



Education Subgroup

MINUTES

21st October 2019 – 9.30a.m.-12.00p.m.

Pound Lane Learning Centre, Leamington Spa

Present: Adrian Over, Education Safeguarding Manager (AO)
Ann Seal, Taking Care Scheme Manager (AS)
Carol Hooper, Kineton Playgroup (CH)
Helen Jones, North Leamington School (HJ)
Ian Budd, Assistant Direction, Education Services (IB) (**Chair**)
Jane Le Poidevin, Paddox Primary School (JLP)
Jo Farmbrough, EPS (JF)
Jo Howell, The Polesworth School (JH)
Julia Kenny, Governor Services (JK)
Karen Berwick, Stratford-Upon-Avon School (KB)
Linda Fenn, Education Safeguarding (LF) (**Minutes**)
Matthew Pike, Macintyre Academies (MP)
Sally Kaminski-Gaze, All Saints CE Primary School (SKG)
Sonia Waszczak, Early Years (SW)
Yvette Grogan, ABP Eastern Area (YG)

Apologies: Amrita Sharma (ASh) Beth Sharpe Hayley Good
Jane Key Katherine Skudra Paul Fellows
Sarah McKluskey Sharon Kindred Vanessa Gilbert

Visitors: Geoff Thomas, WCC Prevent (GT)
Emma Gelfs, WCC ICT Development Service (EG)

1. **Introductions and apologies:**

Attendees introduced themselves and apologies were noted as above.

2. **Minutes of last meeting (30.4.19) / matters arising:**

Page 1: Amendment – CH advised this should refer to 'WeLearn accounts' and not Egress testing as stated in the minutes. This has now been resolved.

Page 2: Heads Up/Independent Sector: IB advised subscription to Heads Up is widely available to everyone. AO to therefore liaise with Ruth Waterman to arrange access awareness raising communication with the independent sector.

Page 4: AO confirmed he had spoken to Jamie Barber re the scorecard.

ACTIONS:

AO: Heads Up access – liaise with Ruth Waterman to arrange communication with independent sector.



3. Off rolling and schools' responsibility to undertake safeguarding checks in relation to alternative providers and other schools

AO explained that this is a follow up from the last meeting, at which the illegality of children remaining on part time timetables beyond 16 weeks was highlighted. That had led to a discussion about children being placed with alternative providers or managed moves being negotiated, which in turn had led AO to raise the issue of schools securing written confirmation from alternative providers and other schools that those settings/schools have undertaken all requisite pre-employment checks in relation to their staff when placing children in those settings/schools.

AO highlighted that DfE suggest in KCSiE that written confirmation should be secured and schools should not just assume that these checks have been done in the other settings; schools receiving children should also send a letter to advise that their staff have been checked. Schools should hold written evidence they have sought reassurance. The subgroup agreed that extra guidance and clarification is required on this matter.

JP: In relation to off rolling, JP advised that following on from the last meeting, the suggested discussion with HG is still to take place and that this conversation is still required. IB advised that in generality, there cannot be excuses for delays and that these would need to be justified.

HJ: Having gone through an inspection under the auspices of the new Ofsted framework, exceptional circumstances were identified as existing where a personalised timetable demonstrates that there is a regularly assessed and planned review process. The Inspector was satisfied that in the exceptional circumstances that this was a supportive process to prevent exclusion and to support that child on an individual basis. In terms of a reintegration strategy, HJ reported that a building up timetable does not have to mean building up in physical time, it could be building up in terms of challenge.

SKG: Nothing has changed in schools, in fact it is getting worse with schools being expected to work with more and more challenging children. This is not helped by cuts to the SEN service, not having any TA's to call upon and external agencies that could previously help not being there any longer. Schools understand that 16 weeks is the cut-off point but they are also not receiving any additional funding to help.

IB: The High Needs task and finish group was very clear where the demarcation is between the LA and schools in looking after children and young people with significant needs. SEN provision has not been cut, it has been significantly increased but within the high needs wall. schools are expected to make provision for additional TA's in classrooms through school funding. The system is designed so that schools are more autonomous. It is not an LA's responsibility to provide TAs.



JP: With reference to access to specialist TA's through the Specialist Teaching Service, schools are now unable to do this as that service has been cut, even if schools were in a financial position and chose to do so.

IB: It should be noted that this is not one of the recommendations that came out of the headteachers' representatives and High Needs task and finish group. One of the key messages from head teachers in that group is that some schools are further on with that journey than others. It was acknowledged the latter group need more skills within their workforce.

ACTIONS:

AO to remind HG that JP would like a conversation with her about off rolling.

4. Update - secure electronic communication between schools and other agencies: Emma Gelfs

EG reported that in terms of Warwickshire maintained and academy schools, there are now only four schools that are not using WeLearn or for whom it has not been possible to establish whether the systems they are using are secure. AO advised that these schools can now be approached directly. EG reported that quite a few of the independent schools are still outstanding. A number of early years settings have also requested WeLearn accounts and those applications are continuing to come in.

The default arrangement now is that the LA will send confidential information either to the 'Head@' or named address for the headteacher in the school's secure Email account. However, if an alternative named address in the school's secure Email account (e.g. for a DSL, SENDCo or designated teacher for children who are looked after) has been nominated in relation to a particular child, confidential information about that child can be sent to the named professional at the nominated address.

EG reported that some secondary schools have nominated different contact details for people with different roles, e.g. DSL/SENDCo/designated teacher for CLA. In the absence of any such nominated named Email address, all confidential information will be sent to the headteacher's nominated school Email address.

AO highlighted the need for schools to have a mechanism whereby the headteacher has access to the Emailboxes of other nominated staff in the event that individuals are on leave or off sick so that the school still picks up important confidential information and responds in a timely manner. It is for each headteacher to work out the specific arrangements that work best for them while maintaining confidentiality.



EG highlighted that there is still some work to be done to make these arrangements as secure as possible, e.g. it is necessary to remind all WCC staff of the new arrangements if they hold individual contact lists, i.e. it is likely that the message will need to be reiterated several times.

The subgroup wished to acknowledge and thank EG for the excellent work done to date in this regard.

ACTIONS:

AO/EG: To contact the 4 remaining schools with a view to resolution.

5. Prevent Education Focus Group (GT)

GT introduced himself. GT has been in post since January; he is keen to explore the relationship of Prevent colleagues with the education sector; and he has worked with AO on delivering the DSL Prevent WRAP 3 train the trainer course and sending out key information to DSLs and headteachers via Heads Up and Education Safeguarding Service bulletins.

GT introduced the need to identify a suitable forum for debate and discussion about Prevent issues in the education sector. GT advised that he has established a termly FE Prevent Group which includes all the FE colleges in the county. This is working well with lots of positive feedback. GT would like to discuss how similar discussion could take place with schools and other non-FE education settings, whether there is an interest in facilitating those discussions and what the focus might be.

GT delineated the issues to be considered:

- *Training needs review* - various options are available (online etc) but is this what education professionals want? Is there a forum where training requirements could be discussed to ascertain exactly what practitioners would like to progress the Prevent agenda?
- *New products and support* – GT gets access to suggestions of new resources, e.g. “Game On” by Reveal Theatre (endorsed by the Home Office) but there is no forum to bring these for consideration by education professionals. GT has an offer to be trained in “Behind Closed Doors” which is Prevent based online learning for students but where/how could GT share this learning with others?
- *Developing best practice models* - sharing and developing best practice amongst education professionals, e.g. risk assessment/action plans for Prevent. GT is sharing and developing this work within the FE group which will result in a composite risk assessment/action plan matrix being developed.



- ‘Sign off’ of developments, e.g. Warwickshire Prevent toolkit - GT has developed an updated Prevent toolkit for Warwickshire. He has shared this with AO but where/how could GT get education professionals to look at and have conversations about developments such as this and get them signed off? GT needs a vehicle to do this.
- *Frequency* – there would be no need to meet very regularly. GT suggests two or three times per year but is there a better option, e.g. a standalone forum such as this subgroup? GT would be happy to support any suggestions that are thought to be appropriate.

AS: Why is it just an FE group not including 6th forms? GT confirmed he has no problem with it including secondary/6th forms.

GT advised he would like suggestions about how education practitioners can preview the new toolkit before it is rolled out. SKG advised she would be more than happy to do this. Other suggestions included GT attending local schools’ consortia meetings, the headteacher conference or Area Behaviour Partnership meetings. It was identified, however, that all of that would require GT to attend a lot of meetings. MP advised this needs to be shared with the people who are planning and designing the curriculum so it is incorporated into PHSE, protective behaviours etc, i.e. there is no point thinking about Prevent as an add-on, it is part of the wider safeguarding agenda. There is an issue about changing attitudes and minds.

AO suggested that, in order to have focused discussions and to facilitate the requisite ‘sign off’; and also to avoid GT having to attend a lot of meetings, there would be merit in offering GT a regular slot on the agenda at the next two or three meetings of the Education subgroup. The arrangement could then be reviewed and if it is felt to be working, could then continue. This would allow for attending professionals to cascade information about the Prevent agenda to other colleagues and groups. In the event of the need for more detailed discussions about any specific issues, more time could be allocated on the agenda as necessary and other people could be invited to attend specific meetings as required.



Prevent Schools
Forum proposal.pptx

geoffthomas@warwickshire.gov.uk

ACTIONS:

GT to have a regular slot on the agenda. This arrangement to be reviewed in terms of effectiveness and continuation next year.

LF to provide GT with future meeting dates.



6. Scorecard – AO/IB

An updated scorecard was presented to the subgroup and discussed.

- The number of CLA without EHCP has decreased from 330 to 325.
- CME (whereabouts known) – reduced from 59 to 52.
- CME (whereabouts unknown) – gone up from 28 to 36.
- The number of children who are home educated has increased from 550 to 560 – *“Nearly 10% of all children who are EHE have become so since the start of the new academic year. The team continues to monitor these children closely to ensure that no child is potentially ‘off rolled’ from their designated school”.*

Some parents are deciding to home educate until a space comes up at a school of their choice; there is increased awareness generally (via social media) of the option for parents to home educate. There are more school refusers, parents having fall outs with school. There is a danger of EHE being seen as an easy option to get out of those situations.

- Fair Access Process *“This year’s FAP unplaced represents 0.9% of all children which is a slight increase when compared to July 2019”.* Good news for FAP placed with increase from 9 to 17.
- Permanent Exclusions converted to Managed Moves increased from 27 to 40. Permanent Exclusions upheld increased 1 to 8: If a MM is unsuccessful, the child goes back to their original school where the problems still exist. MMs can be an appropriate way forward to overcome problems; sexual misconduct issues make a MM extremely difficult as schools are reluctant to want to take that child into their school. For a teenager having to reintegrate into a new school with new peer groups, this can be a very lonely and difficult place to be. Parents play a large part in agreeing to MMs. They can be effective when they are in a child’s best interests but sometimes they are more about the parents’ wishes/issues than the child’s.

AO suggested that it would be useful for Jamie Barber to be invited to attend these meetings from time to time in order to provide some commentary/more detailed breakdown of the figures provided than AO is able to provide.

It would also be helpful to have some reasoning and analysis about why/what caused parents to opt to home educate; it was noted that currently parents may be withdrawing children due to certain aspects of the curriculum. AO to contact Kate Nelson and possibly invite her to attend a meeting.

ACTIONS:

AO: To contact Jamie Barber and invite to attend a future meeting.

AO: To contact Kate Nelson for EHE analysis/breakdown of reasoning and invite to attend a meeting to discuss.



7. Operation Encompass update: AO

Briefings were held in the summer. AO expressed thanks to the vast majority of schools that have now signed up and acknowledged the excellent response and recognition of this positive development. Some subgroup members confirmed that notifications are being received and these are very helpful. DS Reece Bower has advised that so far, a total of 644 alerts have been sent to schools since the start of term, highlighting the level of activity.

24 schools/settings have not yet signed up and half of those would have received some alerts had they been signed up.

A question was raised about whether, when children are already the subject of a Child Protection Plan, the allocated social worker is informed. AO agreed to check whether this is the case.

ACTIONS:

AO: To check whether allocated social workers are informed when OE alerts are sent to schools

8. Relationships Education Briefing: (IB)

IB provided the subgroup with the background to this discussion item regarding recent sensationalised reporting and comments by the written media and in social media about Warwickshire's approach to relationships and sex education; and the outcome for schools resulting from that inaccurate communication.

This was started by one set of parents of children at one school but it very quickly spread out of context within the community and in the social media/press arena. It included lots of social media threats as well as threats being made to school staff and officers of the council dealing with this matter. Some of the comments made were totally inappropriate. A collective approach has been taken and it has been agreed that the 'All About Me' programme is very important. The only change will be a slight change to wording that was misinterpreted in media and social media responses.

JP advised that she has already rewritten some of the content from the earlier Spring Fever programme in order to make it more age appropriate for children under the age of 5/6. JP agreed to share this with IB. Good preparation work had been done before the parents' meeting and parents had been reassured that the children were not going to be taught anything that was not age appropriate/suitable. Parents were also given the choice to withdraw their children from particular lessons if they wished.

IB advised that a review is being undertaken of some of the content on the 'Respect Yourself' website. However, it is important to recognise that a lot of the material on the RW website was requested by young people.



AO: media coverage of protests in Birmingham about future RSE curriculum indicated that those protests were driven by a particular faith perspective. The situation in Warwickshire is also driven by a faith perspective but not the same faith perspective as in Birmingham. AO highlighted that colleagues in Public Health who lead on RSE in Warwickshire and AS from a Protective Behaviours perspective have promoted the need for need better relationships education that is mandatory for some years. Children need good quality information about relationships, respect, consent, body ownership etc in order to be safe and they need to be able to identify when they do not feel safe and tell a trusted adult about it. The primary objective is to keep children safe and give them the tools to recognise when they are at risk. The moral perspective of a minority of parents can be a barrier to this objective.

AS stated that she fully supports the All About Me programme and helped with the editing of it to make sure it is consistent with Protective Behaviours principles. AAM provides children with reasonable and normal information that they are entitled to. There is a need to trust the skills of teachers to deliver it safely.

IB observed that the issue has had the impact of bringing the education community together in support of the school and in support of what children and young people should have as an entitlement. More schools have since signed up to the All About Me programme. The parents who raised the issue are clear that they do not endorse some of the online behaviours that were triggered by press reporting of their concerns. The headteacher feels that the response has only served to reaffirm how important delivery of the AAM programme is for children.

AO stated that it is important to emphasise that from a safeguarding view, schools and the LA are not distracted or deflected by this; we still believe in the 'All About Me' curriculum for our primary school age children and it is important that schools are in a good place to meet the mandatory requirement for relationships (primary) and relationships and sex (secondary) education from 2020. As a public body, where there is a volume of reaction from the community, it is important to review wording to consider how it might have been or could be interpreted or misinterpreted; but that does not change our fundamental commitment to delivering good quality relationships education to children as an important contribution to keeping them safe.

ACTIONS:

JP: To share revised 'All About Me' content with IB.



9. **Schools Safeguarding Audit 2017/18 – draft outcomes report:** AO

AO provided an update on the draft outcomes of the 2017/18 audit as below. AO confirmed that the closing date for the 2018/19 audit is the 25th October 2019. 169 responses had been received as of today's date. AO hopes that the schools yet to submit will submit their returns this week or, at the latest, during half term (albeit that would be after the closing date).

AO advised that the 2017/18 outcomes report remains in draft pending any comments or suggestions from the subgroup. AO summarised key outcomes and themes in the report as follows:

- 273 submissions, more than the previous year.
- Steady rise in the number of DSLs. There are a small number of schools however that still only have one DSL, this can cause problems when that person is off sick. Anyone trained as a DSL needs to have full access to the information that they would need in order to act as DSL in the event of the lead not being available. All DSLs need to be actively involved at all times to keep their skills and knowledge updated, i.e. they need to be involved in supporting the school/setting's safeguarding practice. KCSiE now states that all Deputy DSLs should have that role in their job descriptions.
- In terms of how DSLs are supported/supervised, 85 respondents said there had been no developments.
- Reflective supervision training: AO advised that ESS have commissioned reflective supervision skills training. This training has run 3 times now and another session is coming up on the 7th November. If anybody is interested, there are still some places available. There will be more sessions later in the year. AO is keen that as many lead DSLs with at least one year's experience access this training to stimulate their thinking. Reflective supervision is the process of facilitating reflection on safeguarding practice in order to keep it safe for children, parents and staff and to make sure that significant safeguarding issues are not missed/lost or over/under emphasised.
- Academy trust safeguarding policies. KCSiE is clear that every school must have its own policy that accurately references local safeguarding arrangements including child protection referral and early help processes. If academies are required to adopt a trust policy, it is important to ensure that the policy is adapted to include and reflect those local arrangements. AO is aware of situations where schools have been obliged to adopt trust policies and Ofsted have then been critical that requisite specific safeguarding issues have been missing from the policy. AO suggests that schools always check any such trust policies with reference to the WCC model policy, which includes all issues that statutory guidance requires.
- Mechanism to ensure that all staff **understand** Part 1 of KCSiE. Ofsted will seek evidence of this mechanism. For those staff with limited English, KCSiE is available/translated into 15 different languages. DSLs should be aware of and support any staff who need such assistance.



- There has been an improvement in safeguarding induction processes. It is important to ensure that volunteers and temporary staff receive an appropriate safeguarding induction.
- DBS Certificates still seem to create some confusion. AO highlighted that any visitor without a DBS Certificate can still be allowed on to a school site to conduct legitimate business. It is the school's responsibility to assess the need for and provide appropriate supervision rather than deny legitimate visitors access to the school site because they cannot produce their DBS certificate. Schools do not have the right to ask to see DBS certificates of individuals that they do not employ. Where a 3rd party provider or contractor is required to have a DBS certificate, it is the school's responsibility to obtain **written confirmation** that the employing organisation has undertaken appropriate checks; and then to check that the person is who they say they are upon arrival (i.e. by checking ID passes).
- Safer recruitment training. There are still some schools with insufficient school leaders and/or governors that have undertaken SR training so if the trained individual left post there would be a problem in terms of recruiting a replacement. There are no stipulations in statutory guidance or from the Safer Recruitment Consortium about how often this training should be renewed. AO recommends that trained individuals should undertake refresher training every 3-4 years but if anyone has not trained since 2014 then they really need to access the training again because they will be well out of date.
- Topics covered in staff safeguarding training – the audit suggests that more work needs to be done to ensure that peer on peer abuse is covered effectively in staff training. It was reassuring that fewer schools seem to be relying on one annual safeguarding training event and are adopting more of a 'little and often' or 'drip drip' approach to ensure that the range of issues are covered across the year and that training is effective.
- 'Opening door' questions – AS and AO have been emphasising the importance of these in DSL and whole staff group training. AO reiterated the importance of anyone who comes into contact with children picking up on concerns but also knowing how to respond appropriately and helpfully to children's comments and questions.
- Restrictive physical intervention - 131 schools/settings reported that there were no incidents requiring staff to physically intervene at all during the academic year. 108 more reported 10 incidents or less. AO commented that he is less concerned about the respondents that reported high numbers than the ones reporting zero incidents in terms of how well equipped staff in those schools/settings are to deal with an incident safely should the need ever arise for them to physically intervene.
- Overall, the total number of incidents of physical intervention that were reported was 3,181 incidents across 142 schools /settings.



- Children who are looked after - 90% of respondents reported that they have an appropriately trained Designated Teacher for children who are looked after. It is now a requirement that every school should have a qualified teacher in that role, whether the school/setting currently has any children who are looked after on roll or not. The role must also address the educational needs of children who were previously looked after.
- Consent, peer on peer abuse, Protective Behaviours, CSE. A lot of primary and infant schools commented that they need better resources for talking to very young children about issues of consent. AS highlighted that if schools are embedding Protective Behaviours effectively both in the curriculum and the everyday language and culture of the school, they are well on the way to addressing this issue.
- Sexual Harassment - some responses referred to the school's staff behaviour policy and sexual harassment between staff in their responses to these questions. The behaviour of staff does need to model appropriate behaviours and staff need to feel safe doing their jobs in order to safeguard children.
- The local safeguarding partners working with exploitation and the Education Safeguarding service continue to recommend "Real Love Rocks" as a resource for engaging children about CSE. There are primary and secondary versions. Barnardo's continue to provide support in relation to CSE.
- Residential and offsite visits. 187 schools/settings reported that they were very confident about their arrangements. 74 stated they were confident but have more work to do. Evolve provide resources for planning offsite visits which highlight the importance of safeguarding and whistleblowing during those activities – please refer to www.evolve.online.
- Early Help – AO reminded the meeting that WCC's new early help offer will be launched at the headteachers' conference the following day 22/10/19. It is important that as many schools as possible are represented. Nominated deputies can attend if the head is unavailable.
- The audit asked whether governing/proprietor bodies are aware of key safeguarding requirements as set out in Part 2 of KCSiE. 266 respondents said yes. The audit also asked whether safeguarding is an agenda item for meetings at least once per term. 268 respondents said yes. These are significant increases from the first schools audit in 2015/16.

JK advised that just having a nominated safeguarding governor does not mean a governing body has a robust oversight of safeguarding. Every governor has a responsibility for safeguarding and needs to understand their responsibilities including how to report a concern. JK highlighted that several schools have got into difficulty with the recruitment of governors. Because governors are volunteers, checks are not always as robust as they need to be. JK reported that a lot of guidance will be coming out from Governor Services shortly on how governors need to engage in their responsibilities in relation to safeguarding.



SW observed that early years settings do not have governors as such but they do have volunteers who sit on boards of trustees, management committees etc. SW is trying to access training and support for them and asked if anybody knew of anything that is available. AO advised that the safeguarding training offered to chairs of governors and safeguarding governors by Governor Services and delivered by AS and AO has been available to members of early years boards of trustees and management committees for some years and can be booked through Governor Services. JK advised that Governor Services are looking at providing an offer for early years settings currently. JK and SW arranged to discuss this further outside the meeting.

- The audit asked whether governing bodies are familiar with Ofsted guidance for inspectors *Inspecting Safeguarding in early years, education and skills settings* and whether they have considered paragraphs 10-30 in assessing the effectiveness of the school's safeguarding arrangements. Only 26 respondents said yes to this question.

There was a discussion about the importance of governors having a strategic overview without becoming too involved in operational matters. Governors should not know too much detail about what is going on in individual cases with the exception of parental complaints where governors might need to become involved in investigating complaints or sit on appeals panels in relation to exclusions. Generally, governors should not know the names of children or families who are the subject of safeguarding concerns or issues. Their responsibilities are more to maintain a thematic overview of safeguarding arrangements and strategies/plans for improvement.

- The overall total number of safeguarding concerns reported by staff to DSLs rose again to 33,413.
- Referrals by schools to MASH: 1,751 referral in total – average = 6.41 per school/setting. 31 schools made no referrals (a decrease from last year). Almost half of all the referrals made were from just 39 schools/settings, most of whom also initiate a lot of Early Help single assessments and have high levels of vigilance in terms of number of concerns identified and reported to DSLs by staff. A small number made a lot of referrals without undertaking the commensurate level of early help activity. AO is planning to have conversations with those schools.
- Yellow forms: 45 schools said they had not adopted yellow forms and that they were confident staff would report concerns about the behaviour of colleagues to the head. If used properly to facilitate early identification and low-level intervention by headteachers, most yellow forms should not necessitate a consultation with the LADO. Yellow forms can prevent more serious concerns developing at a later stage by enabling heads to nip matters in the bud.
- In terms of new safeguarding challenges experienced since the last audit, the most common responses referred to time and capacity. 47 responses highlighted challenges in relation to accessing early help support. Other responses included the emotional impact of dealing with safeguarding



matters on staff including DSLs; non-education matters such as housing issues for families; and Children's Social Care not completing minutes of child protection meetings before the next meeting.

AO asked the meeting whether it considered the draft report as valid and ready to be circulated to schools.

SKG said she feels the audit report is a really useful tool for taking back to schools and for discussion in DSL teams; and also the wider staff group in relation to particular issues.

JH feels the analysis in the report is really helpful and provides greater awareness of safeguarding issues and developments for schools. Completing the audit is very useful and provides the action plan, which is a helpful basis for discussion with safeguarding governors.

It was agreed that the report should be circulated to schools, FE colleges and other respondent settings.

SW stated that the early years audit will not go out until January.

10. **Warwickshire Safeguarding Partnership – update** (report from Amrita Sharma)

ASh had submitted a written report.

- New partnership arrangements came into force on 29th September 2019.
- Warwickshire Safeguarding is the name of the new partnership.
- Web address: www.safeguardingwarwickshire.co.uk
- New governance structure:
 - Warwickshire Safeguarding Executive Board (WSEB)
 - **Subgroups** – Education, Safeguarding Reviews, Exploitation, Prevention and Early Intervention
 - Warwickshire Safeguarding Children Partnership Group
 - Warwickshire Safeguarding Adults Partnership Group
- A new strategic plan for 2019-2021 has been agreed and the priorities are effective safeguarding; prevention and early intervention; exploitation.
- A new quality assurance framework is being finalised to enable the commencement of the work of the Quality, Learning and Improvement Hubs in November.
- A series of 7-minute briefings will be published to help put the spotlight on specific topics. These have been launched through the website this week. Safeguarding leads will receive notifications when new briefings are published in the future. Heads and DSLs are encouraged to keep an eye on these.
- Serious Case Reviews – these are now referred to as 'Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews' at national level or 'Local Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews' at local level. There are currently three Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews underway in Warwickshire.



The subgroup agreed it would be helpful to have either Amrita or Elaine attending future meetings.

11. Any Other Business:

None tabled.

12. Dates/time of next meetings:

(Pound Lane Training Centre, Red Room – 9.30 a.m. to 12.00p.m.):

20th January 2020

27th April 2020

22nd June 2020

19th October 2020