**SESLIP Quality Assurance Leads Meeting**

**Thursday 6 January 2022 (14:00 – 17:00)**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Brighton and Hove | Sharon | Martin |
| Brighton and Hove | Tina | James |
| Buckinghamshire | - |  |
| East Sussex | Douglas | Sinclair |
| Hampshire | Amanda | Meadows |
| Hampshire (Chair) | Kim | Goode |
| Kent | Kevin | Kasaven |
| Medway | Becky | Cooper |
| Oxfordshire | Tan | Lea |
| Portsmouth | Sarah | Alexander |
| Reading | Fiona | Betts |
| Slough | Sandra | Davies |
| Southampton | Jo | Feeney |
| Surrey | Senay | Nidai |
| West Berkshire | - |  |
| West Sussex | Christine | Impey |
| Windsor & Maidenhead | Shungu | Chigocha |

**Apologies:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Hampshire | Stuart | Ashley |
| Southampton | Stuart | Webb |
| Surrey | Patricia | Denney |
| Surrey | Tom | Stevenson |
| East Sussex | Lou | Carter |
| Medway | Christine | Pitchers |
| Milton Keynes | Sophie | Marshall |
| Bracknell Forest | Kogie | Perumall |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Introductions & Apologies** |
| Kim Goode chaired the meeting and welcomed all. Introductions were given. |
| **2. Matters Arising from Last Meeting** |
| The minutes of the last meeting were agreed and actions discussed – see table at end of minutes. |
| 1. **Feedback following Pilot JTAI** |
| Hampshire put themselves forward to pilot the new JTAI arrangements to assist Ofsted and this took place from November 1 to 18. Hampshire received the call from Ofsted on November 1 and were given two weeks’ notice. The inspectors included Ofsted, 2CQC and one constabulary and fire service. They spent 4 days on site and were based in our headquarters in Winchester. They based themselves centrally as we have 8 districts.  The theme of inspection was the front door – not just MASH but safeguarding teams. The focus was on the previous 6 months and their intention was to follow cases from the initial referral into CAST for up to 8 weeks. They were specifically looking for s47 that had progressed to CP conference and resulted in a CP plan. They were looking at that journey and the process.  Week One  On Day 1, the lead inspector notified DCS followed by calls from each inspectorate and senior leaders. On Day 5, the Lead inspector using child data from Annex A to select children whose experiences they wanted to evaluate. They selected between 5-7 children and asked local agencies to jointly evaluate these. To prepare, we circulated to all our SWs a checklist so they could ensure that all the details were up to date and recorded on children’s files. We audited our complex and high-risk cases in previous 6 months with the help of District Managers.  In week one we also prepared some additional briefings - we highlighted where we think Ofsted may go and put together a rationale and explanation, therefore pre-empting. It was a chance to brief all. We briefed partners and walked them through the process and expectations. We had daily meetings with agencies.  A long list of 30 cases arrived on Thursday in the first week and we audited them all. We made sure that SW checklist was completed and any gaps addressed. We prepared for key documents. It is important to note that 6 of the 30 were chosen from the multi-agency list. Therefore from week one, there was a lot of work going on behind the scenes. The list included babies, under 8s and complex teenagers – they picked cases with repeated assessments and re-referrals.  On the Friday of the first week we received the seven deep-dive cases, all complex cases. By 5pm each day it was important to have uploaded the documents and information/evidence.  Week 2  The Lead inspector created a timetable for onsite week with other inspectorates. We shared any information from Annex A, looked at electronic documents for children whose experiences were being audited and looked at multi agency audits. Therefore the focus was on the initial referral contact and notification. They wanted copies of assessments and multiple documents.  There was a lot of concentrated work by partner agencies and ourselves auditing the deep dive seven cases by single agency. Then the agencies came together to form a judgement for ourselves. We used their tool to audit cases and we gave our feedback at the end to Ofsted about the questions in the audit tool. Our feedback to Ofsted included our advice that the second week should be for the multi-agency safeguarding meetings, so they may change this.  KG advised that it is important to do a deep dive audit of all 30 cases so that you are prepared. They wanted to know our thresholds, decision making and quality of assessments. They looked at a wide range of information, particularly step up and down, s17 CiN assessments, s47s through to CP conference, quality of CiN/CP plans, UASC and exploitation, cases with neglect and cases with no further action.  Key Points:   * Clear focus on lived experience for the child, with significant case sampling. * You need to know your data and performance well. * We asked for an opening presentation session with key leaders across the partnership. * Keep in touch meetings were useful, feedback was general. * Police and health were not as prepared as we would have liked them to be and link person had not been a key person for an inspection before. * AM felt the guidance was a reaction to the Wood Report and LSCPs. Yet, when they arrived they fell into standard Ofsted practice of case sampling. There should have been things in the timetable, which the lead inspector removed. She was very much in Ofsted focussed visit/ILACS mode. This might change after the pilot. * Annex A, List One. Make sure you have this ready. They had additional requirement for “no further action” cases.   Discussion followed. AM confirmed that Ofsted looked for “the voice of the child” on the system and there was no dialogue with parents and young people. The Hampshire & IOW Approach helped us have the voice of the child and their parents on the system.  In terms of equality, ethnicity, diversity and inclusion, they disproportionately managed to select a lot of cases and SWs whose ethnicity was not British white. We did ask if this was a key line of enquiry but this was denied.  They did pick complex cases for teenagers and they did focus on MET. They picked a cross-section of ages and managed to pick the most complex cases.  The Chair will not be sharing this feedback but confirmed we did share the JTAI PowerPoint with the group recently. Following the pilot JTAI with Hampshire, we will have to wait to see the finalised version.  A final point is don’t assume your other agencies are as prepared as you are, or their link person has any experience of what is required. They will need your assistance. Expect Ofsted to do what they do, which is case sampling. |
| 1. **Feedback from CP Chairs Sub-group** |
| Sharon Martin reported that the CP Chairs sub-group met on 4 January 2022 and the turnout was good. Matters discussed included:   1. The group touched base around Covid and hybrid/virtual working. Most, if not all, local authorities are working virtually. We discussed the technology and different ways of working. 2. We have agreed to set up a channel within Microsoft Teams so we can share templates and different ways of working. 3. We looked at anti-racist practice within the conference environment. 4. We had a conversation about training and cultural competence in staff’s learning and development needs. It was apparent there was a wish to have more training around that for CP conference chairs and IROs. 5. The group was an all-female group, predominantly a white group. We are going to include this as a focus of development going forward. 6. We touched on the Social Care Review and call for ideas. We recognise IROs often have a dual role and chair CP conferences. SM shared key themes that came from a national group, practitioners keen to share that they work collegially and proactively with SW colleagues. Also issues around recruitment & retention and working together in reflective spaces to share knowledge. 7. We looked at CP chairs performance development - what good practice looks like. Also QA audits and sharing of templates was agreed. 8. We talked about thresholds, benchmarking and understanding risk, which lead to conversations about tragic child deaths. There were a high number of ICPCs convened over Christmas period – discussion that in some cases referrals made were unnecessary and perhaps impacted by tragic deaths. 9. There is a Community of Practice event being held on 10 March looking at safeguarding for IORs. The event has also been extended to CP chairs.   The agenda items for the next meeting will be professional dissent and challenge, PLO processes, supervision orders, dual roles including LADO, and anti-racist practice. The CP Chairs subgroup will be meeting quarterly. |
| 1. **Quality Assurance and Performance** |
| The area of challenge for this meeting is Performance of health assessments and dental for LAC – all LAs to investigate and report back.  There was discussion at meeting with contributions from Slough, Portsmouth, Medway, Kent and Windsor & Maidenhead. Please could all complete their responses and share with [Sally.Hickman2@hantgs.gov.uk](mailto:Sally.Hickman2@hantgs.gov.uk).  Good practice as identified by QA Framework  Tina James (Brighton & Hove) produced a piece of work for this as there is an area of emerging practice. This was around CiN and quality of plan - compliance with processes, supervision and management oversight. The findings in Q2 were that the child’s plan was smart and rated green in 100% of cases audited, compared to 77% in previous year. Statutory processes consistently good over the last year. One of the findings from our ILACS in July 2018 was to improve our response to CiN. Good practice– a plan was put in place lead by the Head of Service responsible for CiN. We added additional layer of management oversight in the review process. A CiN steering group was set up which piloted new CiN documentation, including a Smart Plan/What if Plan. We have also increased the number of cases we audit each quarter to 50% of total cases. We continue to do thematic audits on a regular basis. We have high level of scrutiny, focusing on CiN work and this work is continuous.  All – in terms of examples of good practice, please put this in writing and send to Sally to disseminate to the group. |
| 1. **Topic for discussion - Benchmarking and understanding the number of children that are part of a child protection plan** |
| Surrey (Carol Adamson and Gill Halden) is leading on this. Senay Nidai reported that Carol’s request was to understand the number of children that other LAs have in terms of children with disabilities on a CP plan. This was a request around numbers. We are focussing on safeguarding knowledge in the CwD service and highlighting risk. We found we had an inability to benchmark with the number of children in other LAs. We have recently done a piece of work re CwD placed out of county in residential care settings. There has been some valuable learning – there are “impacts” that have a narrative but there might be inconsistencies around injuries and bruises. CwD needs to be integral to CP and safeguarding.  Kevin commented that investigations might involve LADO and Adult Services - are services robust enough to manage allegations?  Senay will confirm to Sally whether incoming AD will require a discussion at the next meeting. |
| 1. **AOB and information sharing** |
| The Chair reported that DCS have been asked to nominate someone for the moderation of self-assessment panels – should that be someone from this group? This is a request via Alison Smailes and Stuart Ashley. Please could all come back with their nominations for the moderation panel, via Sally. Amanda advised this needs to be someone able to read someone else’s self-assessment and critically assess. SESLIP don’t have their own staff and moderation going forward will be made up of volunteers from South East group.  **Action: KG to follow up with Stuart Ashley.**  Suggested items for next agenda:   1. Kent (Kevin) requested pre-proceedings. How do we QA? 2. Slough (Sandra) would be keen to look at section 47s. We are issuing a higher number than others; how are people managing thresholds and understanding the s47s. 3. Brighton & Hove (Sharon) – anti-racist practice within CP process. Look at specific workshop training in regard to that, geared towards those roles. Does SESLIP has any access to pooled budget that would allow for a contribution to training. KG will ask the question.   The Chair thanked all for their time and contribution. There are some actions for you all in terms of written responses to questions we asked.  The date of the next meeting is 16 March 2022 at 2 p.m. |

**Actions from the last sessions – 10 March, 7 June and 10 September.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Matters Arising from last meeting** | Douglas Sinclair to share East Sussex protocol developed as part of Care Leavers transitions work | Open |
| **Children Missing Education** | Douglas Sinclair will share the East Sussex multi-agency CME audit tool | Open |
| **Added value to the QA system of IRO and CP chairs** | Stuart Ashley will share Hampshire’s review report once completed. Not available at time of QA Leads meeting on 6 January 2022. | Pending |
| **Responding to minister’s request for assurance - (serious incident notifications, and concerns over increasing incidents involving babies)** | Kent will share the early years development programme | Closed |
| **Virtual QA Thematic Peer Challenge Framework 2020 21 – QA** | Thoughts/feedback to be sent to Stuart Ashley | Closed |
| **Forward Planning and Agenda** | Stuart plans to do a monthly touch base that will help develop the agenda and plan contributions. This will help colleagues do preparation in advance of the meetings | Closed |
| **Forward Planning and Agenda** | Quality of Plans – agenda for June meeting – colleagues to share in advance their work on QA and quality of plans and challenges – this will enable a richer focused discussion at the meeting | Closed |