



Haringey Council

NOTICE OF MEETING

Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Advisory Committee

THURSDAY, 26TH JANUARY, 2012 at 19:30 HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, LONDON N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillors Amin, Corrick, Davies, Hare, Rice(Chair) and Stewart

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of late items of urgent business. Late items will be considered under the agenda item they appear. New items will be dealt with at Item 11&12 below.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is being considered must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of the consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

A member with a personal interest in a matter also has a prejudicial interest in that matter if the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgement of the public interest.

4. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 14)

To consider the minutes of the meeting held on 03 November 2011 and agree the minutes of the joint meeting with the Corporate Parenting Committee held on the 11th October 2011.

5. MATTERS ARISING

6. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT DATA - CHILDREN AND FAMILIES - DECEMBER 2011 DATA (PAGES 15 - 20)

This report is an update of Children and Families key safeguarding performance information at the end of December 2011. This Committee will have a role in scrutinising and challenging this information and should further explanation or analysis be required this can be requested and provided through a process of exception reporting.

7. CAF ACTION PLAN UPDATE (PAGES 21 - 26)

The Committee will consider update on CAF Action Plan previously considered by them in January 2011.

8. UNANNOUNCED OFSTED INSPECTION REPORT (PAGES 27 - 32)

The report will inform elected members of the outcome of the unannounced OFSTED inspection in October 2011 and of the progress made against the areas for development.

9. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following items as they contain exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972(as amended by Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1985): paras 1&2:namely information relating to any individual , and information likely to reveal the identity of an individual.

10. PROGRESSION OF CASE REFERRALS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE IN JULY 2011 (PAGES 33 - 64)

The Independent Member of the Committee was commissioned to undertake an audit into a sample of case referrals considered by the First Response team in July. The Committee will now further consider how these cases have been progressed.

11. ANY NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Date of next meeting **13th March 2012 7.30pm**

The date of the next joint meeting between Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee with the Corporate Parenting is on

05 March 2012 7.00pm Council Chamber

David McNulty
Head of Local Democracy and Member Services
5th Floor
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Ayshe Simsek
Principal Committee Co-ordinator
Tel: 0208 489 2929
Fax: 0208 881 5218
Email: ayshe.simsek@haringey.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**THURSDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 2011**

Councillors Corrick, Davies, Hare and Rice

Apologies Councillor Amin

Also Present: Marion Wheeler, Sylvia Chew, Iain Low, Phil De Leo, Deirdre Cregan,
Michelle Robson.

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTON BY
CSPAP C25	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Amin.	
CSPAP C26	URGENT BUSINESS There were no items of urgent business for the Committee to consider.	
CSPAP C27	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interests put forward.	
CPAPC 28	MINUTES The minutes of the 13 September were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting. The minutes of the joint meeting between the Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee and the Corporate Parenting Committee were tabled. It was agreed that any comments or amendments be put forward to the clerk.	All to note
CSPAP C29	SAFEGUARDING DISABLED CHILDREN IN HARINGEY When recently considering the Safeguarding and Looked after Children Action Plan, the Committee had remarked on the low number of disabled children in Haringey subject to a child protection plan and had wanted to find out more about the safeguarding of disabled children in Haringey. This was to be assured that the disabled children that needed the attention of the safeguarding service were being identified. The Head of Services to Children & Young People with Additional Needs & Disabilities attended the meeting and presented a briefing paper on	

MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 2011

how the service worked to safeguard disabled children living in Haringey. The service was mainly responsible for disabled children with high levels of need (tier 3 and 4 on the threshold of need). Work with disabled children involved a multi agency approach due to the range and complexity of support required by the child. The briefing note contained information about :

- How disabled children are referred to the service
- The evaluation of safeguarding referrals received by the team
- The connections made with safeguarding services and bodies
- How the DFE guidance is followed
- The development of practices and policies for schools and professionals working with disabled children
- Engagement with present and past users of the service to develop and continually improve services to disabled children

The vulnerability of disabled children was a key concern of the Committee and the Head of Children & Young People with Additional Needs & Disabilities presented a leaflet that had recently been publicly distributed. This leaflet contained the telephone numbers to contact if there was concern about the care of a disabled child.

The Committee further learnt that the service were continually self evaluating the care given to disabled children through the completion of case reviews, and having challenging discussions about the attention given to a disabled child . This was to allow better practices to be developed and inform training to schools and professionals.

In relation, to disabled children that were subject to a child protection plans, there was analysis of their journey, through this care process with an analysis of the thresholds of need considered by the service and an examination of the quality assurance work being undertaken by the Children's service.

The Committee gained an understanding about the current tools used by professionals to support their communication with severely disabled children. These were a range of symbol cards in use by local authority and health professionals.

The Committee were provided with information on the number of disabled children subject to a child protection plan in Haringey with some comparisons provided with other borough's figures.

The Committee asked information about parents that employ carers or have family members help with the care of their disabled children, and if they have a completed CRB checks on the people working with their children given the intensive responsibility they have for them and as they will likely receive direct payments for this care. The Committee noted that legally, the Council could not dictate to a parent that a CRB check was needed for an external carer or family member helping care

MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 2011

for their disabled child. However when working with parents there were sensitive approaches employed to ensure that parents understood the importance of them and that CRB checks were completed. There were currently no parents employing carers or family members without a CRB check. The Council would also ask parents receiving direct payments to complete a pro forma on what services and activities they were spending funding on and the Council were able to audit bank accounts to ensure funding was being spent appropriately.

Questions were asked by the Committee about the engagement with disabled children of different ages. It was noted that the type of communication method would depend on the child's age, physical ability, and language ability. The service was always self evaluating and challenging the approach taken with a disabled child to ensure that it was equal to non disabled child. The Police were more guarded about recommending the use of symbols for communicating with disabled children as there could be legal challenges later on if this evidence was relied upon in a court process. This was a current partner debate in the policy forum attached to the LSCB.

Further understanding was sought on the thinking behind the compilation of statistics relating to London Boroughs and their disabled child population set out in the briefing note. It was noted that the boroughs listed were those that had provided a response to the survey. However there would be a further response sought from North London boroughs with their responses added to the table and provided to Members as an update. There was a further query on the percentages shown for the disabled child populations and whether the percentage range could be increased to 10,000 to enable fuller comparisons to be made with other boroughs. The Head of Services to Children & Young People with Additional Needs & Disabilities agreed to examine the feasibility of this.

The Committee recognised that there was rigorous care process involved with children that had high complex needs as a child protection issue was less likely to be apparent. This led to discussion about disabled children that met tier 2 and 3 of the threshold of need. It was noted that information on children with a disability or special need meeting these lower thresholds of need could be extrapolated from existing data bases. However the Committee would also need to keep in mind that children could be assessed as having a special need or disability after they had come into contact and assessment with the Safeguarding Service.

The Chair of the Committee felt that there should be an audit exercise focused on children with disabilities that met threshold of need at tier 2 and 3 to enable the Committee to get an understanding of the type of services and support they were receiving. This would help give further confidence to the Committee that the number of children with a disability subject to a child protection plan was right. The Head of Services to Children & Young People with Additional Needs & Disabilities agreed to

Phil Di
Leo

HC/
Phil Di
Leo

MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 2011

	meet with the Independent Member of the Committee to compile a proposal for this audit for the Chair to consider.	
<p>CSPAP C30</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICE IN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WORK</p> <p>The Committee received a presentation from Deirdre Cregan, Domestic Violence Co-ordinator, and Michelle Robson, Senior Practitioner for Domestic violence on the subject of Domestic Violence. The presentation enabled the Committee to obtain a more focused view about domestic violence which was currently a factor in 70% of child protection cases. This finding had led to the movement of the Domestic Violence team from the Policy section of the Council to Children's services.</p> <p>Previously in 2001 a best value review had found a lack of co-ordinated of services for women escaping domestic violence. This led to the establishment of Hearthstone a centre for survivors of Domestic Violence providing support with housing and access to services. Since 2002 there has been a strong policy message in the borough about the zero tolerance of domestic violence. There has been training programmes with partners and agencies to raise awareness of Domestic Violence. MARAC (Multi agency risk assessment conference) was established in 2008 to enable a co-ordinated multi agency response to cases where there was risk of significant harm to an individual.</p> <p>The Committee further learnt that Domestic Violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is gender based violence • Has a far reaching impact on families • Can be seen as a non crime as the violence has to result in serious injuries i.e. ABH for prosecution to occur • Although there was a positive arrest policy it was felt by Domestic Violence practitioners that this was not well embedded as a practice • There was prevalence of domestic violence amongst young people and in particular Committee noted that 1 in 5 teenage women reported violence from a partner. • A government survey into attitudes about domestic violence indicated that domestic violence was still seen as acceptable in relationships. <p>The Committee asked if there were any statistics on domestic Violence involving the elderly and it was noted that there was now further research being carried out into elderly abuse as there was a current lack of services available to older victims reporting abuse. The organisation which was responsible for addressing reports of elderly abuse was SOVA (Safeguarding of Vulnerable Adults)</p> <p>The Independent Member reported that, prior to carrying out her audit of referrals which involved 2 year olds and where domestic violence was a factor, she had gathered some valuable insight and knowledge from the</p>	

MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 2011

	co-ordinator and Practitioner on Domestic Violence which had informed the audit which members were to consider in the next item.	
CSPAP C31	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>The press and public were excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following item as it contained exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the local government Act 1972 (as amended by Section 12A of the local government act 1985) paras 1&2 namely information relating to any individual, and information likely to reveal the identity of an individual.</p>	
CSPAP C32	<p>AUDIT OF REFERRALS OF UNDER 2 YEAR OLDS WHERE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WAS A FEATURE</p> <p>The Independent Member of the Committee introduced her report which set out the findings into referrals involving children under the age of 2 where domestic violence was a factor in their referral to the Safeguarding Team.</p> <p>A positive finding of the audit was the support being given to mothers to leave a violent relationship. Although after care arrangements for mothers was continuing to improve, the Safeguarding Service acknowledged the need to continue to focus on this area as feelings of isolation experienced in a new setting could often be a trigger for returning to a violent partner. The service was looking to encourage involvement in Children Centre services and instigating introductions to community based organisations to help mothers feel independent and supported. On a wider scale there was continuing work with Solace to develop long term practices for safeguarding children living in house holds where domestic violence was featured.</p> <p>Although the sample of cases looked at was not significant in number, as this was a qualitative audit, the impact of a first child in a relationship was noted to be a key introduction point to domestic violence. Other risk factors, seen in the cases analysed for Social Workers to be aware of, were if the mother was not in close distance to her family and if there was a significant age gap between the father and mother of the child.</p> <p>In the cases which involved unborn babies there was good evidence seen of midwives speaking with the mothers and detecting if problems in the relationship were of a violent nature. The midwives knew the appropriate services to refer the mother to.</p> <p>The Committee learnt that when the Police receive a call in Haringey reporting domestic violence notification is provided to the Domestic Violence team. When the Police are visiting the address they will check if there are children living in the home and report this to the domestic violence team. If there are no children seen at the address but there is</p>	

MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 2011

	<p>reason to believe that there are children living there, the Domestic Violence team will get the address details and make a visit to the property.</p> <p>In general the quality of work on the cases was good. There were 10 cases which the Independent Member made comments on for follow up action and there would be a response provided by the Head of Safeguarding at the next meeting on the actions being taken.</p>	SC
CSPAP C33	<p>EXEMPT MINUTES</p> <p>The exempt minutes of the 13 September 2011 were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
CSPAP C34	<p>NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT BUSINESS</p> <p>None</p>	
CSPAP C35	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>The Committee agreed to cancel the next scheduled meeting on the 12th December and defer the potential items on the CAF Action Plan, progression of case referrals from the July audit to the meeting on the 26 January 2012.</p>	

Cllr Reg Rice

Chair

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

Councillors Rice, Reith, Solomon, Allison, Watson, Hare, Stewart, Amin, Brabazon, Corrick, Reece, Davies

Apologies Councillor Stennett, Debbie Haith

Also Present: Marion Wheeler, Sylvia Chew, Iain Low, Attract Craig, Wendy Tomlinson, Chris Chalmers,

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTON BY
CSPAPC 7	APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR The Chair of Corporate Parenting Committee and Chair of the Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee had previously discussed the chairing of these joint meetings and they had agreed that they would alternate this responsibility. Councillor Rice was appointed as Chair for the meeting.	
CSPAPC 8	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE(IF ANY) Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Stennett and Debbie Haith, Head of Children and Families service.	
CSPAPC 9	URGENT BUSINESS No items of urgent business were considered.	
CSPAPC 10	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of Interest put forward.	
CSPAPC 11	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS There were no deputations, questions or petitions put forward.	
CSPAPC 12	MINUTES The Committee considered the minutes from the previous joint meeting held on the 17 March 2011. A remark was made on the timeliness of the Joint Committee considering these minutes as it would be difficult to recall the issues discussed at the last meeting. A suggestion was made to have the minutes agreed with by the Corporate Parenting Committee	

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

	<p>and Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee at their next available meetings and not at the next joint meeting in March. The Committee agreed that this suggestion be taken forward.</p> <p>Clarification was sought on the number of children at the time of the meeting in March that were subject to child protection plans as there were two figures contained in the minutes. The Committee noted that it was likely to be 326 children but Committee members would receive an email update on this. The service have since advised that</p> <p><i>The 326 figure relates to the number of Children and Young people subject to Child Protection Plans across the Department; the figure of 253 is the number of children and young people subject to Child Protection Plans within the Safeguarding and Support Service. The data came from Ian Lowe's presentation about the work of the Safeguarding and Support.</i></p>	Clerk
CSPAPC 13	<p>THE MUNRO REVIEW OF CHILD PROTECTION: FINAL REPORT - A CHILD-CENTRED SYSTEM</p> <p>Committee members considered a summary of the Munro review into child protection along with the government's response to the review. The key components of the recommendations from Munro report were: developing social work capacity; ensuring children were communicated with, and that the child was at the centre of the organisations process. Overall, the government response was to agree with the recommendations of the review. However, the Independent Member of the Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee, advised that the government had not set out how local authorities were able to change fully to the direction of preventative services at a time of reduced funding for Children's services. It was anticipated that local authorities would begin to review their models of social care following this report and it was suggested that the social work care model developed in Hackney would be worthwhile to look at. The Chair of the Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee agreed to take this forward as an action.</p> <p>Clarification was sought in whether the Children's service had undertaken a systems analysis approach to the changes that would be required following the Munro report. The Committee were informed that separately to considering the Munro recommendations and impact on the service, there was an equal need to examine sufficiency to know the level of services that would need to be commissioned in order to meet the needs of children coming into the care of children's services. For example this would mean considering whether there were right levels of accommodation available for looked after children and care leavers, now and in the future. There would also to follow some joint strategic assessment work with the involvement of partners to look at</p>	Cllr Rice

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

how services are provided. The Children's service would also be completing an exercise on care pathways to examine how the service identifies children coming into care.

The Committee were advised that to meet the requirements of the prevention agenda, would mean the service, along with partners, looking at incrementally compiling services around the support that would be needed to prevent a child coming into care. This support package would need to include voluntary sector and partner agencies with consideration given to how the services were provided in totality. The Committee noted that these were high level changes which required consideration of the strategic direction of the service, involved service redesign and considering how other children related services could be included in this support offer. This could only be led by the incoming Children's Services Director who would be in post on the 14 November. It was agreed that the Cllr Reith and Cllr Rice would speak with the new director about how the Munro recommendations would be taken forward with a more substantial report likely to be available for consideration by both Committees in May 2012. Members of the Committee learnt that in the meantime the Safeguarding Team were already working with the Early Intervention and Prevention service to look at how they can support the de-escalation of certain circumstances which lead to children coming into care. The Head of First Response explained that the service recognised it would be crucial to de-escalate these circumstances permanently and this was a key part of their work with the Early Intervention and Prevention service when considering the services for the families to access.

Cllr
Reith/
Cllr
Rice

In terms of the impact of the Munro recommendations on systems and processes followed, the service were already exploring the impact on IT systems.

A question was asked about the plans for developing social work practice. The Committee noted that there was already a multi agency team in First Response and this team would be expanded with staff from Police intelligence, Adult Safeguarding and Mental Health. This Multi agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) would also have satellite links to services such as Probation and Adult services with a member of their team physically situated in the MASH (Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub) one day a week. This team would consider referrals to the Safeguarding Service and instantly share information they had on the family in turn assisting the information gathering stage of an assessment and expediting the decisions on how the referral should be progressed by the Children's service. In terms of social work development, there had in been a graduate trainee programme in place, which had been very good at recruiting trainee Social Workers. Past members of this scheme were now becoming team managers and senior practitioners. The key aim for the service was to continue to build the experience and expertise of Social Workers so that it was a workforce able to work and deal with

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

	<p>complex cases .</p> <p>Members asked about help to families and early intervention services to reduce the number of children going into care . Officers explained that Munro saw early help to families as different to early intervention services .The new meaning for early intervention service encompassed all work outside statutory sector . With regard to work with families, Munro was interested in Social Workers engagement with families and their work with them . Munro also advocated learning from existing family intervention projects and having evidenced systems in place that will help families who need more than the support provided by universal services.</p> <p>Understanding was sought on the relationship between safeguarding social care and providers of care such as children's centres. It was felt that children between the ages of 0 to 5 had critical developmental milestones which needed to be supported especially if they were LAC or children in need and therefore should be focused on as a group . In response it was noted that this relationship between the Safeguarding Team and Early Years continued to improve each month. Social Workers who were responsible for children on child protection plans, under the age of 4, would ensure that they could access day care services.</p> <p>Members noted the report.</p>	
<p>CSPAPC 14</p>	<p>CHILDREN MISSING FROM CARE AND HOME</p> <p>The Committee considered a report about children that go missing from care and missing from home . The Committee gained further understanding about the statutory guidance followed by the council when children go missing and what the council's responsibilities are . This was a particular national area of concern especially when it was concerning vulnerable children and children under the age of 11. Haringey was part of 3 London boroughs awarded £300,000 of funding over the next 3 years through an externally funded joint project with Aviva (formerly Norwich union), the Railway Children international charity and Barnardos. This was an early intervention project, beginning in November, aimed at engaging with and supporting with children that were likely to go missing from home and reduce the level of harm that they could come to.</p> <p>Members of the Committee were provided with some local context about the children that are reported missing in Haringey. Usually the primary sources for reporting missing children to the service were the police. It was noted that children could be reported for a number of reasons i.e lateness in coming home from school, children going missing in the shopping centre, missing from home overnight or not coming back following attendance at evening events . All of these circumstances were recorded by the Children's service . The</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

Safeguarding service had established a triage system involving a multi agency response to absences in their area of responsibility . This was set out in appendix 2 of the report and used to assess and measure the level of concern that should be given when they receive a report that a child has gone missing. Where there was the highest concern it often indicated that there is an improper activity involved which lead to a series of assessments and speedy responses.

Section 5.2 of the report detailed the number of children between April and mid September 2011 that had gone missing. It was noted that 51 children out of 630 LAC had gone missing from care or had a period of unauthorised absence. The Committee noted that of these 51 children there were two children still missing. Child A came from an extended Gypsy Roma family where other members of the family have previously gone missing and returned . At the current time Police were trying to locate this young person. The second young person went missing from care . He was an unaccompanied minor and UK boarder agencies had been notified as he has previously tried to leave the country. The Committee noted that when children go missing from a placement the service will try and ascertain whether there are any issues with the child placement .

Some Members expressed particular concern about LAC that are placed in residential homes as they seemed to be the highest number going missing .Officers explained that children that go missing from residential homes are older teenagers and there will a higher difficulty in dealing with these absences with different levels of engagement undertaken with the young people . The Committee noted that it was not always the case that placing older children in a residential homes was the last option but would largely be a placement of choice as the children may have previously been in unsuccessful foster care placement . Young people that went missing from residential homes may have previously also absconded when in a foster placement.

In terms of monitoring children that go missing from placements, the Deputy Director or Children and Families received weekly reports , and completed risk assessments. There was quite a tight process for recording absences which had been recently reviewed to ensure that all departments in the Children and Families service were fully aware of the details to record when a child/missing person goes missing.

It was noted that the Barnado's joint borough project on missing children would, as part of its remit, be awareness raising, with the selected children and young people, about the situations/ groups to avoid where they could be vulnerable and open to inducement into unsafe activities.

The Chair enquired about the work with Gypsy Roma families . The Committee noted that the council was working with the London Councils and Bulgarian government on tackling the trafficking of young people from this community into the borough. The Committee learnt that,

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

	<p>through a previously funded project, the Safeguarding service had gained a wealth of experience and knowledge about the risks of vulnerable children being subject to sexual exploitation and could use this in their work with the community. The service were aware of the named addresses that the Gypsy Roma families moved to and from in London so that they were able to communicate with the boroughs that they moved to. There was also a Romanian and Bulgarian speaking staff member in the Children and Families team who was able to provide vital language support to Social Workers and police working with children in this community that were in the care of the service. This member of staff was also assisting the service to ensure children under the age of 4 in the Gypsy Roma community had access to GP services and were being seen by health workers if required.</p> <p>The statutory guidance applicable when children go missing from home was attached to the report and it was recommended that the Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee could consider the statistic for children missing from home and the strategies in place to deal with these occurrences. There was also a scrutiny review on missing children and it would be worthwhile checking the areas that they were considering in case of cross over.</p>	MW
CSPAPC 15	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>None</p>	
CSPAPC 16	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>The press and public were excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following item as it contains exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972(as amended by Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1985): parts 1&2: namely information relating to any individual, and information likely to reveal the identity of an individual.</p>	
CSPAPC 17	<p>REFERRALS AUDIT JULY 2011</p> <p>A programme of audits had been established by the Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee in order to monitor practice and performance in Children's Social Care, and identify areas of good practice and areas for improvement. An audit of new referrals between July the 12th and 19th 2011 had been examined by the Independent Member with involvement from Cllr Amin. The findings had been considered by Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee at their meeting in September and were also shared with the Corporate Parenting Committee as part of this joint meeting.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

Comment was made on the following: the number of cases where statutory timescales were not being fully adhered to, whether there were fewer referrals to the service but higher numbers of children being taken into care and the length of time the cases were open for in comparison to other comparator boroughs. The Independent Member of the Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee advised that at the time of writing the report the 2010/11 comparator data had not been published. Since this report comparator data for 2010/11 conveyed that Haringey were now more significantly in line with comparator boroughs in terms of number of children coming into care. In response to the query about the adherence to timescales i.e. for core and initial assessments, in this sample of cases, social workers were awaiting information from GP's or teachers in order to decide how to take the referral forward. Overall the timescales for dealing effectively with referrals was improving. In cases where there was a risk of significant harm to a child, these were prioritised. Due to the nature of some referrals there was a need to do preparatory work to understand how best to take the referral forward. This was further explained by the Head of First Response in the attached action plan arising from the audit.

A councillor attending Regulation 33 visits asked the Independent Member whether in her experience in working with the council she had seen missing information from files. The Independent Member confirmed that the paper work she had seen in files relating to this audit were up to date.

It was further confirmed that the follow up actions relating to the audit were attached to the report and the cases looked at in July would be further followed up in November to check their progression or outcomes.

The Committee thanked the Independent Member for the insight and knowledge gained from considering the real life and complex cases in the audit and understanding how Social Workers were dealing with them. Cllr Amin had assisted with this audit and was thanked for her input and advice. Councillor Amin advised the Committee that some of the social work practices she had seen, being applied to the referrals, were to a very high standard and the service should be commended for this.

Arising from the discussion of this paper Members asked various questions and learnt the following:

- That the number of children recently moving to the borough and the subject of a referral to the safeguarding service, would be recorded. Officers advised that there would be children and families from the borough put in out of borough placements and therefore this data may need further analysis to compile a narrative that could be used in future to make a case for the borough receiving additional resources.
- That there would be further training with staff that make referrals

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE & CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRACTICE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2011**

	to safeguarding working in schools and other partner agencies, to include appropriate information to aid the speedier processing and evaluation of the referral when received by the MASH. The referral format was also currently being worked on with tips and advice on how to compile a good referral this would consider and signed up to by LSCB(Local Safeguarding Children's Board) which included a wide membership of partner agencies.	
CSPAPC 18	NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT BUSINESS NONE	
CSPAPC 19	NEXT MEETING 05 MARCH 2012	

Cllr Reg Rice

Chair



Haringey Council

Briefing for:	Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee
Title:	Performance Management Data - Children and Families – December 2011 data
Lead Officer:	Marion Wheeler – Assistant Director Safeguarding
Date:	26 January 2012

1. Background

This report is an update of Children and Families key safeguarding performance information at the end of December 2011. This committee will have a role in scrutinising and challenging this information and should further explanation or analysis be required this can be requested and provided through a process of exception reporting.

1.1 Note that the we are closely monitoring progress and contributing to consultation involving the data information requirements proposed through the Munro Review. We will update members of any changes to our statutory reporting requirements following the outcome of this but will continue to report on this key data until such time.


1.2 Haringey's Ofsted Statistical Neighbours group includes the following boroughs:

- Croydon
- Greenwich
- Hackney
- Hammersmith and Fulham
- Haringey
- Islington
- Lambeth
- Lewisham
- Southwark
- Waltham Forest
- Wandsworth

This page is intentionally left blank

Children and Families Safeguarding Information



Headline performance information relating to Children & Families Contacts, Referrals, Assessments and CP
 More detailed analysis can be requested through exception reporting.

1. Contacts, Referrals and Assessments											
Op	Description	2010/11	Eng. - Average 2010/11	SN - Average 2010/11	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	2011/12		Comments	
		Value			Value	Value	Value	YTD	Target	Status	
Op504	The number of child contacts received in the month.	9,556	-	-	585	612	489	5,041	-	-	
Op410	The number of referrals to children's social care	2658	4046	3177	196	226	161	1731	-	-	Based on the number of referrals received in the last quarter, the projected number of referrals for the year is approximately 2300
OP410a	The rate of referrals to children's social care per 10,000 pop	541	556.8	599	-	-	-	352.52	-	-	Based on the rate of referrals received in the last quarter, the projected rate of referrals for the year is approximately 469
Op383	Re-referrals within 12 months of the previous referral	18.5%	25.6%	18.9%	23.5%	16.4%	16.1%	17.7%	14%		
Op368	Percentage of referrals to children's social care going on to initial assessment	77.5%	71.5%	77.1%	99.5%	95.1%	110.6%	99.1%	-	-	The monthly calculation should be interpreted with care as it is crudely based on the number of children who had initial completed assessments divided by the number of referrals received in the month - however, the initial assessment may have commenced from a referral started in the previous month. This means that sometimes this indicator can exceed 100%

Description	2010/11	Eng. - Average 2010/11	SN - Average 2010/11	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	2011/12		Comments	
	Value			Value	Value	Value	YTD	Target		Status
HY59 Percentage of initial assessments for children's social care carried out within 10 working days of referral	66.3%	72.2%	81.9%	83.6%	91.2%	85.4%	68.5%	70%		Excellent progress has been made in this area and we are on track to achieving the target set for year end.
Op60 Percentage of core assessments for children's social care that were carried out within 35 working days	62.6%	75%	83.2%	73.6%	76.8%	83.2%	67.5%	70%		Good progress has been made in this area.

2. Child Protection

Description	2010/11	Eng. - Average 2010/11	SN - Average 2010/11	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	2011/12		Comments	
	Value			Value	Value	Value	YTD	Target		Status
Op388 Children subject to a child protection plan	320	281	228	269	288	290	290	-	-	
OP388a The rate of Children Subject to a CP plan per 10,000 pop	65.58	38.7	43	54.78	58.65	59.06	59.06	-	-	The rate of children subject to a plan is considerably higher than comparator authorities.
OP 411 Children Becoming Subject to a CP plan in the period	-	322	240	11	40	16	208	-	-	
OP 413 Children Ceasing Subject to a CP plan in the period	308	299	246	32	21	14	238	-	-	
Op421 Children moving to Haringey on a CP Plan	-	-	-	3	0	3	9	-	-	
Op422 Children moved out of Haringey on a CP Plan	-	-	-	0	6	0	23	-	-	
HY64 Child Protection Plans lasting 2 years or more	5.8%	6%	8.8%	15.6%	0%	14.3%	5.5%	6%		

Description	2010/11	Eng. - Average 2010/11	SN - Average 2010/11	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	2011/12			Comments
	Value						Value	Value	YTD	
Op 365 Percentage of children becoming the subject of Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time	9%	13.3%	11.6%	9.1%	25%	0%	8.7%	10%		Monthly figures to be interpreted with caution due to small numbers of children becoming subject to a plan.
Op367 Percentage of child protection cases which were reviewed within required timescales	97.7%	97.1%	99.4%	97.7%	96.7%	96.9%	96.9%	100%		

This page is intentionally left blank



Haringey Council

Report for:	Children's Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee	Item Number:	1
Title:	CAF Action Plan Update		
Report Authorised by:	Jan Doust Deputy Director Prevention and Early Intervention		
Lead Officer:	Alison Botham head of Integrated Working and Family Support		
Ward(s) affected: All	Report for Key/Non Key Decisions: Non key		

- 1. Describe the issue under consideration**
Update on CAF Action Plan previously considered by the committee in January 2011
- 2. Cabinet Member introduction**
N/A
- 3. Recommendations**
That the committee note progress made.
- 4. Other options considered**
N/A
- 5. Background information**
Full Briefing CAF action plan update Jan 2012 appendix 1.
- 6. Comments of the Chief Finance Officer and financial implications**
N/A
- 7. Head of Legal Services and legal implications**
N/A



Haringey Council

8. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments
N/A

9. Head of Procurement Comments
N/A

10. Policy Implication
N/A

11. Use of Appendices
See appendix 1

12. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Appendix 1

Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee 26th January 2012

Briefing

CAF Action Plan Update January 2012

Introduction

This is an up date report on the CAF action plan report presented to the Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee a year ago in January 2011. The action plan had been developed in November 2010 and all actions were implemented effectively.

This report will also provide an up date on further developments in relation to the CAF in the last year. This has been a challenging year across the service and there have been significant developments in working arrangements supporting CAF assessment practice, and the work of the CAF team.

Up dates specific to the November 2010 Action Plan

The particular issues highlighted for action in 2010 had been

- Consideration and evaluation of the numbers of CAF's undertaken and presented to the CAF panel that resulted in no additional service allocation
- Concerns about the Framework - i data base and whether the reports provide the right information about CAF activity
- The back log of CAF's waiting to be reviewed by the CAF manager and the delays in a number of CAF's then getting to the CAF panel for consideration.

Progress in relation to each of these concerns is outlined below.

Consideration and evaluation of the numbers of CAF's undertaken and presented to the CAF panel that resulted in no additional service allocation

- This remains at below 20% of all CAFs received. This had been as high as 30% when the action plan was first agreed.
- We are now more consistent in ensuring that development work takes place with assessors if there are issues about information provided in the CAF. This has been mainly an issue in schools and we have used the SENCO forum to raise specific areas of concern about CAF practice.
- In addition we have delivered new CAF training for all settings that has been well attended and has had good evaluation and feedback from all participants.
- The Head of Inclusion has also undertaken training in some of the schools who were experiencing difficulties in relation to CAF work.

Concerns about the Framework - i data base and whether the reports provide the right information about CAF activity

- We have developed better use of the available reports and data analysis that does allow us to evaluate CAF activity.
- We are now beginning to use reports available in First Response and the Safeguarding and Support Service to ensure that effective comparisons can be made.

Appendix 1

Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee 26th January 2012

Briefing

CAF Action Plan Update January 2012

The back log of CAF's waiting to be reviewed by the CAF manager and the delays in a number of CAF's then getting to the CAF panel for consideration.

- Most significantly we have operated without a backlog at all since May of last year. All CAFs are now reviewed by a member of the CAF team when they are received and presented to panel as soon as all relevant information has been explored and gathered.

2011 developments in CAF panel arrangements, CAF assessment practice and the CAF team.

CAF panel arrangements

Panel arrangements have been reviewed through the Integrated Working Implementation group, and the more recent Family Support and Parenting planning group, and through a workshop with SENCOs in May 2011. In addition we have reviewed arrangements with partners in health and are piloting some new arrangements in relation to the CAF and Speech and Language services. This has resulted in

- piloting using a shorter format for Speech and language assessments for the under 5's – the outcome of this pilot will be reviewed later this month
- Continuing to use the full CAF format for all other CAF assessments until the outcome of this pilot has been considered
- SLT for the under 5's is now direct to SLT from health visitor
- Arrangements are in place to ensure that CAFs for Family Support can be considered out side panel when urgent and services including Child in need nursery placements can be made in between panels so that services can be accessed without delay
- In addition we have agreed arrangements that where children may be at risk of exclusion CAF decisions can be also be made in between panel and then considered more fully at the next CAF panel
- SENCO's have attended panel and have given feedback about arrangements through the SENCO forum, in the main this has been positive and has lead to a better understanding of panel arrangements and decision making on the part of SENCOs
- Feedback about the value of using the CAF in school settings has continued to be more positive.

In addition new arrangements for the delivery of Children's Centre services have provided an opportunity to consider how to improve CAF practice in early years and we are developing a model for regular cluster meetings, bringing all key partners together to ensure that information about vulnerable children and their families is shared effectively, and feeds supports good assessment practice. We anticipate that once this is established we will be able to adjust panel arrangements for the under 5's as necessary.

Appendix 1

Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee 26th January 2012

Briefing

CAF Action Plan Update January 2012

CAF assessment practice

CAF assessor training has been delivered twice a term since January 2011 for two days for 15 participants. This training has included training in effective assessment practice as well as working as a lead Professional and Team around the Child practice.

This training has been well attended by staff in universal settings including, Children's Centres, schools, health visiting teams, the voluntary sector providers and targeted services such as family support.

The training means that the identification of vulnerable children and quality of assessments continues to improve.

CAF team developments

The CAF team has now developed as staff previously based in Children and Families have moved into the team as Family Support Workers. This has meant that we have been able to ensure timely responses to CAFs as the team receives them, with more capacity to gather relevant information and screen assessments. In addition the FSW's carry cases and work jointly with First Response in providing immediate Family Support that can prevent the need for children to come into care, and contribute to assessments that will mean a swift step down from the First Response Team. Feedback has been very positive about the work of the team and we are reviewing capacity and team arrangements to ensure that this area of work can be developed further.

The team is made up of 4.5 Family Support Workers, the CAF manager and CAF administrator. A full time FSW will typically working with up to 7 family support cases at any one time, which may include a case that involves visiting the family 3 or 4 times a week. At the same time they will be co-ordinating the information gathering and screening of up to 8 or 9 CAFs pre panel. We are reviewing impact, training and staff development needs on an on going basis so that we establish a flexible and responsive service within the team. Key strengths at this point are

- Good CAF knowledge transferred from the existing CAF manager to CAF FSWs
- Strong working relationships between the CAF team manager and the managers in the First Response team, ensuring effective decision making and working together
- The team is based in Station Road allowing for a duty system that means that FSW's can undertake joint work with the First Response and Safeguarding Service as the need arises
- Good standard of skills and knowledge within the team who have previously been involved in contributing to court based parenting assessments. This means that they are experienced and able to respond to complex cases and ensure effective joint working and planning.

Appendix 1

Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee 26th January 2012

Briefing

CAF Action Plan Update January 2012

The CAF team will continue to work closely with colleagues in First Response, Safeguarding and Support, and the other Family Support teams to ensure a timely and response to need. As well as working with universal settings to support the early identification of need and support good CAF assessment practice.



Haringey Council

Report for:	CSPAC 26/1/2012	Item Number:	
Title:	Unannounced Ofsted Inspection Report		
Report Authorised by:	Marion Wheeler Assistant Director Safeguarding EXT 1912 Marion.wheeler@haringey.gov.uk		
Lead Officer:	Sylvia Chew Head of Service First Response Sylvia.chew@haringey.gov.uk ext 5788		
Ward(s) affected: all	Report for Key/Non Key Decisions:		

1. To inform elected members of the outcome of the unannounced OFSTED inspection in October 2011 and of the progress made against the areas for development.

2. Cabinet Member introduction:

The OFSTED Annual unannounced inspection of contact, referral and assessment arrangements within the London Borough of Haringey Council Children's Services took place on 11 and 12 October 2011. The inspection outcome will contribute to the annual review of the performance of Children's Services..

2.2 The inspection team looked at the quality and effectiveness of contact, referral and assessment arrangements and their impact on minimising any child abuse and neglect. Inspectors considered a range of evidence, including: electronic case records; supervision files and notes; observation of social workers and senior practitioners undertaking referral and assessment duties; and other information provided by staff and managers. Inspectors also spoke to a range of staff including managers, social workers, other practitioners and administrative staff.

The inspection identified areas of strength and areas of practice that met requirements, with some areas for development. There were no identified areas for



Haringey Council

priority action. The OFSTED letter can be accessed via <http://www.haringey.gov.uk/ofsted-unannounced-inspection.pdf>

- 2.3 Whilst the primary focus was on work in First Response the inspectors also looked at case files for children from the Disabled Children's Team and Unaccompanied minor's team, both of whom complete initial assessments. The inspection looked at work started and completed in the three months prior to the inspection (June to October 2011)
- 2.4 It was pleasing that Ofsted validated the progress made by Front Line services in the last year and identified two strengths – the work of the multi agency screening team and the additional support provided by the UKBA specialist and the Roma/new communities community partnership worker attached to the No Recourse to Public Funds Team. Both demonstrate the ability of the service to respond flexibly to the needs of vulnerable children and young people within these target groups.
- 2.5 The inspection team were satisfied overall with Haringey's response to referrals, our ability to respond to contacts and referrals in a timely manner through a designated multi agency screening team, to offer advice and information as required and to respond promptly with cases where children may be at risk of significant harm
- 2.6 They noted that the majority of assessments are based on consideration of a range of relevant information and children and young people were routinely seen as part of the assessment process with their wishes and feelings taken into account. Assessments were seen as *'comprehensive with a good analysis of risks and protective factors.'*
- 2.7 The inspectors noted that, in most cases, the diverse needs of children and young people are considered as part of assessments and plans, Interpreters were available to help social workers communicate effectively with children and young people and their families where English was not their first language. Children with disabilities were enabled to communicate their needs through a range of non-verbal approaches.
- 2.8 With regard to supervision they stated that *'Staff receive regular supervision that meets their professional needs. A wide range of training opportunities are available including learning from serious case reviews. Newly qualified social workers are well supported to undertake their roles through enhanced supervision and mentoring enabling them to take on new and more complex tasks. High levels of management oversight and scrutiny are clear on all case files. Decisions made in supervision are generally well recorded and show management direction and challenge to ensure that work is properly undertaken.'*
- 2.9 Finally they noted that 'a robust system of performance management and case file audit is in place. All managers understand trends in performance and use this information to improve the services provided by the team.'



Haringey Council

Areas for development

The inspection also identified some areas for development. A range of actions have been put in place to respond to these recommendations.

- 3 The areas for improvement are as follows:
- ii. *'Record keeping is not always up to date and, in some cases, not complete. For example, child in need plans are not always undertaken and some meetings and case discussions are not recorded. As a result, it is not always possible to understand the progress of the case and ensure that all agreed actions have taken place'*. Whilst no national timescales are in place for the completion of child in need plans the inspectors felt that there was unnecessary delay in some cases
 - iii. *'In some cases, where there is no immediate risk of harm, assessments are not started in a timely manner which delays the introduction of services to support these children and young people.'* This related to a period where our overall performance was still 'recovering' in June 2011 which has now been resolved with assessment performance now consistently up above target levels.
 - iv. *'Following the recommendations of the safeguarding and looked after children inspection in January 2011, a protocol was developed to ensure that all assessments are led by suitably qualified social workers. However, this has not been fully implemented and social work assistants are still allocated and undertake initial assessments without a designated social worker to support them.'* Following close scrutiny of a significant number of files inspectors identified a case file where supervision was recorded at the point of allocation and on day 11 of an initial assessment rather than day 9 (ie during the period of assessment.). Inspectors found that the piece of work, undertaken by the experienced social work assistant, to be of a high standard but noted that recorded supervision should have been on the file before the assessment was completed, read and signed off by the manager.
 - v. *'The authority has not implemented the national protocol for allocation of responsibility for court reporting in private law cases. As a result, the service is undertaking additional work in preparing court reports for which it no longer has responsibility'* Inspectors concluded that the service was completing too much work on private law cases and was not sufficiently robust in ensuring the appropriate cases were left with CAFCASS. This area for development is being progressed jointly with the Haringey Legal team in conjunction with CAFCASS and our local judiciary.
 - vi. *'Protocols and assessment tools that are currently used to assess risks to victims of domestic abuse, do not properly consider the differing needs of young*



Haringey Council

people who are direct victims. Consequently, they do not always receive a service that meets their needs.' This related to a 15 year old young person who was assaulted by her boyfriend. Following discussion with her mother it was concluded that her parents had taken the incident very seriously, were working with the police and had a sound action plan in place. The inspectors expressed concern that a piece of work was not completed with the Young Person herself and as a result she was not able to adequately protect herself from further incidents. A new protocol for DV risk assessment with young people has been developed and further training undertaken.

An updated report of progress against areas for development will be presented by Head of Service at Committee; an updated version of the evidence of progress against the areas for development will be tabled.

4. Recommendations

For elected members to consider the contents of this report and note the progress to date.

5. Other options considered

n/a

6 Background information

n/a

7. Comments of the Chief Finance Officer and financial implications

n/a

8. Head of Legal Services and legal implications

Please refer to point 5 of the action plan

9. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

n/a

10. Head of Procurement Comments

n/a

11. Policy Implication

n/a



Haringey Council

12. Use of Appendices

Letter from OFSTED dated October 2011

<http://www.haringey.gov.uk/ofsted-unannounced-inspection.pdf>

13. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985



Haringey Council

This page is intentionally left blank

Freshford House
Redcliffe Way
Bristol BS1 6NL

T 0300 1231231
enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
www.ofsted.gov.uk

Direct T 03000 130570

Safeguarding.lookedafterchildren@ofsted.gov.uk



9 November 2011

Mr K Crompton
Chief Executive
London Borough of Haringey Council
Civic Centre
High Road
Wood Green
London
N22 8LE

Dear Mr Crompton

Annual unannounced inspection of contact, referral and assessment arrangements within the London Borough of Haringey Council children's services

This letter summarises the findings of the recent unannounced inspection of contact, referral and assessment arrangements within local authority children's services in the London Borough of Haringey Council which was conducted on 11 and 12 October 2011. The inspection was carried out under section 138 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006. It will contribute to the annual review of the performance of the authority's children's services, for which Ofsted will award a rating later in the year. I would like to thank all of the staff we met for their assistance in undertaking this inspection.

The inspection sampled the quality and effectiveness of contact, referral and assessment arrangements and their impact on minimising any child abuse and neglect. Inspectors considered a range of evidence, including: electronic case records; supervision files and notes; observation of social workers and senior practitioners undertaking referral and assessment duties; and other information provided by staff and managers. Inspectors also spoke to a range of staff including managers, social workers, other practitioners and administrative staff.

The inspection identified areas of strength and areas of practice that met requirements, with some areas for development.

The relevant recommendations identified at the safeguarding and looked after children inspection in January 2011 have mainly been addressed.



From the evidence gathered, the following features of the service were identified:

Strengths
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The co-location of staff from the police public protection department, health and education welfare within the First Response Team has resulted in more effective use of intelligence and better co-ordination of adult risk management processes to ensure that children and young people are properly protected. ▪ The authority effectively commissions services to address the needs of the community that it serves. As a result, a Romanian worker is employed within the First Response Team to ensure that child protection issues are balanced with the cultural needs of this community. An officer from the United Kingdom Border Agency has also been seconded to the authority on a part-time basis which has resulted in a more rapid resolution to applications for asylum from young people and families.
The service meets the requirements of statutory guidance in the following areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contacts and referrals receive a timely response through a designated multi-agency screening team. Decisions are made in line with agreed thresholds and, where these are not met, referrers are appropriately signposted to other agencies or advised to use the common assessment framework. ▪ In cases where significant harm is suspected, child protection enquiries are undertaken promptly following strategy discussions with the police. These result in a clear analysis of risk and, where necessary, appropriate action is undertaken to protect the child or young person. ▪ The majority of assessments are based well on an extensive range of relevant information. Children and young people are routinely seen as part of the assessment process and their wishes and feelings taken into account. Efforts are made to ensure that parents are also actively engaged in the assessment process. This results in comprehensive assessments, with a good analysis of risks and protective factors. ▪ In most cases, the diverse needs of children and young people are considered as part of assessments and plans. Interpreters are available to help social workers communicate effectively with children and young people and their families, where English is not their first language. Children with disabilities are enabled to communicate their needs through a range of non-verbal approaches. ▪ The emergency duty team provides an appropriate out of hours service that links well with daytime services. Support is available from the police child abuse investigation team (CAIT) on an on-call basis.

- Staff receive regular supervision that meets their professional needs. A wide range of training opportunities are available including learning from serious case reviews. Newly qualified social workers are well supported to undertake their roles through enhanced supervision and mentoring enabling them to take on new and more complex tasks.
- High levels of management oversight and scrutiny are clear on all case files. Decisions made in supervision are generally well recorded and show management direction and challenge to ensure that work is properly undertaken.
- A robust system of performance management and case file audit is in place. All managers understand trends in performance and use this information to improve the services provided by the team.

Areas for development

- Record keeping is not always up to date and, in some cases, not complete. For example, child in need plans are not always undertaken and some meetings and case discussions are not recorded. As a result, it is not always possible to understand the progress of the case and ensure that all agreed actions have taken place.
- In some cases, where there is no immediate risk of harm, assessments are not started in a timely manner which delays the introduction of services to support these children and young people.
- Following the recommendations of the safeguarding and looked after children inspection in January 2011, a protocol was developed to ensure that all assessments are led by suitably qualified social workers. However, this has not been fully implemented and social work assistants are still allocated and undertake initial assessments without a designated social worker to support them.
- The authority has not implemented the national protocol for allocation of responsibility for court reporting in private law cases. As a result, the service is undertaking additional work in preparing court reports for which it no longer has responsibility.
- Protocols and assessment tools that are currently used to assess risks to victims of domestic abuse, do not properly consider the differing needs of young people who are direct victims. Consequently, they do not always receive a service that meets their needs.

Any areas for development identified above will be specifically considered in any future inspection of services to safeguard children within your area.

Yours sincerely

Karen McKeown
Her Majesty's Inspector

Copy: Andrew Spencer, Department for Education

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank