Multi Agency Case File Audit Findings...at a glance 2015-16/Audit 1
(Thresholds/Contacts) 35 cases referred to MASS March 2015 & not progressed to referral

### What we saw

#### Case History
- 37% of cases had a previous contact in the last 6 months – 30% of whom had also had a previous referral
- 25% of cases in the sample had a referral in the preceding 12 months
- Contacts are not supported with a CAF and, where a contact was not supported by a CAF MASS did not request these from the referring agency
- From these 35 cases that did not progress to referral, advice from the CAF coordinator was sought in only 25% of cases

#### History of Involvement
- CSC audit data states that contacts are submitted at the correct level of need, the quality of the information provided within contacts is good and is sufficient to support CSC decision making
- 43% of contacts were made using the Multi Agency referral form. In addition to the MARF, a range of written referring mechanisms were used
- Recording the assessed level of need and the rationale for decision making is good

#### Contact to CSC
- Good Practice
  - Evidence of timely & appropriate contacts containing all relevant information in most cases
  - Significant proportion of cases had consulted their safeguarding lead before contacting MASS
  - Good use of MARF or appropriate agency documentation – 15 contacts were made using MARF and 13 used other referring mechanisms

#### Management & Supervision
- Summary
  - Contacts made to MASS for DV incidents, Missing Children, behaviour issues, children self-harming, historic abuse disclosure, injuries to young children, case transfer from other LA’s & offenders due for release notifications.
  - Timely identification of concerns & consideration of previous concerns & involvements was good.
  - Lack of evidence to confirm this was used to consider early help available to prevent escalation of risks.
  - Evidence of single & multi-agency work but little evidence that this delivered in a coordinated & structured format of assessment & planning via CAF.

#### Recording
- Good Practice
  - Programme of single agency audits in place
  - Thorough record noted—with information & intelligence
  - Comprehensive electronic, Records up to date & passed onto the next school (theme in SCR Child D)

### Issues Identified

#### Good Practice
- Audits record the involvement of a range of agencies but very few current CAFs are noted
- No evidence of liaison between services to share escalating concerns.
- Chronologies missing
- Limited documentation regarding child protection concerns
- More intelligence on the child would alert regular officers to any problems at an address.
- Historical issues/concerns not shared

#### Summary
- 10 day delay in return of Public Protection Investigation noted in one case. During this time no risk assessment was conducted

#### Issues Identified
- Agencies record recognition of child care concerns however, these have been found not to be at the level on the CNRF that requires a service from CSC
- Audits record the involvement of a range of agencies but very few current CAFs are noted
- Historical issues/concerns not shared
Multi Agency Recommendations

- As part of the review of MASS explore options to enhance the progression of the contacts requesting help for children through the correct route by using electronic recording systems in a different way.

- Explore the additional support or training required for safeguarding leads

Key messages for practitioners

Data Quality Issues

Duplicate records for two young people were found
A significant number of the contacts did not have their ethnicity recorded
Relationship links were not established on systems where this is possible
No parental details gathered where DV took place at the house of a relative caring for children who were not their own children

Information sharing across schools that border Rochdale has proved difficult.
Sharing relevant information with Colleges does not appear to have taken place
Contacts to MASS are not supported by CAF’s even where there is a current CAF in place
In some agencies, Safeguarding Leads do not appear to have sufficient understanding of the CNRF leading to inappropriate requests for service from MASS
CAF Coordinators are under used in the MASS
Visibility of PPI information would benefit front line officers
Information suggests that when a contact outcome recommends a CAF it does not always result in a CAF
Auditors suggest that a high proportion of case recording is good