause or procure him to be neglected)
- In a manner likely to cause
- him unnecessary suffer or injury to health
  (including injury to or loss of sight, hearing, limb or organ of the body or any mental derangement)
Considering Criminal Neglect

• Child H
  Theft offences = picture of neglect

• Natalie Daniels
  Piecemeal investigation
  vs
  Endemic neglect in a family
Child Protection Case Conferences

- Results to Neighbour Inspectors
- Dissemination to PCSOs & NHPT
- Attendance at ICPCC from 50% to 85%
- Now have dedicated staff member
- We are aiming for 100% ICPCC
Context of the pilot

- Numbers of children affected by neglect are increasing
- Tackling neglect requires strong partnerships
- We can learn from success of Thriving Families Programme
Focus of the pilot

Objectives

• Introduce better ways of working that provide effective help and support to families improving communication and co-ordination

Leading to:

• Reduced number of children requiring child protection plans due to neglect
• Reduced number of children becoming looked after due to chronic neglect
Objectives

Delivered by:

• Testing new models of service delivery to ensure services address the needs of the whole family
• Building a full picture of the extent and depth of neglect
• Maximising intensive intervention with the most vulnerable by testing new ways of organising and delivering services
• Ensuring that neglect is understood in the same way that child sexual exploitation is now understood
• Enabling practitioners to identify neglect and intervene directly or prompt intervention
Timescales

Pilot development
September 2014 – October 2014

Pilot
November 2014 – May 2015

Evaluation
May 2015 - June 2015
Work so far…

• Multi-agency event on 10 September
• 80 professionals attended from social care, schools, early intervention, Thames Valley Police, health, children’s centres, housing, youth justice
• 38 volunteers to form Task Groups on:
  a) Education settings
  b) Think Family
  c) Focus on under-5s
  d) Supporting Practitioners
  e) Research and evidence: tools to tackle neglect
• Action plan developed
“Persistent failure to meet a child’s basic ... needs, likely to result in the serious impairment of health and development... Neglect may involve a parent or carer failing to: provide adequate food, clothing, shelter or protection from harm or danger, ensure access to health care. Also includes unresponsiveness to a child’s basic emotional needs.”

Working Together 2013
‘Ultimately, effective safeguarding of children can only be achieved by putting children at the centre of the system, and by every individual and agency playing their full part, working together to meet the needs of our most vulnerable children.’

And yet

‘Around one-third of professionals said they have felt powerless to intervene when they have had concerns about neglect.’

---

Working Together 2013

Action for Children 2013
Spread of neglect cases
North neglect cases
Children with previous child protection plans for neglect

- CPP for neglect: 100
- Previous CPP: 29
- Previous CPP for neglect: 23
Troubled Families

The 100 children identified come from 41 families in the north of the county.

Of these families, 10 are on the Troubled Families list:

- 43/100 children live in one of these ‘troubled families’
- 7/10 of these families receive out of work benefits (17% of households nationally have no-one in work)
- Between Jan and Aug 2013, 2 adults in the 10 families found guilty of an offence – including one into custody
Education

Numbers in school
49 school age (September 13/14)
2 of 49 not in school
42 are under 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 60 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance Of 47 who went to school:
Special Educational Needs

37/47 (79%) have SEN (nationally 19% of children have SEN)

- School Action - 15 children (32%)
- School Action plus – 18 children (38%)
- Statements – 4 (9%)

Of the 22 children with School Action plus & Statements:

- 66% have Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulties
- 50% have Moderate Learning Difficulty
- 33% have a Significant Learning Disability
Feedback from professionals (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You said</th>
<th>We’re proposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No common understanding of neglect</td>
<td>Trial use of Graded Care Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned neglect doesn’t get the same response as physical or sexual abuse</td>
<td>• Set of resources to support professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to be clear with all adults – family and professionals – what is an acceptable standard</td>
<td>• Graded Care Profile&lt;br&gt;• Resources for families and professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools often meet basic needs of children (food, washing) – is this masking the problem?</td>
<td>• Strengthening core groups&lt;br&gt;• Set of resources to support professionals&lt;br&gt;• Needs analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient communication between key agencies</td>
<td>• Strengthening core groups&lt;br&gt;• Multi-agency project planning and governance&lt;br&gt;• Link this work with School Nurse Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Feedback from professionals (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You said</th>
<th>We’re proposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to prioritise intensive work for pupils falling behind</td>
<td>• Intensive support for children on child protection plans for second or third time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults within the families are treated in isolation</td>
<td>• Establish named Link workers in key services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thriving Families Employment advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Had to cut basic pastoral roles – hard to do preventative work</td>
<td>• Single worker to support key transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient communication between key agencies</td>
<td>• Strengthening core groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multi-agency project planning and governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Link this work with School Nurse Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to build capacity for more joint home visits</td>
<td>• Establish regular pattern of joint visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intensive support for children on child protection plans for second or third time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the family ends to early if things are going well</td>
<td>• Single worker to support key transitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed action plan (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Training and supporting practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Pilot use of the Graded Care Profile (GCP) tool to identify neglect across children’s care and education settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Set of resources to support practitioners to feel confident in identifying early signs of neglect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Resources for families and the public to convey the impact of neglect on child development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Live supervisions by team managers or senior practitioners to provide feedback and guidance on practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed action plan (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Strengthening partnership working: structural changes to service delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td><strong>Single worker to support key transitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children due to start school in September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children moving to secondary school in September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children aged 15 – 16 years preparing transition to EET post-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Joint visits**
   All families - at least fortnightly multi-professional joint visits

3) **Intensive family support for children on repeat CPPs**
   Joint multi-professional visits three times a week
   Support with practical tasks at less predictable times of the day
## Proposed action plan (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Think Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Education, Employment and Training (EET) worker to support parents</td>
<td>1) Education, Employment and Training (EET) worker to support parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Named North link workers to connect children’s and adults services</td>
<td>2) Named North link workers to connect children’s and adults services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Police Community Support Officers to take part in multi-professional joint visits</td>
<td>3) Police Community Support Officers to take part in multi-professional joint visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Education, Health and Care Plans for children currently on statements</td>
<td>4) Education, Health and Care Plans for children currently on statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Multi-agency reflective supervision sessions</td>
<td>5) Multi-agency reflective supervision sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed action plan (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Needs analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Analysis of numbers and trends for children on child protection plans for neglect for the past three years, including those with SEN and the number known to Young Carers, Family Group Conferencing, YOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Reviewing adult services involvement with families and children on Child Protection Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Multi-agency case audit of 10 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Review pilot cohort to establish incidence rate of anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Schools to indicate the resources they are putting in to support neglected children via questionnaire in School News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Analyse information available from health services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed action plan (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening the core group function</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Action plan to be handed out at each meeting – clear and prioritised actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Terms of reference for core groups, - clarifying purpose, roles, expectations of family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Administrative support prioritised for core groups supporting large families (of 4 children or more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) First core group meeting for children coming on to a plan to have a reflective session with the family and core group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) All children on repeat plans to have a reflective core group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What next – implications for the county?

- Have we heard your concerns and priorities?
- Are these the right actions?
- Volunteers to implement the action plan
- Successes rolled out across County
- Blue-print for future shape of services
- Keeping you informed
‘Purposeful’ Engagement

- Identify the Problem
- Need for Change
- Capacity to Change
- Timeliness
- ‘Start Again Syndrome’
- ‘What happens at the beginning defines what is possible at the end’
- The Joining Process
- ME ---- You ---- Us
- Professional ‘Use of Self’
- Genuine not Fake
- Clear not Confusing
- Trust and Relationships
Table Discussions

“Engagement”

- What are your concerns if these levels of engagement continue?
- What could be done to progress the safeguarding of the child?
  - What is my professional role in helping to tackle the problem?
  - How can we ensure outcomes and be accountable for them?
Going forward……

• Learning from Serious Case Reviews
• Training? Resources?
• Network and make links with services
• Be curious, dig deeper and look behind the presenting issue
• How can you Improve your practice
• Complete an evaluation form

Thank you!