

WSCB Schools, Learning and Education Sub-committee

MINUTES

21st January 2019 – 9.30 a.m. to 12 noon

Pound Lane Learning Centre, Leamington Spa

Present: Adrian Over, Education Safeguarding Manager (AO)
Ann Seal, Taking Care Scheme Manager (AS)
Beth Sharpe, Princethorpe College (BS)
Caroline Renton, King's High School (CR)
Elaine Coleridge-Smith, Independent Chair Safeguarding Board (ECS)
Hayley Good, Safeguarding and Intervention Manager (HG) (end of meeting)
Jackie Kerby, WSCB Learning & Improvement Officer (JKW)
Jane Key, Warwickshire ICTDS (JK)
Jane Le Poidevin, Paddox Primary School (JLP)
Jo Farmbrough, Senior Educational Psychologist (JF)
Jo Howell, Polesworth School (JH)
Julie Toal, Warks Consortium of Nursery Schools Governors (JT)
Katherine Skudra, Warwickshire College Group (KS)
Linda Fenn, Education Safeguarding (**Minutes**) (LF)
Louise Mohacsi, St Nicholas CE Primary School (LM)
Matthew Pike, Macintyre Academies (MP)
Paul Senior, Int. Assistant Director, Education Services (**Chair**) (PS)
Sally Kaminski-Gaze, All Saints Primary School & Nursery (SKG)
Sara Haigh, Early Years Advisory Teacher (SH)
Sharon Kindred, Stockingford Early Years Centre (SK)

Apologies: Amrita Sharma Paul Fellows
Carol Hooper Sarah McKluskey
Cheryl Jones Vanessa Gilbert

Visitors: Emma Gelfs (EG)
Bill Basra (BB)

1. Introductions and apologies:

PS welcomed members to the meeting. As the new interim chair, PS introduced himself and advised he has been commissioned to provide short term interim capacity support focused on the role of Assistant Director of Education until the end of March. Recruitment for the post is proceeding with a provisional appointment now having been made subject to the normal HR checks; more information to follow in due course.

Attendees introduced themselves. Apologies were noted as above.

2. Minutes of last meeting (15.10.18) / matters arising:

- Page 4 Actions:
 - *Updated self-harm information:* Confirmed Chris Malone did contact Helen Kendall. AO provided a further update: contact has been made with RISE who have agreed to look at the information. In the meantime RISE have forwarded some self-help documents which AO will circulate to the sub-committee for comments as to how useful these would be to schools.
 - *Egress testing:* Carol Hooper absent from today's meeting; Emma Gelfs may be able to provide an update but, if not, this will need to be followed up outside the meeting.
 - *Sarah Bradwell/invitations to SWEP:* AO confirmed this has been actioned and a meeting has been arranged with Sarah Bradwell and Marie Rooney next week.
 - *Early Help Action Plan/Education Professionals:* Emma Walker has now left; BB will update the sub-committee via his early help agenda item.
 - *Heads Up/ESS bulletin cross-referencing:* AO confirmed this has been actioned.
- Page 6 Actions:
 - Emma Gelfs is attending today's meeting and will provide an update.
- Page 7 Actions:
 - *WSCB Schools Audit:* Good response, 273 respondents; AO advised he has not yet received any suggested themes/areas of exploration.
- Page 8 Actions:
 - WSCB new partnership arrangements – confirmed Chris Malone did contact Amrita Sharma; ECS will provide a further update under the agenda item 'WSCB Update'.
- Page 9 Actions:
 - *Operation Encompass:* AO advised he has spoken to Detective Chief Inspector Pete Hill who agreed to investigate and provide an update; AO advised this is a Police ICT system problem in terms of the system's capacity to share information with schools and settings. The situation is confusing however as Worcestershire and Telford, which are within the West Mercia Police force jurisdiction and therefore use the same ICT system, have already implemented Operation Encompass. Warwickshire signed up to this in 2017 but there has been no progress. ECS was asked whether she could chase the Police from a strategic perspective via WSCB with a view to getting this actioned.

ACTIONS:

AO: To circulate to the Group RISE documentation for comments on their usefulness.

EG: To contact Carol Hooper to obtain the results of Egress testing.

ECS: To discuss with Amrita Sharma with a view to possible progression of Operation Encompass strategically via the Board.

3. **Early help strategy update:** Bill Basra

In terms of context, Bill Basra reported that the rationale for the strategy originated from the Ofsted inspection and subsequent LGA Peer Review held in 2017, which recommended the development of a strategy. In 2018 the strategy was developed under the auspices of the WSCB. This included the setting up of an early help action group with a number of key partners, and was followed up by a conference. Approval of the strategy was received by the WSCB, followed by approval from WCC Cabinet at a full council meeting at the end of 2018.

Since then work has focused on developing the early help action plan incorporating the work undertaken at the conference and the findings of the strategic review, which were published in the autumn.

The intention is to share the draft action plan with WSCB, its respective sub-committees and wider partners. BB would welcome the sub-committee's input on the plan including thoughts and ideas on how best to engage with education professionals. One idea is to hold a number of events in the localities and invite practitioners from the early help network to these events, i.e. education, health etc. The outcome from these would be not only to look at the draft action plan but also to start the discussion around developing the early help process and access points.

Discussion

It was highlighted that the peer review acknowledged that schools and early years settings in Warwickshire have been very well engaged with early help for a number of years. AO reported that in the 2017/18 WSCB schools audit, schools reported having initiated over 1,000 Early Help Single Assessments within that academic year. It was agreed that both education and health professionals need to be involved in the further development of the early help strategy. The health interface is important. Reducing numbers of early help assessments initiated and led by health professionals is a cause of concern and the strategy needs to bridge that gap.

BB observed that Health engagement has been an issue for a number of years and extends beyond the initiation of Early Help Single Assessments to engagement on a number of fronts. This has been flagged up to the Health and Wellbeing Board. 15 months ago a request was sent for nominated Health Champions with a strategic remit who can sit on the Children and Families Partnership Board. Currently Health Champions/representatives from the Health and Wellbeing Board are in place. The hardest ones to engage are the CCG's.

JLP advised that she was part of the education group involved in developing the strategy. One frustration is the time that it is taking. It is important that education professionals are involved in developing the action plan in terms of "what does it look like in practice?" It is now 2 years since the Ofsted

inspection. Regarding accessing education professionals, the suggestion was made to access them via schools consortia. However, the challenge of the time required to attend such a large number of meetings was identified at a previous meeting and, as agreed then, makes this suggestion problematic. JLP reiterated that the strategy looks very good but what does it mean in practice for practitioners in schools, i.e. where do they go for help? Access to any resource to help families is now harder than it has ever been before.

LM reiterated concerns around health engagement and suggested that the next WSCB audit explores the gaps that are being plugged by schools to make up for lack of health services, i.e. what additional work are schools doing to meet early help needs that health professionals have drawn away from due to funding cuts? AO made a note of the suggestion for the 2018/19 schools audit. LM asked what training will be provided in order that schools can support children appropriately in view of the requirement for schools to have a Mental Health Lead from next year. Early Help needs to be at foundational stages of concern. It was stressed that Early Help needs to be pitched at the foundation stages of mental health/emotional wellbeing concerns.

JH asked what is the timeline for measuring the impact health champions are having in that role and what they are doing on the frontline. Concerns about children that were previously Child in Need now seem to be deemed early help. Schools are not skilled enough to manage many of these issues and there is anxiety about missing significant issues as a result of the pressure of dealing with higher level cases.

PS commented that a lot of Tier 2 services have now disappeared as they are not statutory and that schools are having to deliver help and support or cases are going straight to Tier 3 which is specialist. Therefore we need to try and stop cases of complex needs children escalating up the pyramid, keeping things at Tier 1 by building capacity in our schools and settings via CPD and support.

ECS queried where we are in terms of developing the action plan and whether consideration has been given to this being audited/checked by the WSCB as a multi-agency piece of work. ECS asked who is responsible for the action plan.

BB responded that it is hoped to have the action plan agreed/ signed off by the end of March in order to implement from the beginning of April onwards. BB confirmed that the ultimate responsibility for drawing up the action plan rests with him on behalf of WCC; and that he is more than happy to attend school consortia meetings in order to share views and get feedback. The draft action plan will also be circulated virtually for comments to WSCB and all the sub-committees including the Education sub-committee. It is also planned to set up 5 stakeholder events across the county to offer practitioners the opportunity to come and feed in their perspectives.

PS suggested that all strategies should be based on assessment of need; that the needs assessment comes via JSNA, statistical data, anecdotal work, physical and practical data; and that the strategy has to go where the data takes

us. Going out into the localities to get an assessment of need would be crucial rather than hearing about it bit by bit. The assessment of need is going to be critical and each locality will have different demands based on different locality needs.

BB confirmed that the assessment of needs has already been undertaken and that he felt we currently have a good picture of Warwickshire. The strategy is showing the principles we need to deliver on. We now need to progress the action plan with a view to implementation in April. In due course there would still be opportunity to refresh the needs assessment and the action plan on an annual basis.

PS asked what the mechanism is for sharing the action plan with members of the sub-committee and whether wider stakeholders will have a share in the design. BB reiterated that locality stakeholder events are planned; and that he will attend consortia meetings. He will inform colleagues about planned events and developments via the WSCB Education sub-committee and also Heads Up to ensure the message is out there.

JLP asked who was involved in writing the action plan and whether the information from the conference was used. BB responded that the first draft of the action plan was drafted by him, taking into account what came from the Ofsted inspection, the peer review and the workshop sessions from the conference. BB confirmed that the action plan should be ready for circulation by the end of January 2019. PS suggested that when the document is ready to share, colleagues are invited to comment on it and given the opportunity to get involved, perhaps including some roadshow conversations. BB agreed to share his milestones and timescales table with the sub-committee for information together with the draft action plan.

AO observed that the principles of the strategy are entirely valid but no different to the Every Child Matters agenda, which was central to the roll-out of the early help process in which CAF and the Lead Professional role were central in 2007-2010. AO highlighted that schools and other education providers have been used to having a team of Early Help Officers to support them in delivering early help so in view of the high level of engagement in early help by schools it would be useful for them to know what the proposals are for that service, i.e. will it still exist to support practitioners in frontline services for children? AO suggested that it would therefore be helpful if the action plan included clarity about the future of the Early Help service and also the family support worker function as both of those have been fundamental to the delivery of early help by schools.

ECS commented that she liked the strategy but was unsure how/why an action plan was required at this stage and felt we should be testing whether we are delivering on this strategy and from that, working out what the actions should be, i.e. are we working in partnership, do we understand what early help means across the sector etc. The questions that we need to work on in an action plan do not leap out from the strategy and we need to find out what our problems are first.

SKG commented that the issue is the responsibility of partner agencies in the whole process of early help. SKG suggested that partner agencies do not understand the issues for schools. Schools need action. Budgets are reducing daily. The challenges that children are presenting to schools are increasing because of what is happening in the wider community.

PS commented that any strategy will not be a complete solution of these critical issues given that both Local Authority and school resources are being reduced. Non-statutory functions have been particularly squeezed. PS said that he was using his wealth of comparative analysis and experience on a national level in highlighting this. It is important therefore to understand that the early help strategy is not going to be a 'magic pill' but that the action plan could through incremental steps address some key areas that warrant attention.

ECS highlighted that there is more funding being made available via mental health services and that the strategy and action plan should reflect that.

MP felt there was a risk of alienating agencies and practitioners if the action plan is not clear in terms of resources including what training will be provided for practitioners delivering early help and what resources will be provided centrally, i.e. what is the core offer and what is traded for school budget planning?

BB responded that the wider issue of resources needs to be seen within the context of transformation and the challenges the Local Authority is facing. Family Support Workers were protected within the Children's Centre budget last year. However, in terms of other aspects of the Family Support Worker service, this is now mainly reliant on time-limited funding streams, of which the largest is 'Priority Families' (nationally known as the 'Troubled Families Programme'). The government has previously indicated that there will be no phase 3 'Troubled Families' programme but BB has also heard this may be reviewed under the Comprehensive Spending Review. In some instances, BB does not have the answer due to the Local Authority's reliance on government funding streams.

In terms of the Early Help Officer service, one of the recommendations of the Strategic Review was the need to review this function on the basis that a Service set up 10 years ago, was set up in a different climate to what we are currently operating in now. No decisions have been made regarding this Service other than a need to review the service

BB further stated that, in respect of the Early Help Officer service, one of the recommendations of the strategic review was the need to review this function on the basis that a service set up ten years ago was set up in a different climate to what we are operating in now. No decisions have been made regarding this service other than the need to review it and ensure its fitness for purpose moving forward. BB suggested that the focus at the moment needs to be on the action plan.

PS summarised the discussion by observing that these are tough times and we need to be realistic about the space that we are in. Not all Local Authority areas have an early help strategy. We need to ensure that we do not lose what we

have. Early Help can only be part of the solution but not in isolation. Thanks were expressed to BB for attending the meeting.

ACTIONS:

- BB to organise a range of consultation events (consortia, workshops, roadshows etc.) to ensure consultation is widely attended.
- BB to share consultation workshop/roadshow details via Heads Up when these have been organised.
- BB to share with the sub-committee the milestones and timescales table for information. LF to attach that to the minutes of the meeting.



FINAL EH STRATEGY
(DEC2018).pdf

4. Secure electronic communication between schools and other agencies: Emma Gelfs

EG provided an update about the sending of confidential information electronically. Quite a lot of progress has been made in ascertaining which Email systems as alternatives to WeLearn schools are using. We are now down to 8 outstanding schools where a response is awaited. AO to send out a communication to those outstanding schools. EG reiterated that communication between WeLearn and Warwickshire County Council Google Email addresses is secure.

Furthermore, there are some Email addresses that do not look like WeLearn addresses but are in fact backed up by an Email server which is the same.

The other key issue is the need to avoid confidential information being sent to 'admin' Email addresses.

EG advised that the vast majority of schools use WeLearn accounts, e.g. @WeLearn365.com. Some schools have Email systems that are based on WeLearn but which have changed their domain name, e.g. @awonderfulschool.com. Communication between those schools and WCC Google accounts is secure.

There are some other schools (mainly academies) which have moved to their own systems. For those schools, there is a need to determine what the back end is, whether this is an alternative Office365 or Gmail system and – in conjunction with WCC corporate ICT security – ensure that end to end encryption can be put in place.

EG advised that it would be useful if the sub-committee could make a decision for WCC to send a wider communication to all WCC staff that send confidential information to schools not to send that information to school admin Email addresses. The biggest issue surrounds the corporately maintained schools list ('SCHLIST') on the WCC shared drive which lists details for all schools. In

the column on that spreadsheet headed 'Secure Email address', school 'Admin' addresses are listed and the vast majority of WCC teams send confidential material to those admin addresses. EG explained that if that is to change in order to ensure that sensitive/confidential material is not opened and seen by individuals to whom it is not addressed (albeit unwittingly and in good faith), current day to day processes for a lot of people will have to change; so that will need to be communicated widely and clearly. The spreadsheet for maintained schools would need to be updated or an additional column inserted.

Schools would therefore need to provide a named or Head@ address for all confidential/secure Email correspondence. The sub-committee supported that course of action.

The 8 outstanding WCC schools and all independent schools will need to advise WCC what system they are using or confirm they are using a secure alternative, e.g. Egress. EG reiterated that if those schools are using Office365 or Gmail - which the vast majority of educational establishments are – then WCC can support them to their current Email systems secure for these purposes.

EG identified that 3 forms of communication are required:

- (1) To all independent schools and all state funded schools not using WeLearn, using a form of words that has already been provided by Guy Darvill.
- (2) A wider communication to all other schools using WeLearn, to invite them to provide nominated Email accounts for Headteachers or named accounts for individuals such as Designated Safeguarding Leads, SENCOs or designated teachers for children who are looked after to use for communicating confidential information.
- (3) Communication to all WCC staff advising that confidential and sensitive information must only be sent to Head or named Email addresses, not generic admin addresses.

It was agreed that EG and AO would work together to progress the actions above with a view to getting all schools and settings set up securely.

SH commented that lots of early years settings have non-secure addresses but there has been an increased number of settings enquiring about how to set up a WeLearn account. SH has highlighted to settings that if they are sending anything confidential/personal it needs to be sent via a secure Email address. EG/AO will share the planned communications with SH in order that these can be forwarded to all early years settings.

It was agreed that this item will be placed on the agenda for the next sub-committee meeting with a view to EG and AO providing an update, numbers outstanding and a plan of action.

ECS asked whether there are any similar issues in respect of secure sharing of confidential information between WCC, health, police and other partner agencies. ECS asked whether those partners use Egress.

BS noted that a lot of children at a number of Warwickshire schools are not Warwickshire residents. So there is a similar challenge for those schools in terms of secure communication with other Local Authorities and reciprocal arrangements therefore need to be in place with those authorities to ensure secure communication in respect of all children.

EG confirmed that Coventry and Leicestershire use Office365. EG advised that it would be wise to confirm in writing that corporate organisations contacted are using Email systems that support TLS encryption in order to ensure that we have done our due diligence; that we have gone through a process and know any information we are sending is secure. The meeting was of the view that all .gov.uk Email addresses would be secure. EG advised if anyone would like her to check any cross border authorities that they communicate with to ensure that their Email addresses are secure, please let her know.

KS advised that Warwickshire College uses both Gmail and Egress and asked EG to check and confirm that their systems are secure. MP advised this could be a problem where staff leave and have a named address or for part-time staff. Schools will need to make sure this information is updated regularly. The default to the Head address will just transfer over and designation to that account can then be passed to the successor when a Head leaves their post.

It was confirmed that the WCC Insight Team (contact Julie Robottom) is responsible for updates to the schools list on the shared drive.

EG reported that she had an action from the last meeting to speak to Corporate ICT about adding a spreadsheet/drop down list on the WCC intranet to check whether specific Email addresses are secure. That conversation took place. No more development to the intranet is planned but there is a link there already. If users search under GCSX there is a link to Email domains that users can send Emails to securely. This will give the domain name but not the address.

PS suggested that a watching brief is kept on this matter. Hopefully the number of schools with non-secure Email addresses will be down to zero and the early years gap will have closed. It was agreed there should be a follow-up discussion at the next sub-committee meeting.

ACTIONS:

AO: Communication to be sent to the 8 outstanding schools.

AO/EG: 3 communications as above

AO/EG: Share the above communications with SH for circulation to early years settings.

LF: Agenda item for the next meeting.

ALL: Send to EG details of any cross-border authorities which they would like checking re: secure systems being used.

EG: Check and confirm to KS that communication with Warwickshire College is secure.

5. **WSCB Update:** Elaine Coleridge-Smith

ECS wanted to update colleagues about the new flexible arrangements coming into place for Safeguarding Children Boards, in particular ending the current arrangements and introducing new flexible plans that need to be in place by June 2019. The arrangements will still be under the auspices of Working Together 2018 and the revised Children Act 2017 but the new arrangements ensure equal and shared responsibility for safeguarding arrangements across Warwickshire between 3 key partners – the Chief Executive for the Local Authorities, the Head of Police and the Lead CCG Chief Operating Officer.

Those three key partners replace the previous Safeguarding Boards. ECS is starting to meet with the 3 key partners to try and address some problems, e.g. how to fund the new arrangements in an equal and shared way. The partners are looking at different modelling and the advantages of aligning the new arrangements for children with the Adult Safeguarding Board. There are quite a few similarities in activities and the skills required between the two bodies.

The adults' and children's board business support teams have developed different strengths working with their respective boards but plans to bring them together with a view to streamlining, saving money and being more effective are under discussion. The statutory guidance for the new arrangements include requirements for the new partnership to identify and work with 'relevant agencies, which allows the 3 key partners to consider which other partner agencies would be essential to work alongside them and also to introduce relevant partners to be involved in specific pieces of work.

In relation to the current WSCB Education sub-committee, the education sector is not going to be listed as a relevant partner as yet because it still has a statutory responsibility to co-operate with the work of the 3 key partners. There will be in any plans a separate paragraph about how the new partnership will relate to and work as an executive team with the whole schools and education agenda, which will be fairly similar to what is being done now with a robust education sub-committee. There is an important piece of work to change the leadership of the partnership to make sure that the 3 key leads understand their responsibilities and how to make it work. Another challenge will be how the partnership retains the interest, support and goodwill of all the previous partners who sit on the current WSCB and its various sub-committees. There is a need to ensure that level of expertise and knowledge is maintained and developed.

There will be four identified key areas of concern/interest/focus across each year. It is anticipated that this will give the 3 key partners more strength in commissioning the work on what they believe are their mutually priority areas of concern. The job for all other partners including those in education will be to inform the 3 key partners through audits, sub-committee meetings such as the current WSCB Education sub-committee etc. as to what the main areas of concern are. The 4 current WSCB business plan objectives are diversity, neglect, CSE and early help. The document has to be drawn up by the 29th June and it is hoped publication will be no later than the 29th June.

Discussion:

AS asked about the new partnership's agenda in relation to multi-agency training. How will this change, will multi-agency training still be provided and, if so, how? ECS advised that training is one of the big issues due to the issue of funding/costing. A lot of the current multi-agency training is co-provided by practitioners in the current WSCB and this will be looked at to see if it can continue, focusing on the core areas. The other idea is that the partnership uses quarterly chunks of topical work to focus on the training that is delivered. There is consideration of some of the partnership posts in the current business team changing to incorporate a training and a QA function.

JK advised that the breakdown for multi-agency training when it was reviewed last year was 40% WCC employees including schools and 60% from other partner agencies. JK's current role is to design, deliver and evaluate the training programme and build the training portal; and also to negotiate with practitioners and managers in other sectors, e.g. early years, to provide support in delivering the training. The multi-agency training programme has been well received and well attended, particularly from education. It will be the new partnership's decision as to what shape the multi-agency programme takes going forward.

AS highlighted that the WSCB training programme relies on practitioners' goodwill and them managing their time to ensure their availability to deliver training. Without a multi-agency approach and practitioners on the ground assisting delivery, partner agencies would lose such a lot so the new partnership was urged to bear that in mind. JK advised that feedback from delegates is that the value of multi-agency training is not just the subject matter, it is about engagement, talking to and working alongside colleagues they would not ordinarily encounter, engaging with faith organisations that do lots of work with children and families etc. ECS acknowledged these comments and that this is the focus of the four pieces of work.

PS commented that there are considerable, positive developments in terms of the future shape and work of the new safeguarding partnership and its relationship with this education sub-committee. ECS advised the sub-committee to let her know if anybody has anything they would wish to be taken back to the partnership apart from the issue of multi-agency training. PS said he was encouraged by the breadth of representation at today's sub-committee meeting, not just in terms of the large number of attendees but also the quality and calibre of discussion and education colleagues coming together with commitment to keep children safe.

LM asked that the new safeguarding partnership in its planning is not developed as a top down model. ECS advised that the development work is being undertaken through the current WSCB. The next full WSCB meeting will consist of workshops to gather feedback.

ECS highlighted that the new framework for Serious Case Reviews could have an impact on the sub-committee. SCRs will not be carried out locally anymore. All referrals will go to the national body and the timeline is considerably slicker

and faster. This means that schools will have less time to respond when asked to provide initial information for SCRs. Further guidance will be provided as soon as this is available.

The new safeguarding partnership arrangements will go live on 1st September 2019. There will be further communication until 29th June. ECS will circulate information that is available for sharing. It was identified that full WSCB meeting minutes are not currently shared with all schools but it was felt that they possibly should be. ECS will look into this and incorporate it into the new arrangements if agreed (LF to send the draft minutes to ECS for accuracy). There needs to be effective communication between this sub-committee and the new safeguarding partnership. Heads Up goes out weekly so this is a good platform for sharing information as it is made available. Query was raised as to whether Heads Up could be circulated to the independent sector – PS agreed to look into this.

JK: Serious Case Reviews update:

- There are 3 SCRs that have been investigated by a Task and Finish sub-committee, looking at key areas of learning and themes. These findings and activities will be taken to the full WSCB later this week. When WSCB has approved the task and finish sub-committee findings and activities, publication of the reports should follow. The reports will be uploaded to the WSCB website and JK will send out an Email alert to key contacts to advise that they are available. The Education Safeguarding Service
- WSCB has undertaken its first rapid review under the new arrangements. Where notification is received of a case for consideration, WSCB (and in future the new partnership) has 10-13 days to gather all the initial information and identify whether the case meets the threshold to commence scoping. For this case, the scoping has been completed and a draft report has been presented to the Serious Cases sub-committee.

PS asked whether in future a briefing note with headlines about SCRs could be provided to ensure the discussion is enhanced and important conversations are not lost.

ACTIONS:

- **ECS:** To explore with full WSCB whether minutes of full WSCB/new partnership meetings can be shared with all schools.
- **PS:** To investigate whether Heads Up can also be circulated to the independent sector.
- **ECS:** To circulate to the sub-committee a briefing note with key SCR headlines in order to enhance discussion at these meetings.

6. 2018 and 2019 schools safeguarding audits: Adrian Over

The 2017/18 audit was finally closed in late November. Not quite so much chasing of late submissions was required this year and most of the schools chased responded quickly. AO will be starting the analysis very soon with a view to reporting the findings just after Easter. AO has already identified that there was an increase in the numbers of safeguarding concerns identified by,

recorded and submitted to DSLs due to increased levels of vigilance. One of the challenges is to maintain that vigilance and recording going even though it may feel to members of staff that not a lot changes for a child as a result of them raising a concern.

Another key development is the number of schools who mentioned the need for reflective supervision for DSLs and staff. The concept appears to be something that schools are now embracing and identifying as an issue. AO advised that the first Supervision Skills training for experienced DSLs will take place on the 1st February and is already very well subscribed. One more session is planned this year and if evaluations are positive, more will be commissioned.

AO wished to express his thanks to all schools for submitting their audit returns. The analysis report will be sent to all schools in due course.

For next year's audit there will be similar themes but there is also a need to keep it fresh, interesting and reflective of new and developing safeguarding themes. AO requested that if there are any particular themes or areas of interest that people would like to see included in next year's audit to let him know. AO had already noted LM's earlier suggestion and will incorporate this accordingly. An area that AO intends to include following a discussion at a full WSCB meeting last year is keeping children safe when off site on residential trips.

ECS advised there should be some reflection of WSCB's priorities in the audit. AO confirmed that CSE is included. In terms of neglect, AO suggested that a discussion with Amrita Sharma and JK would be helpful in putting together some suitable questions.

JLP suggested including 'Strengthening Partners' as it may be helpful to measure to see what impact this has had on schools. LM suggested inclusion of County Lines. AO asked LM to consider how an audit question/s could be structured based on her experiences as discussed. PS queried how much work on County Lines had been done by the sub-committee and suggested that this is an area that needs to be included in the sub-committee's forward plan. PS said that there needs to be a priority conversation with representation by Police or Youth Offending so a co-produced conversation can be had. It was recognised that this is a growing problem both locally and nationally. JK advised there is a definite need to include this in multi-agency training, particularly with reference to the links in to the exploitation agenda.

PS suggested that there is a need to do a wider piece of work on County Lines and asked ECS whether the wider WSCB might take this on as a priority theme to get a sense of where we are currently as this requires a partnership wide response.

AO highlighted that for the last 3 years the schools safeguarding audit has been hosted by WSCB on the basis that the Board has a right to seek assurance from partners about their safeguarding arrangements. AO asked for clarification about whether the new safeguarding partnership arrangements will have the

same statutory rights to seek similar assurance. ECS responded that the statutory requirement is for the 3 key partners to be assured that appropriate services are being provided to safeguard children. How the 3 partners wish to gather that information can vary, e.g. via interviews, focus sub-committees etc. but they need to be assured services are meeting their statutory requirements regarding safeguarding and education. It will be for the 3 key partners to decide.

AO advised that the schools safeguarding audit is now very well embedded. Other attendees supported AO's statement that most schools now find it useful, particularly in helping to identify areas for improvement and the development of an action plan for the following academic year.

PS suggested that the audit is the most efficient and effective mechanism for gathering this data. AO agreed to resend the audit report and questions to ECS.

ACTIONS:

ALL: Send any areas of interest or themes to AO for inclusion in next year's Audit.

AO/JK/AS: To meet to discuss questions regarding neglect for inclusion in next year's Audit.

LM: County Lines – LM to advise AO how this could be incorporated within the audit based on her experience.

AO/ECS: AO to place County Lines on the forward plan with possible representation from Police or Youth Offending to enhance discussions; ECS to explore with the board whether County Lines could be a theme.

AO: To send the audit report and questions to ECS for information.

AO: AO to provide some headlines for the next meeting; **LF** to put audit update on agenda.

7. Forward Planner – Paul Senior

PS stated that there is a need to keep the sub-committee's business as strategic as possible with a focus on key areas in order to ensure it is making the best use of attendees' time. In the light of this, PS asked what the sub-committee's priorities should be for the April, June, and October meetings, suggesting a rolling calendar. The planner that had been circulated with the papers for today's meeting reflects back to the meeting held in October 2018. Do we already have items for the next agenda? In the past, items for discussion have usually been picked up from the previous meeting but they are not planned on a quarterly basis. There are some standing items e.g. the WSCB update. What topics are discussed throughout the year that should be included in the forward planner? ECS advised that with the new arrangements, it would be helpful to match the sub-committee's quarters to that of the safeguarding partnership's 4 topics in order to provide some symmetry.

PS spoke about the need to get into the discipline of forward planning and being clear which items take place at which part of the year. County Lines is one area which requires the sub-committee to have a reasonable understanding in order to answer questions.

PS would also like the sub-committee to be aware of the SEND inspection and the implications for the education sector. This should be an agenda item for the next meeting and Ross Caws should be invited to attend. PS said that this is about process, implications, school visits and the focus will be on how good we are not only when it comes to our children with SEND but also about connectivity with the new safeguarding partnership.

PS suggested that a meeting with AO should be arranged to forward plan quarters 1, 2, 3 and 4; to agree which discussions are standing items and what the work plan should be for the sub-committee for the year. The outcome of this meeting would then be shared with colleagues at the next meeting for them to consider, comment, and fill in any gaps. SH advised that early years have different timescales which will need to be taking into consideration when drawing up the forward planner. SH will send information to AO in readiness for the meeting with PS.

ACTIONS:

LF: Include SEND inspection and implications for the sub-committee as an agenda item for 30.4.19 – Ross Caws to be invited to attend.

PS/AO: To meet up to forward plan items for Quarters 1, 2, 3 and 4. Document to then be shared at the next meeting.



Ed Sub Forward
plan. 1.19.docx

8. Information sharing score card – Paul Senior

PS stated that the sub-committee needs to think about children who are missing and children missing education; children who are home educated, how well does this sub-committee monitor patterns and trends around EHE? How do we monitor children on reduced timetables? These type of questions are what we would be subject to in an inspection or review of Board regime. The sub-committee needs to consider how well it monitors and tracks these issues. Whilst the LA remains the statutory partner for accountability purposes for these areas of focus, it is recognised best practice in high performing local areas that the Education safeguarding Board has a reasonable baseline understanding of progress and risk in this area. PS referred to the cumulative score card (attached below) and advised that he would like the sub-committee to start looking at patterns and trends. A system will need to be put in place. This sub-committee would provide governance in this area and therefore reporting into the overarching safeguarding partnership. PS suggested that the sub-committee need to have a deeper understanding in this area, i.e. how are we doing, how do we know, how do we compare? PS advised that if colleagues have any comments or suggestions on the scorecard, to let him have these. PS would also like to have this as a standing agenda item at these meetings. The document is a work in progress.

HG advised that there is now an Education Entitlement Team in WCC that is dedicated to work in this area but prior to this we were struggling to answer these types of questions. There has recently been some significant internal team realignment; and this has proved really helpful having teams together. It has made it easier to find out what numbers we are dealing with and getting answers to these types of questions.

HG advised she is not confident that WSCB is as effective as it could be at sharing and publicising outcomes of Serious Case Reviews and what impact they have. When we are contacted by an HMI, what do we learn from these serious incidents and the follow up that the HMI chooses to put in place. There are lessons learned from such conversations but there is no mechanism for sharing this learning.

SH queried whether PS would like something similar for Early Years children albeit there is not the same statutory responsibility. PS advised that this would be really helpful. PS and SH to meet to discuss and progress this matter.

ACTIONS:

LF: Cumulative scorecard to be place on agenda as a standing item.

ALL: Comments regarding the scorecard can be sent to PS.

PS/SH: To further discuss scorecard for early years.



Score card analysis
comments and furthe



Local Area
Vulnerable Learner sc

9. Any Other Business:

RISE Support (HG): A bid has been submitted as a Mental Health Trailblazer through the South Area Clinical Commissioning Group and the submission has been successful. Margo Brown is working with colleagues in Health to identify some schools in the south (includes Central) of the county, looking at having cluster of schools which will have a named mental health professional attached to them. There are targets that have to be met and robust boxes that have to be ticked to qualify for the funding (£600k over 2 years). This is tied into employing and training the professionals. Have to give a benchmark of 8,000 children and young people in receipt of the services so there will have to be a named mental health professional lead within the school, the school will need to identify this practitioner and training will be provided. The Health professionals who will go into the schools are currently being recruited and trained.

There is some school improvement funding available to set up a couple of hubs in the north of the county, Nuneaton and Bedworth and probably the east, looking again at a cluster arrangement. This is around workforce development and stopping situations escalating. HG agreed to provide some further information regarding this to the sub-committee.

8. Date/time of next meetings

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

30th April 2019; 18th June 2019; 21st October 2019.