

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

Thursday, 12 February 2009

2.30 pm

**Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone**

***All Members of the County Council are invited to attend
this meeting***

(Notice sent from the Cabinet Member's office on 18 December 2008)





AGENDA

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

Thursday, 12 February 2009 at 2.30 pm
Council Chamber, Sessions House, County
Hall, Maidstone

Ask for: **Theresa Grayell**
Telephone **01622 694277**

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the meeting.

Membership (8)

- Conservative (5): Mrs A D Allen (Chairman), Mr J Curwood, Mrs V J Dagger,
Dr T R Robinson and Mr J D Simmonds
- Labour (2): Mrs C Angell and Mr I T N Jones, DL
- Liberal Democrat (1): Mr M J Vye (Vice-Chairman)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

A. BOARD BUSINESS

- A1 Substitutes
- A2 Declarations of Members' Interest relating to items on today's agenda
- A3 Chairman's Announcements

B. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- B1 Protecting Children in Kent (Pages 1 - 14)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership
(01622) 694002

Wednesday, 4 February 2009

Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers maybe inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.

By Peter Gilroy, Chief Executive
To Children's Champions Board – 12 February 2009
Subject Protecting children in Kent
Classification Unrestricted
Ref

Summary This report introduces the Executive Summary of the first phase of a review of the protection and safeguarding of children in Kent

FOR DECISION

1. Attached to this report is the Executive Summary of the first phase of a review of child protection and safeguarding services in Kent. This review has been undertaken in response to two events in late 2008.
2. First, there was a request from the Secretary of State, following the publication on 1 December 2008, of the urgent Joint Area Review (usually referred to as the mini-JAR) into events surrounding the death of Baby P in Haringey in 2007 for all councils with statutory children's social care responsibilities to undertake their own internal quality-assurance reviews.
3. Secondly, County Council on 11 December 2008 resolved to seek its own urgent review of "high risk" cases in line with criteria suggested by the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) and examine the robustness of local child protection arrangements.
4. These two sets of requirements have been consolidated into the review plan attached to the Executive Summary. Additionally, Members will need to be aware that events, nationally and more locally, with regard to the Integrated Children's System (ICS) are rapidly evolving with both Chief Executives and Directors of Children's Services across the region publicly voicing serious reservations in recent days about the system and the new national Workforce Strategy Group being tasked by the Secretary of State to also re-assess its fitness for purpose as a first priority.

5. The full report of this, the first phase of a more comprehensive review, will be published on Friday 6 February. Members will appreciate the need for the review team to double-check the accuracy of the contents of the detailed report, which has not been achievable in time for publication by the 5 clear day deadline required under Access to Information rules.
6. The full report will set out a number of recommendations for action, focussing on building capacity and support for front-line staff, with an emphasis on strengthening competence through training, supervision and professional audit. These are reproduced here in full
 - Recommendation 1 - We recommend an extension of the case-audit work to a larger sample of comprehensive (ie electronic and hard-copy) case-files over the next 5-6 weeks so that a higher level of confidence can be attached to the case-audit findings and that a further quality-assurance report be submitted to Members at a time to be agreed.
 - Recommendation 2 – We recommend that, as a matter of urgency, the work already initiated to rationalise, simplify and streamline the use of ICS exemplars is expedited and that interim guidance is provided to all relevant staff to stabilise recording practices in respect of electronic and hard-copy records.
 - Recommendation 3 – We recommend the planned ending of the practice whereby only social work practitioner staff are permitted to undertake data-entry on ICS. This would be a significant change and the managers of CSS will need to satisfy themselves that sufficient administrative and support staff in local teams have been suitably trained prior to the change of practice being implemented. We would not discourage practitioners from using the system where is agreed with their supervisory staff to be an effective and productive use of their time.
 - Recommendation 4 – In increasing the practitioner establishment of local teams, we recommend that provision is made for strengthening professional supervision through the role of senior practitioners. We further recommend the re-instatement of Area Consultant Practitioner posts, managed within Areas but with a clear practice development and quality assurance accountability to the Policy & Performance Unit. We recommend that Area Consultant Practitioners are tasked with strengthening pre- and post-qualifying training by actively developing links with Kent's local universities.

- Recommendation 5 - We recommend the establishment of a senior consultant practitioner post, in a corporate 'head of profession' advisory role, reporting directly to the Chief Executive, as part of the necessary checks and balances. Details of this post will be subject to further deliberation.
- Recommendation 6 – We recommend that as part of the authority's own performance monitoring regimes, the Policy& Performance Unit are asked to devise an annual programme of practice audits, the results of which are to be publicly reported to CFE Policy Overview Committee and County Council and Cabinet as appropriate.
- Recommendation 7 – We recommend that that the Chief Executive leads on strategic discussions with the Vice Chancellors and Deans of Social Work Schools and the Director of Children Services to develop improved pre- and post-qualifying training specifically on child protection social work practice for the benefit of those practising in Kent.

Members of the Children's Champions Board are asked:-

- (i) to NOTE the contents of this report;
- (ii) to CONSIDER the findings of the Executive Summary (attached) and the full report to be published on 6 February;
- (iii) to DECIDE what further steps they wish to be taken in terms of reporting.

Martyn Ayre
Senior Policy Manager
Corporate Policy

Telephone 01622 694355
Email martyn.ayre@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

By Peter Gilroy
To Children's Champions Board – 12 February 2009
Subject Protecting children in Kent
Classification Unrestricted
Ref

Summary Attached is the full report of the first phase of the review of the protection of children in Kent, the Executive Summary and recommendations of which were sent to Members on 4 February 2009.

FOR DECISION

Members have already received the Executive Summary of the Review and its recommendations. The attachment sets out in the initial findings in greater detail, together with the policy background and a discussion of the critical issues of compliance, competence and capacity.

Martyn Ayre
Senior Policy Manager
Corporate Policy

Telephone 01622 694355
Email martyn.ayre@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

PROTECTING CHILDREN IN KENT

Executive summary of findings

1. The precise remit of this review, which incorporates the Secretary of State's request for local quality-assurance reviews and the requirements of the County Council's resolution of 11 December 2008, is set out in the Review Plan, attached as Annex 1 to this report. This is a 'live' document and the version attached is the version current at the time of this report's publication.
2. This report has been prepared specifically with regard to Phase 1 of the review – that is to say, quality-assuring the robustness of KCC's Children's Social Services' child protection arrangements – and in order to meet the timetable for reporting to the Children's Champions Board on 12 February 2009. The reports asks:-
 - Are existing child protection practices, procedures and policies effectively protecting children from abuse?
 - Are there examples of good practice by Children Social Services with regard to child protection?
 - Are staff able to carry out their jobs effectively?
 - Are there any impediments to staff effectiveness?
 - Are there any urgent actions that need to be taken?

The first key finding of the first phase of the review is:

- there is evidence of sound professional practice in CSS, with appropriate child protection plans, demonstrating satisfactory risk-assessment and multidisciplinary and inter-agency working.

3. This finding is based on examination of electronic and hard-copy case-records on a small sample of cases which meet the criteria, identified by the NSPCC for identifying cases where the Society considers children may be at greatest vulnerability to harm, and which the County Council resolution specified.

The second key finding of the first phase of the review is:

- CSS is learning from and applying the lessons applicable to it from Serious Case Reviews (SCRs) conducted under the aegis of the Kent Children's Safeguarding Board (KCSB).

4. This finding is based on a study of confidential reports prepared by CSS and the KCSB with regard to the 5 SCRs undertaken in Kent since April 2007. (NB – the need to "learn lessons" is not an indication of failure or culpability on the part of CSS for the events that triggered the SCRs.)

The third key finding of the first phase of the review is:

- although not critical, the effectiveness of professional competence of frontline staff and their supervisory staff is potentially blunted by capacity issues related to caseload sizes in some teams, vacancy rates in some

teams and the demands on social worker's and supervisory staff's time from the requirements of the current electronic Integrated Children's System.

5. This finding is based on the review team's own access to and use of ICS, the study of case-files, the study of internal documents and management information reports, interviews with officers in Policy & Performance, and CSS managers and staff.

The fourth key finding of the first phase of the review is:

- Children Social Services can be deemed to be complying, save for some identified exceptions, with the Climbie Inquiry recommendations.

In the view of the review team, these exceptions, although requiring corrective action in some instances, are not indicative of dangerous practice.

6. This conclusion is based on the review team's examination of the final Climbie Inquiry Report recommendations, the Government's response to them and an analysis of how that has been translated into national legislation, regulation and guidance and then locally applied.

Introduction and context

7. This review of child protection arrangements in Kent has been prompted by events in Haringey in late 2008, following the death of Baby P there in 2007 and by the request by the Secretary of State for Children, Families & Schools that all children's social services authorities quality-assure their arrangements for child protection. It is, of course, also prompted by the County Council's resolution of 11 December 2008, with its clear focus on child protection and managing risk.
8. Understanding the context of this review is crucial. Concerns over the protection of children from harm and neglect date back, as a fundamental concern of public policy, to the 1948 Children Act and the founding of the modern welfare state at the end of WWII. What is distinctive about the Baby P case is that it took place in the same area where another child's death had prompted the Climbié Inquiry, chaired by Lord Laming, just a few years previously. That inquiry had itself led to a major overhaul of legislation, policy and organisation in England, actions intended to avoid such a reoccurrence.
9. At the core of the new policy direction in England has been Every Child Matters. This 2003 Green Paper, published alongside the government's formal response to the Climbié Inquiry, was subsequently put into legislation via the Children Act 2004, to deliver 5 key outcomes for all children and young people:
 - be healthy,
 - stay safe,
 - enjoy and achieve,
 - make a positive contribution,
 - achieve economic well-being.
10. This has been accompanied by organisational changes bringing together children services and LEA functions in the great majority of upper-tier councils; the creation of the statutory role of Director of Children Services; new guidance on safeguarding children, including how local interagency child safeguarding arrangements are constituted; the development of children's trusts through the new duty to cooperate and the drive towards a single, England-wide approach to electronic case-recording in Children's Social Services.
11. One of the other changes, rarely commented upon until very recently, that has most directly had an impact on frontline practitioners has been the introduction since April 2008 of new guidance on legal proceedings, following the 2006 Public Law Outline (PLO) review. Under the PLO, councils must comply with an exhaustive pre-proceedings checklist before applying for an order, including exploring the possibility of placing children with extended family members, completing core assessment, the care plan and a social work chronology. Courts prescribe their preferred formats for this being documented. The purpose is to reduce the need for care proceedings and to speed up those that are necessary.

12. This has constituted a fundamental change in how courts handle proceedings involving children, including cases which involve abuse and neglect, and how Children Social Services must prepare their cases for the courts' consideration even before proceedings can commence. Intended to streamline and simplify the processes involved, most practitioners outside of the system for the administration of justice now consider that the changes to have had the opposite, if unintentional, effect, particularly at the earlier commencement stages.
13. Similarly, the introduction of a national system of electronic recording (the Integrated Children's System) has also been experienced in its current stages of implementation, as an additional and time-consuming burden on social work practice. The findings of this review confirm that in Kent the introduction of the ICS and the Public Law Outline since April 2008 are proving to be a considerable addition to the demands on the time of front-line staff, in marked contrast to what was expected from their introduction.
14. KCC introduced a comprehensive competence-based career structure for social workers several years ago. This was developed in partnership with colleges and universities in Kent and a key component was the "ready for practice" programme. This enabled KCC to "grow" its own professional workforce from scratch, as it were, by taking on and developing unqualified staff and then supporting them through to qualification and beyond in their post-qualifying career progression.
15. Whilst most of the competence-based career framework remains in place, the decisions to not retain the Consultant Practitioner posts and to scale back the entry to the "ready for practice" programme appear to have compounded the vacancy difficulties faced in the last year.
16. Members will be aware from recent national reports that some 1 in 7 social work posts in English councils are said to be currently vacant. KCC's vacancy rate of 17% for qualified staff is currently much of this order. Some years ago, the vacancy rate stood between 4% and 7%. Whilst a straight comparison can not be made between the two sets of figures as the methods of calculation have changed, there is consensus that the situation has deteriorated over the last year. The current average of 17% needs to be seen in the context of a very small number of teams with vacancy rates temporarily in excess of 25%. This is a matter of real concern, the more so as the sustained undermining of social workers in various media only further diminishes the attractiveness of a career in social work.
17. We are of the view, albeit with the benefit of hindsight, that some earlier decisions concerning the reduction of administrative and support staff in local teams in advance of the anticipated efficiency gains from ICS need to be

urgently revisited as the problems of implementation. The problems are associated with both with the system itself and with technical difficulties and they will have only compounded the recruitment and retention difficulties currently encountered. The additional resources to start tackling these front-line capacity issues are already identified in the draft budget for 2009/10.

18. This reinforces the importance of having both competence and capacity in the front-line of children's services and the review's initial recommendations focus very much on capacity-building and refocusing on professional competence, via strengthened supervision and support in local teams and through renewed and strengthened training and practice development partnerships with local universities.
19. Finally, by way of introduction, it is to be remembered that child protection is not the sole domain of Children's Social services, although the current legal framework places the lead statutory responsibility exclusively on the shoulders of Directors of Children's Services and the councils that employ them. The Police, schools, health colleagues and others have a critical role to play too.
20. The second phase of this review will focus on the extent to which the Kent Children Safeguarding Board and its partner agencies are working effectively together to deliver the post-Climbie policy changes and that arrangements through local safeguarding boards ensure that agencies can be held individually and collectively to local account and enjoy public confidence. This will need to look at referral processes and the important considerations about thresholds around neglect and the "children in need" category, examining in detail what lies beneath the significant increase in the numbers over the last 4 years of children needing a child protection plan.
21. The third phase will draw together the findings on the local circumstances identified in the first two phases and reflect on how the development of national policy post-Climbie has actually worked out in delivery, compared to the policy intentions and recommendations which flowed from the Climbie Inquiry.

Discussion of compliance, competence and capacity.

22. Although a 'landmark' public inquiry, it needs to be remembered that the 108 recommendations itemised in the initial Climbie Inquiry Report (and the 30 recommendations from the contemporaneous Joint Chief Inspectors' Report) were not translated verbatim, as it were, into subsequent legislation, regulation or guidance. This makes the question of "compliance with the Climbie Inquiry Report" a complex one. The imminently-expected publication of Lord Laming's updating report, commissioned by the Secretary of State in November 2008 will be helpful during subsequent stages of this review in being clear about what "compliance with Climbie" effectively means.
23. For the interim, we have looked to compliance with current protection and safeguarding procedures, highly regarded by the Joint Area Review Inspection Team in 2008, as our proxy benchmark for judging compliance.
24. On the case-audit based on the small sample we have examined so far, it would not be possible to give a guarantee of full compliance, even if that could be precisely described. The 'exceptions', noted from case-records and self-assessment questionnaires, are predominantly in connection with, for example, the timescales on notifying referrers of outcomes or the comprehensiveness of agency checks in the initiation of S7 investigations or the inclusivity of participation in initial strategy discussions. This is not to say actions were not done in compliance, rather that the case-recording cannot confirm they were so done.
25. It has been noted from discussions with front-line, management and policy/performance staff that even prior to our review (and reflected in responses to the self-assessment questionnaire) that CSS had commenced its own stock-take in areas of practice identified in the Haringey mini-JAR and where shortcomings were being identified, remedial action was being taken.
26. On this basis, therefore, as set out in the key finding in the Executive Summary, we can state with some confidence that where there are issues of non-compliance, there is no evidence that this has led to unsafe or dangerous practice but indeed we can give some assurance that there are internal systems in place to identify and rectify such practice and thus minimise the potential risks arising from non-compliance.
27. Members will be aware from comments in paragraphs 8 and 9 in the introduction that there are some significant grounds for concern over capacity as a result of a deteriorating vacancy position in local CSS teams. This is not a situation specific to Kent but nor are there simple quick-fixes either.
28. The capacity of a team can not be simply measured by its vacancy rate or simple measurements of caseload size. However, the worsening of the vacancy levels is linked to the situation regarding caseloads. Current estimates are that the average caseload for a qualified social worker in Kent is about 25, which – on average – will include 4 cases of children with child

protection plans, just over 4 cases of looked-after children, with the balance predominantly comprising cases of children in need.

29. Trend data for child protection cases shows a steady increase in the number deemed, through the case conferencing arrangements, to require a formal child protection plan. In December 2007 the figure stood at 903 and by December 2008 it had risen to 1052, with a net (additions over removals) increase of 44 in December 2008, the month after the publication of the mini-JAR, whilst other information from the self-assessment questionnaire suggests a simultaneous spike in new referrals, strategy discussions and subsequent Section 47 investigations and initial conferences.
30. This would suggest a shift has taken place in how thresholds for intervention are being interpreted and applied. This is an important issue which the review will need to examine in greater detail during phase 2 when looking at inter-agency protection and safeguarding arrangements.
31. This caseload average masks variations between districts and between disability, duty/initial assessment and long-term teams. Another consideration is that CSS also has a robust policy of protected caseloads for newly-qualified social workers in their first year of post-qualifying practice. There is no absolute figure or formula for determining the 'ideal' caseload size but it is to be noted that the current average of 25 compares unfavourably to the caseload of 18 of the social worker in the Baby P case in Haringey, a figure which the mini-JAR considered to be a high number. The reassurance that can be given is to be found in the responses to the self-assessment questionnaire from which it is clear that teams are clear about where their priorities lie and have arrangements in place to actively manage demand, caseload numbers and the effects of vacancies.
32. Competent staff will be less effective unless there is the right mix of practitioners, good quality supervision, sufficient team support and user-friendly systems that enables them to undertake demanding work and make difficult risk assessments and have the confidence to manage those risks. This is why our recommendations look to improve the whole 'package' of recruitment and – perhaps more importantly in the longer run – retention, rather than seeking to define an 'acceptable' level of vacancies or 'ideal' caseload size.
33. The recommendations set out below reflect the priority that is necessary to address current caseload and workload pressures. These have come together in recent months from the effects of vacancies, increased referral rates, the additional demands on social worker's time from the implementation of ICS and the introduction of new court proceedings via the Public Law Outline.

Conclusions and recommendations

34. **The review team is of the clear view that whilst systems and procedures play important roles, the protection of vulnerable children fundamentally relies on sound professional practice by social workers and others, armed with skills in assessing risk, skills in working directly with families and in a spirit of ‘respectful scepticism’, skills (and confidence in those skills) to make inherently difficult judgements and who are supported to exercise those skills by sound professional supervision, training and management and are motivated by the recognition and promise of a career path that values their skills and expertise and seeks to keep these qualities close to practice.**
35. On the strength of the evidence seen so far, the review team is able to assure members of the Children’s Champions Board that, notwithstanding the concerns identified over vacancies and caseloads, there is a bedrock of sound professional practice and sound professional supervision and a clear sense of priority for protection in terms of the work undertaken to safeguard vulnerable children by Kent’s Children’s Social Services.
36. However, the assessment of practice has been based on a small sample of cases where reviewers have had access to **all** the relevant case-file materials. The quality of information where case-audit has been solely reliant on the ICS system is not sufficiently complete or robust to give a similar degree of assurance, at this stage.
37. Staff throughout CSS have been frank in their critique of the Integrated Children System in interviews and in their responses to the self-assessment questionnaire. Senior managers in CSS have worked hard over the last year to deliver a system which is fully compliant with DCFS requirements. This has not been achievable and it is now recognised that the current version of ICS is not fit for purpose and that it would be an unwise policy to become reliant on the ICS system for either maintaining the high standard of case-recording essential to underpin good professional practice or as the primary source of reliable management information.
38. Considerable effort has been made to improve data-quality with regard to data migrated from the previous system (Anite SWIFT) and to improve the accuracy of current case data-entry. Technical difficulties have made the latter a particularly onerous activity for practitioners with “screen-freezing” and “system lock-outs” steadily eroding what initial enthusiasm there was as well as creating risk in case-management terms.
39. **Recommendation 1.** We recommend an extension of the case-audit work to a larger sample of comprehensive (ie electronic AND hard copy) case-files over the next 5-6 weeks so that a higher level of confidence can be attached to the case-audit findings and that a further quality assurance report be submitted to Members at a time to be agreed.

40. **Recommendation 2.** We recommend that, as a matter of urgency, the work already initiated to rationalise, simplify and streamline the use of ICS exemplars is expedited and that interim guidance is provided to all relevant staff to stabilise recording practices in respect of electronic and hard copy records.
41. **Recommendation 3.** We recommend the planned ending of the practice whereby only social work practitioner staff are permitted to undertake data entry on ICS. This would be a significant change and the managers of CSS will need to satisfy themselves that sufficient administrative and support staff in local teams have been suitably trained prior to this change of practice being implemented. We would not discourage practitioners from using the system where this is agreed with their supervisory staff to be an effective and productive use of their time.
42. **Recommendation 4.** In increasing the practitioner establishment of local teams, we recommend that provision is made for strengthening professional supervision through the role of senior practitioners. We further recommend the re-instatement of Area Consultant Practitioner posts, managed within Areas but with a clear practice development and quality assurance accountability to the Policy & Performance Unit. We recommend that Area Consultant Practitioners are tasked with strengthening pre- and post-qualifying training by actively developing links with Kent's local universities.
43. **Recommendation 5.** We recommend the establishment of a senior consultant practitioner post, in a corporate 'head of profession' advisory role, reporting directly to the Chief Executive, as part of the necessary internal checks and balances. Details of this post will be subject to further deliberation.
44. **Recommendation 6.** We recommend that as part of the authority's own performance monitoring regime, the Policy & Performance Unit are asked to devise an annual programme of practice audits, the results of which are to be publicly reported to Children, Families & Education Policy Overview Committee – and Cabinet/County Council as appropriate.
45. **Recommendation 7.** We recommend that the Chief Executive leads on strategic discussions with the Vice Chancellors and Deans of Social Work Schools and the Director of Children Services to develop improved pre- and post-qualifying training specifically on child protection social work for the benefit of those practising in Kent.

In conclusion.

46. It is evident, in the aftermath of the Baby P case in Haringey, that public confidence in the ability of public services to protect vulnerable children has again been dented. In anticipation of Lord Laming's soon-to-be-published 'updating' report, it is prudent to think about finding ways in which greater transparency might help restore public confidence in how children are routinely and safely protected in Kent. There are matters of balancing

confidentiality and proper public interest to consider but it seems unlikely that public confidence will be restored without greater local transparency and accountability – matters which will need to be considered with partners from all the agencies involved during the next stage of the review.

47. The County Council's draft budget for 2009/10 proposes investing an additional £1.5m per annum from April 2009 onwards in the Children's Social Services budget. In line with the view that building competence and capacity in local teams is the best way of protecting vulnerable children, it is evident that the major proportion of this additional resource will be best allocated to additional practitioner posts, additional support staff to free them up for direct work with children and their families and to the professional support of high-quality supervision and training.
48. It is not in the remit of the review to specify how this is done but the review team will wish to ensure that its recommendations are taken fully on board in the service realignment work already underway, in discussions with the CFE SMT, subject to the outcomes of the discussions with Members at the Children's Champions Board and beyond.
- 49. Finally, on a personal note as the Chief Executive, I wish to record my recognition that front-line are clearly working diligently in difficult circumstances and, whilst there is room for improvement, I have full confidence in the fundamentally professional approach they are taking on the important task of protecting Kent's children.**

Peter Gilroy

Peter Thomason

Martyn Ayre

6 February 2009

DRAFT OUTLINE V0.5

KENT SAFEGUARDING REVIEW PLAN

BACKGROUND

The Kent Safeguarding Review will be carried out in 3 phases.

Phase 1 will look at the capability of Kent's Children's Social Services (CSS) to meet its child protection obligations. This will include vacancy rates, staff turnover, caseloads, thresholds, career structures and development, together with the quality audit of child protection plans indicated in the County Council resolution.

Phase 2 will look at multi-agency working for child protection in Kent and issues around communication and front line competence across all the partner agencies engaged in child protection work. This will be carried out collaboratively with the Kent Safeguarding Children Board.

Phase 3 will draw out recommendations concerning national policy, guidelines or procedures, specifically where we would be proposing the case for change.

Attached at annex B is the detailed work plan for phase 1 of the review only. The findings from phase 1 will inform the subsequent phases of the review and individual work plans for each phase will be drawn up and added as annexes to this document at a later date.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The full Terms of Reference (ToR) for this review are attached at annex A. A breakdown of how these ToR will be covered by each phase of the review is set out below.

Area of Investigation	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
The effectiveness of agency arrangements to identify and respond to concerns - this will include for example, an understanding of thresholds, the specific demands on front line staff such as the ICS and PLO requirements, caseload numbers, and the adequacy of resources to respond to and manage risk	X	X	
The quality of recording, assessment and child protection planning across agencies, with specific regard to CSS in Phase 1	X	X	
Close examination of those cases where decisions to take legal proceedings have followed significant dissent between professionals and managers, where children are on interim care orders still at home, and where children are subject of an unfinished police investigation	X		
Single (Phase 1) and multi-agency (Phase 2) training arrangements in place to support the competency and confidence of front line staff, supervisors and first line managers	X	X	
Local accountability and supervision arrangements for front line staff, supervisors and front line managers in Children's Social Services	X		
Arrangements for strategic leadership and management oversight of safeguarding by elected members, senior officers and strategic partnerships	X	X	X
The role of the Kent Safeguarding Board and how well the Board challenges member agencies and a review of Kent's Child Protection framework and procedures		X	
The partnership process for learning the lessons from serious case reviews and agency performance in respect of implementing recommendations		X	
How performance data is used and analysed to measure performance and report on the quality of service provision and practice	X	X	
Evaluation of recent strategic policies, both national and local, to identify if they are enhancing or impacting adversely on managing risk on a snapshot basis in Phase 1 and in-depth in Phase 2	X		X
Compliance with the Victoria Climbié inquiry recommendations	X	X	X

DRAFT OUTLINE V0.5

OVERALL TIMESCALES

Phase 1 – January to report to Members in February

Phase 2 – February & March to report to Members in April

Phase 3 – April to report to Members in May/June

Phases 2 & 3 are very dependent on the findings from Phase 1, therefore timescales for these are only approximate and will be revisited once Phase 1 has completed.

Outline Project Plan

	January				February				March				April				May			
	5	1	1	2	2	9	1	2	2	9	1	2	3	6	1	2	2	4	1	1
	2	9	6		6	3			6	3	0			3	0	7	1	8		
Agree overall ToR																				
PHASE 1																				
Agree review plan																				
Preparation and evidence-gathering																				
Document review																				
Cases review																				
Report writing																				
Hypotheses testing																				
Finalise report																				
Report findings																				
PHASE 2																				
Agree review plan																				
Preparation and evidence-gathering																				
Document review																				
Interviews and discussions with partners																				
Report writing																				
Hypotheses testing																				
Finalise report																				
Report findings																				
PHASE 3																				
Agree review plan																				
Preparation and evidence-gathering																				
Document review and interviews																				
Report writing																				
Hypotheses testing																				
Finalise report																				
Report findings																				

REVIEW TEAM

The review owner will be Peter Gilroy. The review team will consists of Martyn Ayre as review leader and Peter Thomason an external child protection consultant. The team will be supported by Joanne Purvis for research, data collection and recording.

METHODOLOGY

The review will take the form of a document review and interviews with key members of staff and where appropriate, partner agencies. Interviews will take place as deemed necessary by the Review Team to provide further information or add context to findings. There will also be some focus group work with front-line practitioners and managers to evaluate and compare initial findings with workforce experience.

OUTPUT

Each phase of the review will produce a detailed report, including an executive summary and recommendations. The review team will report findings to the Children’s Champions Board (including the lead member for Children’s Services), Full Council, KSCB and the Kent Children’s Trust as appropriate for each phase.

KENT SAFEGUARDING REVIEW – To review arrangements for safeguarding children in Kent following the findings of the Haringey JAR 2008

In the light of the Haringey JAR findings and the case of Baby P the Chief Executive of KCC - Peter Gilroy - will, on behalf of the Kent County Council and in partnership with the KSCB, oversee an independent review of Kent's Child Protection arrangements, set against the shortcomings identified in the Ofsted JAR report on Haringey, the specific requirements identified by the Kent County Council members on 11th December 2008 and the significant recent legislative and policy requirements, to provide assurance that all the required 'fail safes' are in place.

The review's findings and recommendations will be presented to the Children's Champions Board (including the lead member for Children's Services) before being reported to Full Council. The findings will be reported to the Kent Safeguarding Board and in turn the KCT in due course.

Scope of the review

The review will cover the following:

- The effectiveness of agency arrangements to identify and respond to concerns - this will include for example, an understanding of thresholds, the specific demands on front line staff such as the ICS and PLO requirements, caseload numbers, and the adequacy of resources to respond to and manage risk
- The quality of recording, assessment and child protection planning across agencies
- Close examination of those cases where decisions to *NOT* take legal proceedings have followed significant dissent between professionals and/or managers, where children are on interim care orders still at home, and where children are subject of an unfinished police investigation
- Single and multi-agency training arrangements in place to support the competency and confidence of front-line staff, supervisors and first-line managers
- Local accountability and supervision arrangements for front line staff, supervisors and first-line managers
- Arrangements for strategic leadership and management oversight of safeguarding by elected members, senior officers and strategic partnerships
- The role of the Kent Safeguarding Board and how well the Board challenges member agencies and a review of Kent's Child Protection framework and procedures
- The partnership process for learning the lessons from serious case reviews and agency performance in respect of implementing recommendations
- How performance data is used and analysed to measure performance and report on the quality of service provision and practice
- Evaluation of recent strategic policies, both national and local, to identify if they are enhancing or impacting adversely on managing risk.
- Compliance with the Victoria Climbié inquiry recommendations

Independent review team membership

Martyn Ayre
Corporate Policy Manager
Review Lead

Peter Thomason
Independent Child
Protection Consultant

Joanne Purvis
Improvement and
Engagement Officer
Review Assistant

PHASE 1 WORK PLAN

Terms of Reference

The areas of investigation to be covered by Phase 1 of the review are:

- The effectiveness of agency arrangements to identify and respond to concerns - this will include for example, an understanding of thresholds, the specific demands on front-line staff such as the ICS and PLO requirements, caseload allocation and management, and the adequacy of resources to respond to and manage risk
- The quality of recording, assessment and child protection planning across agencies, with specific regard to the role of Children's Social Services in Phase 1
- Close examination of those cases where decisions to *NOT* take legal proceedings have followed significant dissent between professionals and managers, where children are on interim care orders still at home, and where children are subject of an unfinished police investigation
- Training arrangements in place to support the competency and confidence of front-line staff, supervisors and first-line managers
- Local accountability and supervision arrangements for front-line staff, supervisors and first-line managers
- How performance data is used and analysed to measure performance and report on the quality of service provision and practice
- Compliance with the Victoria Climbié inquiry recommendations

Key Questions

The key questions that will be answered in phase 1 are:

1. Are existing child protection practices, procedures, and policies effectively protecting children from abuse?
2. Are there examples of good practice by Children's Social Services with regard to child protection?
3. Are staff able to carry out their jobs effectively?
4. Are there any impediments to staff effectiveness?
5. Are there any urgent actions that need to be taken?

Method

Phase 1 of the review is required to report at the beginning of February, so timescales for this phase are tight. As a result, the majority of the review work will be document-based (including completion of a self-assessment questionnaire) and will include an examination of child protection plans in respect of particularly vulnerable children, as requested by County Council.

There will be scope for a few interviews to clarify documents/data and a focus group of frontline practitioners and managers just before formal reporting, to elicit feedback on the review's initial conclusions, but corroborating and validating the findings from the documents.

DRAFT OUTLINE V0.5

Output

This phase of the review will produce a detailed report, including an executive summary, conclusions and recommendations. This will be presented to a special meeting of the Children's Champions Board (including the lead member for Children's Services) before reporting to Full Council.

Outline timeline

W/c 12th January – ToR agreed and shared with CFE & Members, review plan agreed by team

W/c 19th Jan – Document & case review

W/c 26th Jan – Report writing

W/c 2nd Feb – Meet frontline practitioners & finalise report

W/c 9th Feb – Present findings Children's Champion Board (12th)

W/c 16th Feb – Present findings to County Council [this is the Budget debate, so may be pushed back to March or CC Board on 12th may cover it]

Proposed evidence required

Key Documents

- JAR Report
- JAR Action Plan
- JAR Position Statement on Safeguarding
- 2008 APA submission
- 2007 APA submission
- Serious case review protocols
- Safeguarding Children Procedures Manual
- CHildren In Need (CHIN) Matrix
- CSS dispute/escalation policy
- Details of child protection training policies and plans including records of take-up over the last two years
- Internal evaluation findings since January 2008
- Matrix against the Haringey mini-JAR
- Supervision policy
- Reports on serious case reviews since January 2008 and Ofsted evaluation letter
- Serious case reviews actions plans and monitoring
- Minutes from Safeguarding Board back to 2004

Data

- All child protection plans where decisions have been taken to *NOT* take legal proceedings and where children are on interim care orders still at home, where there has been a dispute or an unfinished police investigation
- Records of where there has been a dispute or escalation
- CSS monthly monitoring dataset (covers referral rates, no. of cases with child protection plans in place and total caseload of child protection cases vs other CSS cases)
- CSS staff vacancy rates over last 2 years
- CSS staff retention rates over last 2 years
- Use of agency staff over last 2 years
- No. of newly qualified staff vs experienced staff

DRAFT OUTLINE V0.5

- CSS staff grievance cases over the last 2 years that have been around child protection issues
- CSS staff whistle-blowing cases over the last 2 years that have been around child protection issues
- CSS staff disciplinary cases over the last 2 years that have been around child protection issues
- Comparative data with other LAs around funding and performance
- Comparative data with other LAs around recommended caseloads after Climbie

Interviews & Focus Groups

Interviews and focus groups will be arranged to corroborate and validate findings from documents, testing hypotheses and identifying other area to investigate

Known Interviews

- Kathy Lambourn re internal audits and disputes - 23rd Jan 9am
- Paul Brightwell re LAC - 23rd Jan 10.30am
- Frontline practitioners/managers focus group to reality-check findings – 2nd Feb 2pm

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

APA – Annual Performance Assessment
CFE – Children, Families & Education Directorate
CHIN – Children in Need
CSS – Children’s Social Services
ICS – Integrated Children’s System
JAR – Joint Area Review
KCC – Kent County Council
KCT – Kent Children’s Trust
KSCB – Kent Safeguarding Children Board
PLO – Public Law Outline
SCR – Serious Case Reviews

This page is intentionally left blank