

Communication – Context - Curiosity

The NSCP undertake multi-agency audits and rapid reviews. Learning from these activities identified:

- ☐ There is good practice in relation to Risk Outside The Home within individual agencies, however, there remains gaps in partnership working.
- ☐ More needs to be done to recognize and respond to risk factors early. There was evidence risk relating to exploitation was not always responded to promptly or shared early such as agencies relying on the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) before initiating any response
- ☐ The lack of shared tools and approaches (chronologies, risk assessment and info sharing) between agencies did not support practice.
- ☐ Information sharing could be improved by sharing precise information between services
- ☐ The role of schools in the early identification and referral of risk was not effective for the implementation of 'Early Help'
- ☐ Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and Trauma were not routinely considered when assessing young people at risk of harm in the community. There is evidence to suggest young people who have experienced trauma may be at increased risk of harm in the community.
- ☐ Improved engagement with the Community and Voluntary Sector is important – there is evidence they hold large amounts of info which was only shared later when formal processes such as Child Protection or MSET were undertaken.
- ☐ Support to parents is important. Support does not leave parents feeling blamed; or responsible for harm in the community. They are crucial partners and should be engaged with positively.
- ☐ Professionals should focus on critical moments (transitions, school exclusion, withdrawal of support, arrests)
- ☐ Unsubstantiated reports of harm should be understood as risk indicators and explored.

Communication – Context - Curiosity

We should be Curious...

- ☐ ...about Adverse Childhood Experience and the impact of trauma and learning needs.
- ☐ ...when families don't engage with support. We should explore why this is.
- ☐ ...about the outcome of meetings, decisions and follow up on referrals.
- ☐ ...about the voice of the child. How do they understand the situation and risks.
- ☐ ...about where they go in the community and who they are with.

We should Communicate...

- ☐ ...information consistently and clearly. Information sharing was less effective when based on sharing of minutes rather than on conclusions, decisions, actions and recommendations
- ☐ ...outcomes of decisions and referrals and follow up with partners regarding concerns.
- ☐ ...because single agency assessments do not result in a shared understanding of risk or effective multi-agency response.
- ☐ ...to establish comprehensive shared chronologies.
- ☐ ...information early to identify contextual risks earlier.
- ☐ ...with all partners. There is evidence that information was shared most consistently between agencies where there was already existing partnership working..

We should think about Context...

- ☐ ...and what unconfirmed reports of risks in the community mean for the safety of young people.
- ☐ ...as this can help professionals to identify risks outside the home at the earliest stages.
- ☐ ...when completing assessments. Single agency assessments with no information about the community tend to be focused on individuals not context.
- ☐ ...because where there is little evidence of a shared understanding of contextual risk factors it is more challenging to successfully bring about safety in the community.