

# 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																				
<b>PHASE 1</b>																				
Agree review plan																				
Preparation and evidence-gathering																				
Document review																				
Cases review																				
Report writing																				
Hypotheses testing																				
Finalise report																				
Report findings																				
<b>PHASE 2</b>																				
Agree review plan																				
Preparation and evidence-gathering																				
Document review																				
Interviews and discussions with partners																				
Report writing																				
Hypotheses testing																				
Finalise report																				
Report findings																				
<b>PHASE 3</b>																				
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 11<sup>th</sup> 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 12<sup>th</sup> January – ToR agreed and shared with CFE & Members, review plan agreed by team

W/c 19<sup>th</sup> Jan – Document & case review

W/c 26<sup>th</sup> Jan – Report writing

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

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

W/c 16<sup>th</sup> Feb – Present findings to County Council [this is the Budget debate, so may be pushed back to March or CC Board on 12<sup>th</sup> 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 - 23<sup>rd</sup> Jan 9am
- Paul Brightwell re LAC - 23<sup>rd</sup> Jan 10.30am
- Frontline practitioners/managers focus group to reality-check findings – 2<sup>nd</sup> 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