**The Public Law Working Group (PLWG) is consulting on proposals to law, policy and practice in relation to supervision orders made at the conclusion of care proceedings to support the child to live with a parent(s).**

The PLWG invites consultation responses from those who have a stake in, or are affected by, the children’s social care and family justice systems. This includes, but is not limited to, families and young people, legal and social care practitioners and managers, directors of children’s services/social services, practitioners and services working alongside/closely with children’s social care, the judiciary, voluntary sector organisations and practitioner bodies/associations.

The attached PLWG interim report attached sets out:

* The research and rationale that has informed the working group’s thinking.
* Recommendations for short and long-term change.
* At Annex C (page73 onwards), draft Best Practice Guidance which aims to provide clear messages and sample tools to support best practice where children remain with, or return home to, their parents at the conclusion of care proceedings. It is specifically intended to support best practice where the court may consider making a supervision order.

The PLWG specifically welcomes responses as to the following:

|  |
| --- |
| **Consultation questions:**   1. Should supervision orders be retained as a public law order? 2. Should supervision orders be reformed to be a more robust and effective public law order? 3. Are the recommendations for immediate reform in this interim report sufficientto achieve the goal of making supervision orders more robust and effective? 4. If not, what other reforms or measures should we recommend? 5. Are the reforms and measures set out in the Best Practice Guidance (**at Annex C, page 73 of the report**) proportionate and practical? Are they, or any of them, overly burdensome to implement for parents/carers, the Family Court, children’s services or others involved in the child protection and family justice systems? If so, how could they be improved? 6. Should guidance be issued by the DfE / Welsh Government to underpin the BPG set out in this report to help ensure consistency of support and oversight? 7. Should there be future legal and practice reforms so that supervision orders are (a) supported under a specific supervision order review pathway provided for in relevant primary and secondary legislation, (b) underpinned, supported and reviewed via the child-in-need framework in England, the care and support plan framework in Wales, or (c) underpinned, supported and reviewed through the child protection framework including through child protection plans? |

Responses from individuals are welcome but the PLWG also encourages collective submissions, for example:

* Local family justice boards canvassing views regarding the interim report, its recommendations and the best practice guidance from members across the local area with those then reflected in a single submission made on behalf of the board by the Chair.
* Designated Family Judges seeking the views of stakeholders in their family justice area to inform their responses.
* Voluntary sector organisations drawing on their expertise of their staff to provide a single organisational response.
* Practitioner bodies canvassing views from their membership to inform their submission.
* Individuals, services and organisations working with children and/or families gathering their views and insights and supporting them to make a submission.
* Organisational responses including professional associations and bodies.

To assist the PLWG in understanding and analysing the responses, we invite respondents to confirm in their responses the following demographic information:

* Category of respondent into which they fall.
* Geographical region .

A list of respondent and regions categories is set out below.

Please provide responses to the consultation by email to martha.thompson@justice.gov.uk and by later than 30 November 2022.

When responding to the consultation please confirm the which category of respondent you belong to and the relevant geographical area.

This information is being gathered to assist the PLWG in accurately analysing the consultation responses.

**Respondent type**

* Parent
* Other family member/relative
* Judge
* Magistrate
* Barrister
* Local authority lawyer
* Solicitor (private practice)
* Independent social worker Social worker
* Social work manager
* Independent reviewing officer
* Other children’s social care practitioner
* Director of children’s services
* Family support worker
* Cafcass
* Cafcass Cymru
* Legal adviser (magistrates court)
* Voluntary sector organisation
* Advocate
* Response on behalf of a local Family Justice Board
* Practitioner body or association
* Voluntary sector organisation.
* Other – give details

**Area or areas in which you work/to which your response relates.**

* North West
* North East Yorkshire and the Humber
* West Midlands
* East Midlands
* East of England
* South East
* South West
* London
* Wales.

If you sit as a judge or magistrate, or represent or otherwise support parents or children, across different areas, please reference all that apply.