SESLIP Quality Assurance Leads Minutes

|  |
| --- |
| Date: Monday 16th June 2025 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTENDEES** |  | **APOLOGIES** |
| **Kent,** Kevin Kasaven – Chair  **Bracknell Forest,** Kogie Perumall  **Brighton & Hove,** Sharon Martin  **Brighton & Hove**, Tina James  **East Sussex,** Douglas Sinclair  **East Sussex,** Michelle Hayman  **Hampshire**, Sarah Plummer  **Isle of Wight,** Victoria Clottey  **Kent,** Leemya McKeown  **Medway,** Teresa Devito  **Reading,** Fiona Betts  **Slough,** Victor Mangwende  **Southampton,** Stuart Webb  **Surrey,** Linde Webber  **Surrey,** Sarah Robson  **West Berkshire,** Nicola Robertson  **West Sussex,** Vicky Richardson  **Wokingham,** Sara James |  | **Bracknell Forest**, Joanna Beaton  **Brighton & Hove,** Justin Grantham  **Buckinghamshire,** Mark Green  **East Sussex**, Louise Carter  **Isle of Wight,** Anna Clarke  **Isle of Wight,** Simon Dear  **Milton Keynes,** Martin Clement  **Milton Keynes,** Sophie Marshall  **Oxfordshire,** Senay Nidai  **Portsmouth,** Kate Soutter  **Reading,** Otilia Broadhurst  **Surrey,** Thomas Stevenson  **Surrey,** Patricia Denney  **West Sussex,** Laura Mallison  **Windsor & Maidenhead,** Shungu Chigocha |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Next Meeting: Thursday 11th September 2025 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA – DD.MM.YYYY** | | | | |
| **Item No.** | **Time** | **Item Description** | **Lead** | **Papers** |
|  | 14:00 – 14:10 | **Introduction and Apologies** | Chair |  |
|  | 14:10 – 14:20 | **Review Action Log** | Chair |  |
| **3.** | 14:20 – 14:40 | **National Ofsted Issues** | Chair |  |
| **4.** | 14:40 – 15:00 | **CP**/IRO/LADO **subgroup feedback (rotated)** | Sharon Martin/Sarah Robson |  |
| **5.** | 15:00 – 15:20 | **Quality assurance and performance**   * **Area of challenge – all LAs investigate and report back on the area identified. Questions to consider could include:**   + **Process**   + **Performance**   + **What do you understand from this?**   + **How do you quality assure** * **Good practice as identified by QA Framework. Questions to be considered could include:**   + **What is it?**   + **How do they know?**   + **What makes this an area of good practice for this LA, what did they add to make it good practice.** | All |  |
| **6.** | 15:20 – 15:35 | Ownership of audit actions | All |  |
| **7.** | 15:35 – 15:50 | Discuss a shared library of training and resources to help developing a baseline understanding of QA for staff. | All |  |
| **8.** | 15:50 – 16:00 | **AOB**  Update on Lead Practitioner role model | All  Sarah Plummer |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS** | | |
| **Action No.** | **Action Description** | **Lead** |
| **5a** | Leemya to present at September’s meeting findings from the Mock JTAI for Domestic Abuse. | Leemya McKeown |
| **5b** | Michelle to have an agenda item at December’s meeting to share the multi-agency audit regarding the impact on a child of delay in police investigations and no further police action in CSA cases. | Michelle Hayman |
| **7a** | All to send Sian any guidance or resources they have on how to improve auditing quality and training staff in auditing, so she can create a shared library. | All |

|  |
| --- |
| **MINUTES** |
| Introduction and Apologies |
| Kevin introduced himself and the purpose of the meeting.  Kevin referred to a discussion during the meeting held in March 2025 regarding the rotating the chair of the meeting. The group agreed for Kevin to remain as chair.  Kevin shared he has been in touch with SESLIP as they have had extra funding this year from the DFE. Most of this relates to SEND however there are other pots of money. Kevin is hoping to gain approval to secure £10,000 for a QA conference to be held in December 2025. Kevin shared he hopes there to be approximately 120 spaces for the group to attend, alongside any QA colleagues they feel would benefit from the event. Kevin explained further communication will be sent within the next few weeks, once this has been approved by the state executive.  Kevin highlighted he has written to The Association of Directors of Children’s Services (ADCS to ask them if they would be willing to attend the conference. Kevin explained once the research has been completed, this will be sent to the ADCS with the view they will attend the conference, and for it then to be presented on behalf of SESLIP at the ADCS in July 2026.  Kevin shared he has also written to the DFE to ask if they will endorse the research and tool this group creates. Kevin shared they are interested in this therefore will pursue this through the Sector Led Improvement Programme (SLIP) partnership. Kevin explained SLIP consists of 21 local authorities in England who are identified as being leading local authorities in developing practice. Kevin further explained he will present the research and the findings with the view of potential DFE endorsement and attendance at the December conference.  Kevin summarised he is ensuring the research and tool is reaching the right forums, with the hope to take it nationally. Kevin will share an update at the September meeting however will send out an email to group if there are further developments in the meantime. |
| Review Action Log |
| Kevin shared the action log with updates and completions noted. |
| National Ofsted Issues |
| Kevin asked the group if they have any recent experiences since the last meeting in March.  Teresa shared Medway had a focused visit. A presumption was made the inspection would focus on vulnerable adults which they briefly reviewed with no concerns raised. The next area of focus was on children subject to child protection plans and child in need plans. Teresa shared the inspectors spent time meeting with practitioners and the inspection ran smoothly and no priority actions were given.  Kevin queried if any elements of the approach to the inspection felt different. Teresa responded the inspectors did not want to speak to managers and only practitioners. Teresa shared some practitioners who met with inspectors were nervous and confused about navigating their way through Mosaic, particularly those who were interim or new to Medway. It was identified by Ofsted practitioners could not always locate information on the system, and therefore improvements should be made in the inductions for new practitioners.  Leemya reflected on families first with the expected changes and questioned if there was a difference in what the inspectors were exploring. Leemya gave example of a focus on family solutions when reviewing child in need and child protection plans. Teresa responded there wasn’t a difference and Ofsted highlighted they liked how Child Protection Conferences were held face to face. Teresa stated the inspection did not feel any different to previous inspections.  Kevin highlighted Yvette Stanley was at a recent conference with ADCS, and she explained Ofsted will not be inspecting the adopting of families first model but rather the impact on children where they see it has been tried. Kevin shared Bournemouth’s recent ILAC inspection has been published and the model isn’t referenced a lot even though the local authority is considered to be the most advance in this area. Kevin reflected it seems Ofsted are steering away from being DFE’s vehicle to explore if the family first model is implemented within local authorities.  Vicky shared they are expecting a help and protection visit imminently. Vicky queried Teresa if Ofsted are following the format of identifying cohorts of children for practitioners to meet with them and discuss. Vicky further queried if there was the opportunity to invite not just the allocated worker but potentially the CROs or adult officers when meeting with the inspectors, to allow these professionals within the authority who are working with the identified child to discuss the areas of practice. Teresa confirmed the usual format was used. Ofsted received the list of 6 months’ worth of audits in which they selected 6 case files from this. Teresa shared they met only with Social Workers but in addition to this, inspectors were invited to attend additional meetings occurring at the time.  Vicky queried to what extent Ofsted wanted practitioners to refer to impact as opposed to focusing on processes. Teresa shared impact was a strong theme. Ofsted highlighted a difference in impact where audits were conducted face to face compared to when they were held virtually. Teresa shared all audits are now to take face to face and steps are being taken for Child Protection (CP) Chairs and Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) to complete midway reviews face to face.  Kevin shared, within Kent, when Senior Managers were moderators to their own audited cases, they were more likely to not challenge or provide a robust overview. This resulted in moderations being conducted from different parts of the county, however, due to the geographical size these do not take place face to face. Teresa clarified moderations are not completed face to face and these are undertaken by the 7 Practice Development Leads within the QA Team. Teresa explained 15 audits are completed a month face to face by the team managers, with all of these moderated by the Practice Development Leads.  Stuart explained Southampton had a JTAI in May which looked at identification of need and risk, with the draft letter expected on Friday 2oth June. Stuart explained this was Southampton’s first JTAI and during this, 5 children were selected for case audit with 2 of these discussed within the multi-agency group. Stuart noted Ofsted attend a MASH meeting, had 1:1 meetings with Social Workers and Family Practitioners and convened a series of groups looking at areas of practice such as work with young people, unaccompanied asylum seekers and work with partners. Stuart shared the report will be published on 18th July.  Kevin reflected on the multiagency aspect of the JTAI and queried if Ofsted identified how Health, Police and Education engaged with the identity of risk. Stuart responded a few elements benefitted the local authority ahead of the inspection such as having family safeguarding governance and oversight through safeguarding partnership which has been in place for a year. Stuart highlighted as a result of this; mature relationships were identified as part of the inspection activity. Another element is the recent integration of the Children’s and Adult’s Board which showcased partnership joint focus during the inspection preparation and the inspection itself. Stuart referred to Health colleagues and highlighted capacity issues during the preparation of the inspection however Southampton colleagues are experienced in inspections.  Kevin explained Ofsted now have capacity of staffing to resume with the usual framework of inspections. Kevin shared Kent’s last inspection was during May 2022 and have reviewed other local authorities who had inspections which found their next inspections didn’t occur until 4/5 years later. However, the Ofsted guidance states inspections should take place every 3 years, either 6 months before the anniversary or 6 months after the anniversary. Kevin encouraged the group to be mindful of when local authorities had their last inspection and previous gradings, as their next inspection could be sooner than they think.  Tina shared the current theme for JTAI is Domestic Abuse and it is likely the theme for September will be Sexual Abuse. Tina questioned Kevin if he is able to confirm this as he attends ADCS meetings. Kevin responded has met with Richard Tindall who is the Senior Advisor for SESLIP as he is exploring future funding for research on what to regionalise within SESLIP. During this meeting Domestic Abuse and Sexual Abuse are 2 topics identified for a potential regionalised approach to develop consistent practice.  Kevin shared Kent have released, free of charge, a Sexual Abuse pathway for lower levels of risk. This can be located on the KSCMP website and includes a practice framework and tools which were created with Anna Glinski. Kevin explained previously local authorities could apply for DFE funding for Anna Glinski to complete work with the local authorities regarding a sexual abuse pathway. Kent applied for this, and although were not successful, Anna was impressed with Kent’s plans and stayed in contact with Kent resulting in this pathway being launched. Kevin was unsure of what resulted from the pilot itself and asked the group if any of the local authorities were selected for this. No response was given and Kevin encouraged the group to explore online if work was published from local authorities following the pilot.  Tina explained as Brighton & Hove have not yet had a JTAI this means they are likely to experience one soon. Tina shared the last time a Child Sexual Abuse multi-agency audit was completed in 2018/19 and therefore are looking to complete one in September. Tina queried for potential themes for the JTAI however will continue to explore and notify the group if discovered.  Kevin reflected on Keir Starmer’s approval for the public inquiry into grooming, even though the initial view was this wasn’t needed. When looking at the inquiry it originated from the grooming within Rochdale which resulted in a number of extensive actions and recommendations, however they have not been taken forward until the new government came in and published a plan. Kevin encouraged the group to keep this in mind and suggested the JTAI will potentially be about exploitation rather than intra-familial harm given the public inquiry into grooming, the impact of this and whether authorities took action.  Kevin shared Kent recently had a freedom of information request which asked whether any members raised in cabinet the need for a grooming inquiry locally. Kevin noted Kent did not have any member raise this. Furthermore, Kent’s general counsel was contacted by the government to see if Kent thought there should be a public inquiry, however, Kent do not have any evidence to support this.  Fiona shared during their last JTAI on Domestic Abuse, although the focus was on children under 7 and identified the subject children, the inspectorate was interested all children in the household and not just the sibling group. Fiona reflected on exploitation and suggested reviewing broader communities around the child to feel prepared. Reading had not recently completed a multi-agency audit which proved difficult as the audit experience under JTAI was not limited to what the guidance stated what it should be. |
| CP Subgroup feedback |
| Kevin reflected during the last meeting the group reviewed the Terms of Reference and agreed there would be rota to invite CP, IRO and LADO to share updates or present findings and learnings from regional meetings.  Sharon introduced herself as the co-chair for the CP Conference Managers group and explained she does this alongside Sarah Robson.  Kogie reflected on the pathfinder programme and the pilots for conference and review teams and asked the group if any local authorities have explored making changes or if they are waiting for the results from the pilots.  Sharon explained there has been a focus on this topic within the CP forum and at the last meeting representatives from Lincolnshire (Andy Cook) and Redbridge (Sharon Springer) attended. Sharon explained there were many DfE discussions online whichtook a broader focus, however, during the CP forums they focused specifically on the IRO and CP chair’s roles regarding implications for service designs.  Sharon shared Andy recognised they were approached by the DfE to become a pathfinder because they were very well aligned with the values and key principles of “Stable Homes Built on Love”, they are an Ofsted rated “Outstanding” local authority and they do not have high numbers of children on CP plans or Child Looked After Plans. Andy shared they were well placed to take on the pathfinder status and their key priority was to preserve, build and maintain their level of excellence.  Sharon explained Andy spoke to the role of the CP Conference Chair and within Lincolnshire they were keen to keep the assurance and oversight aligned with this role and therefore negotiated early with the DfE to not hand over this over to Social Workers. This meant the existing CP Conference Chairs simply moved across with the same grade and job description but within an enhanced role. Sharon explained Lincolnshire had a small group of agency staff which moved across to become permanent within the service. Sharon noted the enhanced aspect of the CP Conference Chair role was in relation to strategy meetings and Andy explained they were not completing all strategy meetings but rather doing some on a flexible basis. Andy gave an example of strategy meetings relating to risk outside of the home with CP conference chairs applying their skills, knowledge and experience.  Sharon noted Lincolnshire had a real emphasis on advocacy in which Andy shared there was value in introducing advocacy early on within the process.  Sharon highlighted the CP Conference chairs are aligned to the Quality Standards Service and sit separately from the Social Work. This was considered as important to ensure governance and assurance to the wider service. Andy shared the feedback from partner agencies, Social Workers and CP conference chairs (who are now the Lead Child Protection Practitioners) was overwhelmingly positive and would not want to revert back to the previous way of working.  Sharon noted the changes are subject to further evaluations and next steps from this.  Sharon reflected on Redbridge and Sharon Springer explained their CP Conference chairs preserved their senior role and were not separated off into the Quality Assurance Service and therefore are more aligned with the wider social work system.  Sharon noted Redbridgetook on strategy meetings more fully than compared to Lincolnshire. Additionally, Redbridge aligned their practice and service hours (07:00 – 22:00) and this is operated on a rota, with one week on and one week off. Sharon explained Redbridge’s Lead Child Protection Practitioners (former conference chairs) are getting enhanced payments for this. Sharon noted one of the benefits of this change is being able to progress matters much earlier with regards to decision making and actions being set.  Sharon highlighted many of Redbridge’s practitioners decided they were less keen on the new role and transitioned over to different roles. Sharon reflected reasons for this might have been because of the working hours or due to the operational way of working. Sharon summarised the system is working well for Redbridge.  Kevin referred to Lincolnshire and queried if the CP Conference Chairs did not have a change in job description but changed the work but undertaking most strategy meetings, Kevin further questions if the CP Conference Chairs undertook Section 47 (S47) visits. Sharon clarified they did not do this, both from Lincolnshire and Redbridge because they did not want the practitioners to straddle case management. Sharon explained discussions took place regarding how to avoid the “group think “to ensure there is an independent view.  Kevin clarified the additionality was in relation to the CP Conference Chair chairing a strategy meeting and then chairing an outcome strategy meeting rather than case allocation to the practitioners. Sharon explained the CP Conference Chairs oversee the process effectively holding the risk and decision making and then decide whether it then progresses to a child protection plan. The CP Conference Chair is involved with the planning regarding this but not the visiting or inquiries.  Kevin clarified the additional responsibilities related to chairing strategy meetings and outcome strategy meetings and this was the same for Redbridge however they changed their hours although it was found the workers weren’t keen on this. Sharon confirmed this.  Sharon shared the key responsibilities for Redbridge were:   * Lead strategy discussions * Chair and co-ordinate multi-disciplinary strategy discussions * Ensure timely informed decision making * Lead and document S47 investigation process, including analysis of multi-agency information * Chairing child protection conferences * Case oversight * Maintain oversight of CP Plans until they end, after which the case remains with a Family Help team * Multi-agency collaboration * Holding Daily Risk review meetings   Sharon shared the roles and functions for Redbridge:   * Independent from Family Help teams * Operate extended hours * Leads the multi-agency collaboration * Writes up investigations * Chair conferences   Linde commented it was interesting to hear from different sized local authorities and noted Redbridge is a small local authority and therefore their implementation was within a small cohort.  Linde shared there was a session with Warwickshire who downgraded the role, and all the CP Conference chairs chose to move and the IROs remain. Warwickshire completed analysis in relation to demands. Linde explained Warwickshire have 2 teams in the North and 1 in the South with them undertaking strategy meetings and having oversight of the work, however, a challenge was found if they have oversight of the work and feel the team need to progress they have no ability to escalate unless they use a formal escalation process. If the Family Help team chooses not to respond or progress, there is no further action the CP Conference chairs can take.  Linde reflect Warwickshire shared advocacy for parents made a significant difference in how they work with advocates being available from either the S47 or the Initial Child Protection Conference which worked well in supporting families through the process.  Sharon noted it was queried if additional staff were recruited to meet demands and confirmed in both Lincolnshire and Redbridge, with Lincolnshire making agency staff permanent.  Kevin highlighted a question within the chat which asked if they chaired PLOs. Sharon confirmed no.  Kogie shared reflected on a discussion with Redbridge, regarding the same person completing the strategy meeting, S47 and chairing the conference, and explained Redbridge were still waiting to see what impact this has. Kogie highlighted when different people complete these tasks there is a level of objectivity.  Kogie noted the chairs who did not want to be completing the strategy meetings and S47 work were deployed to undertake more quality assurance work. Kogie queried if the chairs are completing what the team managers would usually complete prior to the pilot, what impact is it having on their workload and quality of their work in other aspects of their portfolio. Kogie noted they had not yet fully assessed this.  Sharon agreed with Kogie, and shared Andy Cook wanted to avoid group thinking and perception bias which was part of the decision making around maintaining the level of independence, whereas in Redbridge the CP Conference Chairs were aligned with the core social work teams.  Kevin shared it was learnt a few years ago within Kent some of the managers weren’t completing the outcome strategy meetings therefore this performance was monitored. It was made mandatory all Service Managers have to review outcome strategy decisions before they can be signed off in S47. In doing this, it reduced the amount of CP conferences. Kevin highlighted it was helpful for Service Managers to have oversight of the inquiries and the 10-day strategy meeting. Kevin suggested if this is undertaken then local authorities might not need to have the independent challenge from CP chairs.  Sarah shared the Lead Practitioner roles were introduced within Hampshire and suggested discussing her AOB item now as it relates to this agenda item.  Sarah shared the aspiration was to have a Lead Practitioners within every Family Help Team, however this has been a slow recruitment process with only 8 currently in post. Sarah shared they do not chair conferences as in November last year Hampshire received additional funding for CP chairs and there are now 8 dedicated CP chair roles, one for each district. Sarah noted the lead practitioner roles are currently in 2 districts, however this will change when they are able to recruit more.  Sarah noted the Lead Practitioners have been providing oversight of the CP cases, reviewing plans and to look at cases that are almost CP to have reflective discussions to explore what more can be done to support the families.  Sarah shared discussions have taken place with District Managers who have Lead Practitioners in place, and they did not mention S47s and strategy discussions. Sarah highlighted they have not experienced the issues of combining the role with the CP chairs and therefore do not need to question independence, although Hampshire are ensuring the CP Chairs and Lead Practitioners are linked and therefore are meeting regularly.  Kevin question if when Sarah is referencing Lead Practitioners are these non-social work qualified staff. Sarah answered no, it’s the CP Chairs.  Kevin highlighted local authorities have different definitions of “Lead Practitioner”. Kevin noted within the Family Help Model a Lead Practitioner is defined as being alternatively qualified completing C&F assessments and within the Muli-Agency Child Protection Lead Practitioners who are largely Social Work qualified.  Linde questioned if Hampshire’s Lead Child Protection Practitioner is a different grading to the Child Protection Chairs. Sarah confirmed the Child Protection Conference Chairs are the same as IROs, they were always blended before however now have a dedicated one. Sarah clarified they are management grades and have a different market supplement to the operational managers and the Lead Practitioners are the same grade as the ATMs. This was another reason for keeping these separate as there would have been a grading issue.  Sharon reflected on Kevins point on Service Managers screening the strategy decisions and highlighted this speaks to contextual decision making that both Sharon Springer and Andy Cook emphasised. Sharon shared within Lincolnshire they have no concerns around their CP thresholds as they do not have exceptionally high numbers of children on plans, hence why they applied the level of flexibility. Andy Cook particularly spoke to risk outside of the home and within Lincolnshire they have a fairly robust adolescent service which appropriately hold risk outside of the conferencing process, therefore these children typically enter the S47 or strategy environments but do not move on to the CP conference.  Leemya reflected on the processes shared with the roles being kept contained and independent. Leemya queried how to bring together the influence of quality assurance into operational work if the roles are being kept separate. Leemya understood different local authorities have different views but raised the issue of potential duplication and queried how to be efficient and effective in taking the influence of the qualified social worker with experience in managing CP processes and being independent. Sharon responded both Andy Cook and Sharon Springer spoke to the groups being co-located there are weekly or daily meetings as a multi-agency group, so the influence, learning, training, development, oversight and assurance is happening more frequently and therefore is much better embedded. Sharon noted at the same time; they are not embroiled in the day-to-day work such as completing visits.  Leemya noted Sharon’s answer was helpful and reflected it more about taking a place-based approach to influence rather than task orientated.  Kevin thanked Sharon and Sarah Robson for this item as it was received well by the group and provided a stimulating conversation.  Kevin highlighted the government has not identified a single model as local authorities have different populations with different needs and resources and therefore what is implemented should be which meets the needs of the local authority. Kevin raised the Children’s Act was introduced in 1989, and within the last few years there has been a reduction in “Requires Improvement” and “Inadequate” local authorities. ILACs are showing the number of “Good” or “Outstanding” local authorities is around 80% today as compared to 60% 3 years ago. Kevin noted it has taken 40 years since the act was introduced to achieve this but sped up in recent years due to DfE funding to support regionalising approaches and to provide support to struggling LAs. Therefore, recognised the changes made in relation to families first will not be a quick process but will be streamlined to be quicker due to continued DfE support.  Kevin explained Kent CP chairs have been informed over the past couple of years changes will be made and encouraged local authorities to get CP Chairs on board with this. Kevin reflected on Redbridge making change and losing CP Chairs. Kevin highlighted the point of Families First bringing in CP Practitioners is because practitioners completing visits are inexperienced in identifying risks. The Families First initiative was to ensure the Family Help Workers are supported by experienced practitioners.  Kevin encouraged the group to not make drastic changes which may impact on business as usual, but instead to change in a way that does not impact on children and adults. |
| Quality Assurance & Performance |
| Kevin invited the group to share any updates on quality assurance activity completed within the local authorities such as a thematic audit, multi-agency audit or peer review. Kevin shared Kent is finalising a mock JTAI regarding domestic abuse and can potentially present this in September.  **Action 5a – Leemya to present at September’s meeting findings from the Mock JTAI for Domestic Abuse.**  Linde shared they are reviewing the QA process for the audit programme. Currently undertake monthly audits across all Team Managers, Service Managers, CP Chairs, CP Chair Managers. This alternates between case file audits one month and the second month CP Chairs conduct a peer review on CP plans or Child Looked After plan and practitioners will complete a practice observation. This is going to be changed from September by taking away the practice observations and instead do more dip sampling. Linde explained there is a separate audit team who completes moderations.  Linde shared they undertake termly multi-agency audit with the most recent one regarding elective home education and the next one to be completed around exploitation.  Kevin shared Kent have completed an audit regarding transitions. Adult services were approached to ask how many referrals they had in the last year, in which they responded within the 18-25 section, they had 340. The 340 referrals were reviewed and 70% of them had an EHCP. Another finding was 60% had previously had a Social Worker and when this was explored further the majority had a Social Worker between the age of Pre-Birth to 5 years old. This meant children had early years intervention as Child in Need or Child Protection, continued their childhood without any involvement and then as adults had a Care Act need which suggests underlying unresolved trauma. Kevin noted if the child did not have involvement between the ages of pre-birth to 5 years old, then 17-year-olds were becoming known to service because of homelessness.  Kevin highlighted the key strategy for transitioning independence is the Early Years framework which encourages parents to engage from the beginning instead of as a result of a child in need plan. Kevin highlighted exploring transition in its truest form with it starting in permanency planning. Kevin suggested taking an extra step within permanency planning is to resolve trauma to ensure children and families are not re-referred back in. Kent are starting to think about how people prepare for adulthood and what the responsibilities are for parents and the local authorities to achieve this.  Kevin noted the audits completed regarding children missing from education or electively educated at home highlighted where there has been experience of EHCP or SEN needs, sometimes CIN and CP, schools have suggested to families to homeschool children. A current piece of work is being completed with Education to explain the longer-term impact of this.  Kevin noted Michelle shared in the chat East Sussex will be doing a multi-agency audit in July to look at the impact on the child of delay in police investigations and no further police action in CSA cases.  This was a theme that came out of a multi-agency audit last April when looking at their response to CSA.  **Action 5b – Michelle to have an agenda item at December’s meeting to share the multi-agency audit regarding the impact on a child of delay in police investigations and no further police action in CSA cases.**  Teresa highlighted the National Safeguarding Panel report on Child Sexual Abuse and this included several useful recommendations. Medway are exploring and applying these recommendations. It was found some child sexual abuse investigations had no further action with children’s social care because of no further action by police and it was recommended to record on the file the NFA is due to police and not children’s social care, because the thresholds are different.  Kevin shared following the child sexual abuse pathway work completed by Kent an audit was undertaken with a learning review completed as the child was sexually abused and identified intrafamilial risk with Police not taking further action and therefore the social work team not actioning further, |
| Ownership of Audit Actions |
| Kevin explained this agenda item was raised at the last meeting as it was identified in some local authorities when an audit was completed and actions are identified, they are finding quality assurance were allocated the accountability instead of the service.  Kevin shared this does not happen within Kent as if the auditor or Team Manager identifies action then it is usually regarding the allocated team and it is expected for involved CP chairs and IRO to ensure they are completed. Auditing in QA is completed at a later date to see if the actions were completed, therefore there is no culture of expecting quality assurance to complete actions.  Tina shared this was the situation 2 years ago for Brighton & Hove’s QA team. The QA team pull out and highlight the actions to the Heads of Service’s who now have a responsibility to review the audit findings and actions through supervision with the managers.  Kevin shared part of Kent’s moderation process is to check the actions were completed.  Kogie shared within Bracknell Forest the case level actions for cases graded “Requires Improvement” or Inadequate” the QA officer will put a case note on the file that the auditors have identified actions. The manager is then responsible for progressing these actions and will create a responding case note confirming completion.  Kogie informed there are 2 learning events a year to address themes from audit activity, this includes learning from audit activities, learning from national safeguarding practice reviews, learning from complaints and compliments. Doing this covers the actions at both strategic and operational levels.  Teresa shared all their audits are on their Mosaic system. Firstly, the audits are completed which is followed by moderation. Any actions or recommendations are a then a separate work step and go through to the Service Managers who will have reflective discussions with Team Managers. For any case files graded “inadequate”, the Service Manager will re—audit after 3 months and subsequently will be then re-moderated. Teresa shared the actions and work steps can allow for reports to be run to see if they are completed or not.  Kevin shared Kent have moved to putting the audit tool on Liberi (liquid logic)which helped with consistency and to track data and completion of audits.  Teresa shared a PowerPoint to explain how the findings are presented. The findings can be broken down into domains such as assessment, plans, quality of intervention, management oversight & supervision and direct work.  Kevin highlighted what Teresa shared was impressive and showcases the impact of having an audit tool embedded into a local authorities’ systems as it can help streamline tracking. |
| Shared Library of Training & Resources |
| Kevin explained this agenda item was raised at the last meeting.  Tina reflected on Teresa’s previous presentation and shared within the South East group they have not previously shared how local authorities present findings from audits and quality assurance activities to performance boards or directorate boards. Tina highlighted it would be interesting to hear how other local authorities complete this.  Tina shared Brighton & Hove prepare quarterly heads of service reports and complete quality checks of the audits which are then RAG rated so pod managers can review this. Tina noted Senior Managers do not audit the work and instead Social Workers complete this as part of the peer review model, the managers and Head of Service then moderate the audits. Tina explained the quality of audit checks means they can run sessions with individuals or particular teams, which in turn helps improve the training programme for Newly Qualified Social Workers.  Kevin asked if the Service Manager who has oversight of the audits are completing the RAG rating or if it is a QA officer. Tina confirmed QA completes this every quarter once the 60 audits have been completed. Some comments are embedded within the Heads of Service report to highlight how it needs to improve.  Teresa shared they also have performance scorecards which are sent out to Service Managers and Heads of Service quarterly. They are able to review Team Managers and specific Practitioners, which means coaching and support can be targeted through the Practice Development Leads through an individual or team approach.  Kevin asked the group if they are in agreement to send Sian any guidance or resources they have on how to support auditing quality so she can create a shared library. The group agreed.  **Action 7a – All to send Sian any guidance or resources they have on how to improve auditing quality and training staff in auditing, so she can create a shared library.** |
| AOB |
| **Update on Lead Practitioner role model** – discussed within agenda item 4 ([paragraphs 25 - 31](#AOB))  Kevin asked the group if they are happy with how the group is working and the discussions taking place. The group agreed.  Kevin encouraged the group to share any agenda items with Sian. |

TTENDEES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUGGESTED AGENDA – 11.09.2025**  **Items in bold are standing items** | | | | |
| **Item No.** | **Time** | **Item Description** | **Lead** | **Papers** |
| **1.** | 10:00 – 10:10 | **Introduction and Apologies** | Chair |  |
| **2.** | 10:10 – 10:20 | **Review Action Log** | Chair |  |
| **3.** | 10:20 – 10:40 | **National Ofsted Issues** | All |  |
| **4.** | 10:40 – 11:00 | CP/**IRO**/LADO **subgroup feedback (rotated)** |  |  |
| **5.** | 11:00 – 11:20 | **Quality assurance and performance**   * **Area of challenge – all LAs investigate and report back on the area identified. Questions to consider could include:**   + **Process**   + **Performance**   + **What do you understand from this?**   + **How do you quality assure** * **Good practice as identified by QA Framework. Questions to be considered could include:**   + **What is it?**   + **How do they know?**   + **What makes this an area of good practice for this LA, what did they add to make it good practice.** | All |  |
| **6.** | 11:20 – 11:35 | Mock JTAI – Domestic Abuse | Martina Oldfrey |  |
| **7.** | 11:35 – 11:50 | Update on QA Project Research | Devika Menon |  |
| **8.** | 11:50 – 12:00 | AOB |  |  |