

Children, Young People and Families BMHP5004

Student name: Rafaela-Andreea Veletean

Student name: 1916795

Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
CASE STUDY	4
ANALYSIS	5
EVALUATION	7
REFERENCES	9

INTRODUCTION

Childhood is the formative stage of human life. Childhood stages are identified as the pace of human life that determines their older self, personality and adult life (Daelmans et al, 2017). Any negative experiences trauma, as well as abuse or vulnerabilities during childhood, can influence the well-being of the individual and their psychological and social development through life. This report is based on identifying a specific case study and studying the elements of vulnerability in children, young people and families that are evident in the case. The case report includes a factor contributing to the risk of vulnerability towards the children and young people in the family as well as another person in the family and their impact on the health and well-being. The report also focuses on the analysis of the effectiveness of the professional interventions of the health and social care agencies that are involved in the case and the influence of current policy in the decision-making process of all the families. Lastly, the case report will also include the discussion and evaluation of the current policy and case management initiatives that are used in the case and the use of multidisciplinary services and their effectiveness to meet the diverse needs of the vulnerabilities of the children, young people and families involved in the particular case study. The case study evaluated here is from Bradford where Julie is a single mother of four boys and two girls and lives with her sister Sonia. The family system is identified to be dysfunctional due to Julius substance abuse and prostitution as well as the inability to provide appropriate and necessary financial structure and income to the family and trees that children well.

CASE STUDY

Some of the major findings and issues that were specific to the case study are as follows firstly the family consists of six children for boys and 2 girls who were looked after by the primary care of their mother and aunt. The mother of the children is not fit physically or mentally to look after them as well as she cannot produce as per the needs of the children with issues like substance abuse and prostitution. The children in the case are not looked after appropriately as well as it does not have any appropriate caretaker for themselves. The mother has often been involved in several criminal activities as well as prostitution that she does to cover her needs of buying heroin as a dependent individual. The eldest son Tom is also associated with anti-social groups and has been associated with criminal behaviour in past. Other children are excluded from school and attend a professional and alternate form of academic education with a very low level of attendance. Even the youngest child of the family does not attend the school appropriately and has only 3% attendance.

It is also identified that the family structure and system is very much flawed because there is no appropriate income source that is a high level of poverty for education as well as the poor financial allowance for housing as well as a social services or support provided to the family that could enhance their well-being and uplift the situation. Moreover, there are some issues identified with the poor functioning of the multi-disciplinary teams all the social services that are provided to the family that does not apply if the situation rather than creates a further issue of mistrust among the elders of the family.

There are several aspects such as prostitution substance abuse over income sources and the development of a negative environment for the children that leave the family towards their function. According to article 6 of UNCRC, it is stated that every child and young person has the right to survive and develop (Linnan et al, 2017). The article states that the government has the responsibility to develop services and policies to prevent the death of children and young people as well as safeguard them from any potential identified vulnerabilities. The article for the right to development also states that every child has the right to grow up in a condition that does not impact them negatively for their physical and mental wellbeing. This case is an example of how the right to development of children is violated and no appropriate policies are implemented initially to the family to enable all the children to have the right to grow and develop appropriately (Meehan, 2016).

The 1999 National resource centre on child maltreatment stated that child vulnerability refers to the child capacity for self-protection (Peleg, 2019). This definition identifies the difference of associating vulnerability with age but overemphasizes the definition of vulnerability to be associated with the need for more detail and assessment the self-protection. Vulnerability can be associated with age, physical disability, mental disability, proactiveness, powerlessness, defenceless, illness, negligence power, reduces qualification, lack of housing etc. (Peleg, 2019). The children in the cases are living in very poor housing conditions as well as in our environment of their mother demonstrates frequent substance abuse and a bad company that influences their mental and physical well-being. Moreover, the lack of any appropriate healthy guardian for the children makes them more vulnerable to words abuse from society (Meehan, 2016). Having no appropriate house or income source with power tea and criminal activities tag for the family members makes the children in the family vulnerable to discrimination and stigmatization from the society that they live in (Utens et al, 2018). This impact of psychological Israel is emotional growth and development of the children and negatively impacts their overall development. Thanks all these are identified findings indicate that the right to develop in a safe environment for the children, in this case, has been violated and not promoted through appropriate services and support from society.

ANALYSIS

The social care services and other agencies that were involved in care for this family had a very miss trustful relationship with Julie and Sonia as they were always worried that any intervention that local authorities would implement for their family would lead to children being taken into care (Daelmans et al, 2017). One of the major recommendations and considerations made initially for the younger children to be removed from the family system and put into the care (Arts and Tamo, 2016). Previously the family was living in the local community housing that did not provide them with enough appropriate environment for the children and also due to their criminal background and issues the society and people in the neighbourhood often try to discriminate and cause issues for them to remove them from the society. The family was living in an estate near marked for demolition but due to the history of criminal behaviour convection of robbery shoplifting and rowdy behaviour as well as substance misuse of from different members of the family the local authority face difficulty in rehousing the family in a proper society. According to the working together for safeguarding children and adults act that is introduced in the UK, it was introduced after the evaluation of several serious case reviews that indicated abuse and mothers of children due to negligence and inappropriate

partnership working among the social services and other agencies. The foremost outcomes identified for the Every Child Matters policy that was introduced under the act were being healthy enjoying achieving making positive contributions staying safe and achieving economic well-being (Arts and Tamo, 2016). Following these 5 outcomes and principles of the act, every child in the United Kingdom is provided appropriate services to enable them to have the potential to grow and develop both physically and mentally and have a bright and established future (Utens et al, 2018).

The identification of the vulnerabilities in the particular family by different agencies led to the development of serious consideration to removing the younger children from the family system that was providing negative influence on them. Also, the agreement with the elders of the family was considered to engage them in better partnership working and improving the situation (Linnan et al, 2017). The new social housing was developed and provided to the family to live in to enhance the family's engagement with services also they were evicted from the current home and classed as intentionally homeless that provided them with the opportunity to be given a permanent house. The family was shifted into the new home and the key workers help the family to shift in decent order and the partnership between the family members and the workers resulted in better outcomes (Scourfield et al, 2015). Also, Julie was referred to a local drug support project and she continued the educational course as well as literacy and stopped her criminal actions and substance abuse and also decreased unwanted family visitors. All these elements resulted in determining the positive outcomes as stated by Every Child Matters policy where health was the prime goal for all the members of the family, staying safe was achieved through appropriate neighbourhood and better housing, the children were allowed to enjoy and achieve and grow in a healthy environment (Vathi and Richards, 2019). Julie and Sonia were provided literacy programs and recovery programs for their drug abuse that turned out to be a positive influence on children as well as economic well-being were developed and promoted for the family by developing education and literacy for Julie so that she can be employed (Arts and Tamo, 2016).

Tom the eldest son was identified to have a better role in the family structure by leaving the family at a certain age as he continued to have an anti-social behaviour but he left to live with his father in another city and this, in turn, followed a positive influence on other children as the element of antisocial behaviour from the family was removed other children started to behave better (Meehan, 2016). Moreover, the agencies appropriately linked their information and communication and partnership working together for a complete year (Vathi and Richards,

2019). As a result, the exit strategy included in stepping down to the level of intensive interventions and housing association took the lead in tenancy role in monitoring the family as well as permanent tenancy contract was made as seeing the behaviour of Julie and children to be positive towards the neighbourhood and society (Utens et al, 2018). As a result, it was seen that the partnership working among key workers tenancy worker social workers and child safeguarding workers, as well as health professionals, work out to be very well for this particular family.

EVALUATION

Firstly, the keyworker in the case were health and social care workers child care services housing services and local authority. Initially, it can be said that social services did not appropriately play the role as they are responsible, distal to identify the elements of substance abuse as the major issue with family and the identification of the vicious cycle of substance abuse and criminal behaviour that was associated with Julie (Codd, 2021). If Julie was provided with better psychological interventions initially, she would have developed a better understanding of a situation as she did later (Scourfield et al, 2015). The health professional also failed to identify that the children were having a negative environment for living and this would have an impact on their mental and psychological growth. Representation of the family in the criminal justice system enabled the agencies to have a challenging attitude towards the family that was discriminating against their rights and enhancing their vulnerabilities (Arts and Tamo, 2016). Other agencies such as school were also involved in this case as children did not attend school the school has the responsibility to identify any such vulnerable children and referred them to social services for better support (Linnan et al, 2017). No such referral or support from the school was identified in the case.

Therefore, some barriers in partnership working with the family and the agency are identified and one basic barrier was communication where the elders of the family had missed trust over the agencies involved and did not allow the agencies to work together to enable their betterment (Vathi and Richards, 2019). Later this was resolved when appropriate communication was established through the partnership working of the agencies and development of tenancy housing program (Chen and Chan, 2016). Local authorities failed initially to provide proper housing to the individual family here and this also created many issues in their development. As soon as the permanent housing and tenancy program was established for the family the positive changes for the betterment of the family structure were identified (Britto et al, 2017).

Some areas that could be recommended in this case to enable the family to develop their well-being are as follows- according to the child safeguarding rights in the UK every child has the right to have a safe environment and the local authorities need to identify the environment the child is living in every child in the UK and established safety as their first parameter to reduce vulnerabilities of abuse or harm (Chen and Chan, 2016). Secondly, one thing identified in this case was the inappropriate partnership between Keyworker and the agencies as well as delayed diagnosis of any mental health issue or substance abuse and criminal behaviour (Codd, 2021). The health professional should always assess the family as a structured system and identify the impact of the behaviour of one individual on the psychological development and behaviour of another.

REFERENCES

- Arts, K. and Tamo, A., 2016. The right to development in international law: new momentum thirty years down the line?. *Netherlands International Law Review*, 63(3), pp.221-249.
- Britto, P.R., Lye, S.J., Proulx, K., Yousafzai, A.K., Matthews, S.G., Vaivada, T., Perez-Escamilla, R., Rao, N., Ip, P., Fernald, L.C. and MacMillan, H., 2017. Nurturing care: promoting early childhood development. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), pp.91-102.
- Chen, M. and Chan, K.L., 2016. Effects of parenting programs on child maltreatment prevention: A meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 17(1), pp.88-104.
- Codd, H., 2021. 11 Every child matters?. *Parental Imprisonment and Children's Rights*, p.86.
- Colman, I., Kingsbury, M., Garad, Y., Zeng, Y., Naicker, K., Patten, S., Jones, P.B., Wild, T.C. and Thompson, A.H., 2016. Consistency in adult reporting of adverse childhood experiences. *Psychological medicine*, 46(3), pp.543-549.
- Daelmans, B., Darmstadt, G.L., Lombardi, J., Black, M.M., Britto, P.R., Lye, S., Dua, T., Bhutta, Z.A. and Richter, L.M., 2017. Early childhood development: the foundation of sustainable development. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), pp.9-11.
- Linnan, L., Arandia, G., Bateman, L.A., Vaughn, A., Smith, N. and Ward, D., 2017. The health and working conditions of women employed in child care. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 14(3), p.283.
- Meehan, C., 2016. Every child mattered in England: but what matters to children?. *Early Child Development and Care*, 186(3), pp.382-402.
- Nurius, P.S., Green, S., Logan-Greene, P. and Borja, S., 2015. Life course pathways of adverse childhood experiences toward adult psychological well-being: A stress process analysis. *Child abuse & neglect*, 45, pp.143-153.
- Peleg, N., 2019. *The child's right to development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Scourfield, J., Smail, P. and Butler, D., 2015. A systemic approach to improving the engagement of fathers in child safeguarding. *Child Abuse Review*, 24(2), pp.129-139.
- Utens, E.M., Callus, E., Levert, E.M., De Groote, K. and Casey, F., 2018. Multidisciplinary family-centred psychosocial care for patients with CHD: consensus recommendations from the AEPC Psychosocial Working Group. *Cardiology in the Young*, 28(2), pp.192-198.

Vathi, Z. and Richards, E., 2021. Every child matters? Ambivalences and convergences in migration management and child protection in Albania. *Child Care in Practice*, 27(1), pp.19-34