



Name- Sylvie Djeuga Djeuga

Student ID- 2335842

Module Name- Protecting and Supporting Families in Health and Care

Module Code- BMHP5021

Assignment Title- Component 1

Submitted on 28/11/2025

INTRODUCTION

Hi there to all. I am Sylvie, and I'll be giving a presentation today from the viewpoint of a social worker who works to protect children.

My presentation's goal is to critically analyse Case 5: Theo, with an emphasis on partnership working, agency communication, child and family wellness, pertinent UK legislation, what went wrong, and what should have happened. I'll wrap off by offering specific suggestions to enhance future procedures.

B. CASE SUMMARY

Tragically, Theo passed away while in his parents' care at the age of ten months. Several non-accidental injuries were found during the post-mortem, which strongly suggested abuse.

1. When officers arrived at the house, they discovered:
2. Extremely subpar housing
3. The potent scent of cannabis
4. Theo's clothes and mattress had blood on them.

Professionals continued to worry about Theo's and his older sister's safety at the time because they were already involved in care procedures.

KEY RISK FACTORS

1. There were other high-risk safeguarding issues that the family presented:
2. Misuse of drugs by parents
3. Signs of abuse at home
4. Neglect and poor personal hygiene
5. Issues with the mental health of parents
6. Ineffective communication with experts
7. Home visits are decreased under COVID-19 regulations.
8. Despite being known, these dangers were not sufficiently controlled.

C. CHILD AND FAMILY WELL-BEING

Prior to his passing, Theo's well-being was already seriously impaired. When he was a baby, he was entirely reliant on adults for protection, care, and safety. He was exposed to the following in his surroundings:

1. Bodily injury.
2. Damage to emotions.
3. Neglect.
4. Disorderly routines.

His older sister was at a greater risk of experiencing emotional trauma because she also experienced instability and fear.

PARENTAL WELL-BEING

The parents were experiencing difficulties:

1. Mental health challenges
2. Substance abuse
3. Internal strife
4. Limited ability to provide for the necessities of parenthood.

Although these difficulties ought to have prompted assistance, the legal need to safeguard the children should not have been eclipsed by them. In this instance, experts overemphasised the parents' justifications over the experiences of the kids.

D. Partnership Working and Communication

This case highlights significant shortcomings in multi-agency collaboration, which is necessary for successfully protecting children.

The requirements for Working Together (2023)

Organisations must Quickly share information, cooperate with one another, Put professional curiosity to use, collaborate on assessments, put each other to the test when necessary, Keep kids in the forefront.

What didn't work out for Theo was police had previously visited the residence and noted issues, but they failed to notify social service, health care providers were aware of parental challenges, but they chose not to raise the issue, parental capacity was not thoroughly evaluated by social workers, instead of working as a cohesive team, agencies operated independently, restrictions imposed by COVID-19 decreased in-person visits, which resulted in an excessive dependence on parents' accounts.

Overall, important data continued to be dispersed, and no organisation was able to piece together the complete picture of risk.

E. Critical Analysis with Legislation

This situation was covered by a number of safeguarding rules, however they were not applied properly.

Act on Children (1989)

1. Section 17: The need to protect and advance the welfare of underprivileged children
2. Section 47: Investigation obligation when a child is in danger of serious injury

Given the degree of danger, a more thorough and timely Section 47 investigation was necessary.

The Children Act of 2004, Section 11

In order to protect children, this law requires all agencies—police, health, education, and social care—to collaborate. This multi-agency duty was not carried out in Theo's instance.

Cooperation for Children's Safety (2023)

1. Professionals are required by this instruction to:
2. Exchange data
3. Continue your risk analysis
4. Regularly interact with kids
5. Continue to be curious about your work

But in Theo's situation, authorities minimised risk, accepted parental narratives, and didn't confront one another. The main problem was not lack of contact, but lack of coordinated decision-making. The children were known to be at high risk, yet professionals failed to act decisively to protect them.

The primary shortcomings in this instance were the underestimation of the total level of danger in spite of obvious warning indicators and the failure of agencies to exchange critical information. Professionals frequently accepted parental explanations without posing enough challenges, assessments of parental capacity were inadequate, and home conditions were not adequately monitored. The children's visibility was further diminished by COVID-19 limits, and a coordinated multi-agency plan was lacking. All of these mistakes combined to create a dangerous atmosphere that ultimately led to Theo's demise.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS

This analysis highlights a number of crucial enhancements. To ensure that safeguarding issues are communicated immediately and consistently, multi-agency information-sharing must first be reinforced. Infants should be visited in person on a regular basis and given priority as the highest-risk group, especially when problems are detected. Additionally, by challenging parental narratives, investigating discrepancies, and avoiding presumptions, professionals should exhibit greater professional inquiry. In-depth evaluations of parental capacity should be carried out, particularly in cases involving issues like drug abuse, domestic violence, or mental health issues. Furthermore, more managerial control and supervision are required to guarantee that risks are promptly addressed, and instances do not stray. In order for information from mental health, drug abuse, and domestic abuse services to directly influence safeguarding decisions, there must be a stronger integration with adult services. Lastly, the lessons learnt from COVID-19 demonstrate that virtual visits should never take the place of crucial in-person safety inspections for kids.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, Case 5: Theo exposes significant shortcomings in safeguarding procedures. Despite the large number of specialists participating, they operated independently rather than collaboratively. The youngsters were not given enough attention, knowledge was not shared, and risk was reduced. Effective multi-agency cooperation is required by law, as this case demonstrates. It is our duty as experts to make sure that no child—especially an infant—becomes invisible in the system.

THANK YOU!

REFERENCES

Derby and Derbyshire Safeguarding Children Partnership (DDSCP), (2024), “*Local Child Safeguarding Practice Review: Theo (TDS20)*”. Derby: DDSCP”.

Department for Education (DfE), (2023), *Working Together to Safeguard Children*. London: HM Government.

HM Government, (1989), *Children Act 1989*. London: The Stationery Office.

HM Government, (2004), *Children Act 2004*. London: The Stationery Office.

NSPCC, (2023), *Learning from case reviews: Infants*. London: NSPCC. Available at: <https://learning.nspcc.org.uk> (Accessed on 22nd November 2025).

NSPCC, (2024), *Theo: Case review summary (Derbyshire)*. London: NSPCC. Available at: <https://learning.nspcc.org.uk/case-reviews> (Accessed on 22nd November 2025),

Sidebotham, P., Brandon, M., Bailey, S., Belderson, P., Dodsworth, J. and Garstang, J. (2016) *Pathways to harm, pathways to protection: A triennial analysis of serious case reviews 2011–2014*. London: Department for Education.

Munro, E. (2011) *The Munro Review of Child Protection: Final Report – A Child-Centred System*. London: Department for Education.