

## Aims:

### To consider:

1. How good are multi-agency, frontline practitioners at engaging fathers in child protection process? (following the journey of the child from initial concern, to identification of risk, early help, referrals, Section 47 enquiries through to child protection conferences)
2. How well are we doing in relation to engaging with fathers and holding them to account (Protection plans through to case recording and supervision and outcomes for children and young people)
3. What are the key lessons from frontline multi-agency practice in cases of where work with fathers is a feature?

## Recommendations:

1. Commission of a task and finish group to review the current audit proforma, to have assurance regarding the quality of multi-agency safeguarding practice through thematic multi-agency audits.
2. Commissions multi-agency training on understanding and working with a range of orders
3. Monitoring of commissioned services understanding of children's safeguarding and their contribution to children's safeguarding processes
4. Assurance from all agencies regarding the dissemination and practitioner awareness of the relevant MSCB approved protocols/strategy/guidance

## The importance of lived experiences of children:

A challenge to this audit process has been ascertaining a view about the presence and capacity of fathers from the child's lived experience; for example, how does the child experience the father? What is the child's views, hopes or concerns about the presence and capacity of the father? Has the child expressed a view of any particular strengths, protective factors or risks about their father?

## Examples of good practice case 1:

CIN case with a long history of multi-agency involvement. A case with multiple issues describes as "complex, entrenched and concerning".

1. Good relationship based work with the family
2. There was effective inter-agency information sharing from the schools to the professional network
3. Police Officers obtained father's current mobile telephone number and this was shared with the multi-agency system

## Examples of good practice case 2:

CP case in which the risks to children include physical abuse, domestic violence and maternal poor mental health. Other concerns include poor school attendance and possible harmful religious beliefs

1. There is evidence of effective, relationship-based multi-agency practice
2. Comprehensive, clear danger statement and safety goal
3. Evidence of good engagement from the core group
4. Evidence of good quality planning with strong evidence of the voice of the child
5. Mother's mental health and its impact was well understood in this case
6. Strong evidence of the voice of the child



# 7 minutes briefing: Working with fathers multi-agency audit

Carla Thomas

## Key Learnings:

- The importance of assessing parental capacity and motivation.
- Men with a reputation for violence, aggression and/or unpredictability can pose a particular challenge to practitioners.
- The need for multi-agency practitioners to understand the terms and conditions of orders such as restraining orders and for this to be reflecting in assessment and planning.
- The need for practitioners to have a more developed and nuanced understanding of parental substance misuse and its effect on parental capacity.
- The use and awareness of MSCB Protocols
- Adult-Facing Commissioned Services Understanding of their responsibilities in relation to safeguarding children.

## Examples of good practice case 3:

CP case which has stepped down to CIN in which the risks include emotional abuse, domestic violence and paternal substance misuse

1. Clear danger statement and safety goal which outlines the risks and sets out bottom-lines for safety for the child.
2. Appropriate use of pan-London Procedures in relation to timeliness
3. Good multi-agency
4. Appropriate information sharing
5. Appropriate analysis of risks
6. The voice of the child
7. Equality of Opportunity
8. Strong IRO footprint in this case

# Supporting material

Available on request