



MULTI AGENCY CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING AUDIT PACK

CHILD PROTECTION - GRADING GUIDANCE



MULTI-AGENCY CHILD PROTECTION AUDIT TOOL – GRADING GUIDANCE

Area of Analysis	Outstanding = 1	Good = 2	Adequate = 3	Inadequate = 4
History of involvement	If every area of analysis on a case is consistently good or better, the case can be judged outstanding overall.	Previous involvement highly effective in promoting child's welfare and keeping child safe. Safeguarding/child protection concerns appropriately identified and acted on promptly, in line with guidance and good practice.	Previous involvement was keeping child safe and having some impact on promoting child's welfare. Safeguarding/child protection concerns appropriately identified and acted on in line with guidance.	Previous involvement was not having sufficient impact on promoting child's welfare and/or may not have been keeping them sufficiently safe. Safeguarding/child protection concerns were not appropriately identified, or not in a timely way and/or actions were not taken in line with guidance.
Referral		Referral showed clear understanding of when appropriate to refer to social care. Referral made or followed up in writing on agreed format, containing all relevant information.	Referral to social care appropriate. Referral made or followed up in writing and contained most information.	Referral to social care should have been made earlier (delay may have caused risk to child) or it was not necessary to refer to social care. Referral had some gaps in information.
Immediate Response to Referral		Risk assessment, including whether immediate action needed to safeguard child, showed sound judgement. Referral acted on promptly and appropriately. Strategy discussion/meeting held within timescales and S.47* enquiry planned and all relevant decisions made. Case allocated to experienced and qualified social worker.	Appropriate risk assessment made, including whether immediate action needed to safeguard child. Referral acted on promptly and appropriately. Strategy discussion/meeting held within timescales. Case allocated to qualified social worker.	Risk assessment not clearly evidenced. Poor decision-making in relation to immediate safeguarding of the child. Some delay in responding to referral, or referral not responded to adequately. Delayed or inadequate strategy discussion/meeting. Case not allocated promptly, or not to an experienced and/or qualified social worker.
Assessment/ S.47 Enquiry		S47 Enquiry was carried out comprehensively and in accordance with plan, so that risks could be identified and action taken to minimise those risks. All appropriate agencies and family members (including all household members, regular visitors and adults believed to be recently estranged) were consulted/involved and all checks made. Child was seen alone and their wishes and feelings made evident.	S47 Enquiry carried out in accordance with plan and covered key areas. Appropriate agencies and family members were consulted/involved (including all household members, regular visitors and adults believed to be recently estranged) but perhaps not widely or comprehensively enough and all checks made. Child was seen alone, but their wishes and feelings do not come through strongly. Interpreter was used if needed.	There were some gaps in the way the S47 Enquiry was undertaken, which may have impacted on the safety of the child. There were gaps in consulting relevant agencies and/or not all relevant family members seen and/or some gaps in checks. Child not seen alone and/or their views not evident. Interpreter was not used although needed.

Continued on next page.

MULTI-AGENCY CHILD PROTECTION AUDIT TOOL – GRADING GUIDANCE

Area of Analysis	Outstanding = 1	Good = 2	Adequate = 3	Inadequate = 4
Assessment/ S.47 Enquiry (cont'd)	If every area of analysis on a case is consistently good or better, the case can be judged outstanding overall.	Interpreter was used effectively if needed. The S.47 enquiry clearly evaluated risk to child or children and how those risks should be managed. Decision whether to convene Child Protection (CP) conference appropriately made, or appropriate alternative actions agreed.	The S.47 enquiry evaluated risk to child or children and some assessment of how those risks should be managed. Decision whether to convene CP conference appropriately made and some alternative actions if not.	The S.47 enquiry did not clearly evaluate risk to child or children and/or how those risks should be managed. Poor decision-making about whether to convene a CP conference, or no alternative actions if decision not to hold conference.
Planning and Implementing Plan		CP conference highly effective in analysing risk, engaging parents, establishing consensus amongst agencies and setting outline plan to reduce risk. Highly effective core group working, setting detailed plan and engaging with parent to reduce risk to child. Services effectively employed to reduce risk. Social worker visits in accordance with plan and sees child or children alone and with sufficient frequency to establish a relationship and safeguard the child. Each agency carries out all statutory duties, and its role in plan, effectively. There has been an effective response to any further critical incidents.	CP conference analyses risk, and sets outline plan. Core group meets regularly, adding detail to plan, some engagement with parent to reduce risk to child. Some services employed, although could be more focused on reducing risk. Social worker generally visits in accordance with plan, sometimes sees child or children alone and at an adequate frequency. Each agency carries out statutory duties and its role in plan. There has been an appropriate response to any further critical incidents.	Insufficient analysis of risk at conference. Outline plan not sufficiently aimed at reducing risk. Core groups not meeting regularly or not effective in engaging parent and reducing risk to child. Identified services not available, or not sought, so opportunity to reduce risk lost. Gaps in visiting, not evident that child or children seen alone regularly. Each agency has not carried out all statutory duties and/or has not completely carried out its role in the plan. Further critical incidents have not been responded to appropriately, or in a timely way.
Review		Review CP conferences held within timescales. Review CP conferences highly effective in monitoring and evaluating progress re risk to child.	Review CP conferences held within timescales. Review CP conferences monitor and evaluate progress re risk to child.	Review CP conferences not consistently held within timescales. Review CP conferences do not consistently monitor and evaluate progress re risk to child.
Being Healthy outcome		Child's health needs were addressed within CP plan and were met well.	Child's health needs were met.	Plan did not address health needs of child or child's health needs not adequately met.
Staying Safe outcome		The plan was highly effective in safeguarding the child and promoting their welfare.	The plan kept the child safe.	The plan was not sufficiently robust or not implemented well enough to ensure that the child was kept safe at all times.

MULTI-AGENCY CHILD PROTECTION AUDIT TOOL – GRADING GUIDANCE

Area of Analysis	Outstanding = 1	Good = 2	Adequate = 3	Inadequate = 4
Enjoy and Achieve outcome		The child was assisted to achieve well and follow leisure opportunities.	The plan included actions for enjoying and achieving.	Little impact was made on the child's progress in enjoying and achieving.
Making a Positive Contribution outcome		The child was able to make a positive contribution.	Some encouragement was given to the child to make a positive contribution.	Little impact was made on the child's involvement in making a positive contribution.
Economic Well-Being outcome		The plan has had a good impact on the child's ability to achieve economic well-being.	The plan included actions to impact on the child's economic well-being.	Little impact was made on the child's economic well-being.
Management and Supervision		The front-line worker is effectively supported and directed.	The front-line worker receives some support and direction.	The front-line worker does not receive sufficient support and direction.
Recording and Minutes		Minutes of conference and core groups distributed promptly. All records up-to-date and fit for purpose. Evidence of quality assurance activity on records.	Minutes of conference and core groups usually distributed promptly. All records mainly up-to-date and fit for purpose. Evidence of quality assurance activity on records.	Minutes of conference and core groups not distributed promptly. Gaps in records, or not up-to-date, or fit for purpose. Lack of evidence of quality assurance activity on records.
Overall Judgement	The case can only be judged as outstanding overall if every area of analysis has been judged good or better.	The case should be judged as good if at least 75% of the features above are evident, providing the child has been effectively safeguarded and their welfare promoted throughout the work.	The case should be judged as adequate if at least 75% of the features above are evident (or better), providing the child has been safeguarded and their welfare generally promoted throughout the work. However, any significant failings will render the case inadequate.	If 25% or more of the features above are evident, or if there is a significant failure which has impacted on the safety of the child, the case should be considered inadequate.

* S47 – Section 47 of the Children Act 1989 places a duty on Local Authorities to investigate when there is reasonable cause to suspect that a child is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm.



CONTACT INFORMATION

Government Office For London
Riverwalk House
157-161 Millbank
London
SW1P 4RR

www.younglondonmatters.org

OUR PARTNERS

MAYOR OF LONDON

 department for
children, schools and families

London
development
centre

 Department
of Health



ALDCS
Association of London
Directors of Children's
Services

LONDON
COUNCILS


Healthy Schools

NHS
London

YOUR
Rights!
Your say
www.rightsline.org


capital
ambition