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Introduction
Section 11 (4) of the Children Act 2004 requires each person or body to which the duties apply to have regard to any guidance given to them by the Secretary of State and places a statutory requirement on organisations and individuals to ensure they have arrangements in place to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015 states that one of the key functions of a Local Safeguarding Children Board is:

“monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of what is done by the authority and their Board partners individually and collectively to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and advising them on ways to improve;”

Part of the way in which Wandsworth Safeguarding Children Board (WSCB) discharges this function is by carrying out a Section 11 Audit on an annual basis.

This report provides an update on the recommendations which came out of the 2014 Audit. It then sets out the detail of the Section 11 Audit carried out in 2015. It summarises and analyses the agency responses as well as identifying strengths and areas for improvement which will feed in to the business planning and learning and development strategy which WSCB will take forward through the remainder of 2015 and into the following year. It also provides some comparison with the previous audit’s findings.

Section 11 Audit Report 2013-14 – Update on Recommendations
The 2014 Section 11 Audit report made 12 recommendations for WSCB. These are listed below along with an update from the Board on how these were progressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where agency confidence in staff groups’ ability to fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities falls below 75%, this should be addressed as a matter of priority.</td>
<td>The few agencies who fell into this category were called in, challenged and it was picked up in action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to rigorously monitor the delivery of agency Action Plans.</td>
<td>Many more agencies were called in to provide evidence and feedback on action plans being put in place and those not called in, were emailed for feedback/update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to scrutinize responses given to the</td>
<td>The WSCB reviewed responses made within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is there anything more the WSCB could do to raise awareness of child safeguarding in your workplace?&quot; and to take action as appropriate.</td>
<td>the questionnaires. Bi-annual newsletters share safeguarding activities across agencies and other key safeguarding messages. Safeguarding conference is held once a year, as well as learning from experience events to share audits and reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future audit questionnaires should have a rephrased question on “See the Adult, See the Child”</td>
<td>This question was amended and rephrased question was included in this year’s questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to assure itself that professional practice in terms of “See the Adult, See the Child” is sound.</td>
<td>There was a much better rate of understanding of ‘See the Adult See The Child/Think Family’ in this year’s audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to incorporate “Lessons to be Learned” into future Section 11 Audit planning.</td>
<td>This was done and more will be done to keep on refining and improving this process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to user test wording of questions for future audits to ensure they are effective in testing safeguarding knowledge</td>
<td>This was done and will be done again for the next audit to ensure new questions are clear and test the correct knowledge/purpose of question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to encourage agencies to have safeguarding as a standing item at team meetings and supervision</td>
<td>Most agencies confirmed that safeguarding is a standing item at team meetings. Could consider adding this to questionnaire for 2015-16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to support agencies to use their audit self-assessment as a tool to inform service planning and a benchmark for assessing safeguarding performance.</td>
<td>This was achieved and commented on by agencies referring to their results from last year, to look at comparisons and identify the reasons for any changes or fluctuations. IDAS were very disappointed in this year’s results, as they had implemented several key changes and training staff to have greater knowledge and awareness; but due to organisational changes, they lost several key staff members and therefore at the time of redoing the audit, their staff cohort was very different and they had several locums. This identified new gaps. They have put things in place already and again have a detailed action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies to undertake a Data and Systems</td>
<td>This will be addressed within the strategic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
audit and ensure that effective data Quality Assurance mechanisms are in place.

lead’s questionnaire in 2015-16.

WSCB to assure itself that staff understand the “Allegations against Professionals” and Safe Recruitment processes.

This was identified as an area for development for many agencies i.e. that staff need to know who to follow up concerns with and report concerns regarding a colleague. The overall referral rate has continue to increase, which is viewed as there being a greater staff awareness, but staff need to be reminded of the correct process, especially new staff to Wandsworth.

WSCB to establish whether agencies are compliant with statutory guidance on Children Missing from Home and Care, and Children Missing Education.

This will be picked up in 2015-16 audit process with specific questions linked to priority areas. An audit was completed during 2014-15 on children missing from care and home; as well as looked after children who return home from care. Lessons learnt/recommendations from these audits are monitored by the WSCB through the composite action plan via the Monitoring Sub-Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Section 11 Audit 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Methodology**
The audit was carried out over four phases which took place between February – May 2015.

Phase 1 – The Audit Questionnaire

Phase 2 – Analysis of returns and self assessment

Phase 3 – Action Planning

Phase 4 – Interviews and Feedback

These four different types of activity provided both qualitative and quantative information thus enabling a full and rounded analysis of compliance with Section 11 responsibilities across a wide and diverse range of agencies.

The process involved the questionnaire being completed by as many staff as possible in line with samples suggested in the Guidance for Administration of the Audit (shown at Appendix 7)
Following this, Wandsworth Safeguarding Children Board (WSCB) requested that each agency carry out an analysis of the results of the Questionnaire. (**The Audit Analysis Guidance Note is shown at Appendix 8.**) Leading on from this, each agency who, as a result of the self-assessment, had identified areas for learning and improvement, were asked to complete an action plan and return it with their audit analysis form to the WSCB.

The final part of the process involved members of the WSCB Section 11 Audit Review Group interviewing a sample of agencies around how they found the audit experience. This was done as a means of eliciting how the process could be further improved in the following year. Feedback forms were also completed by agencies who were not interviewed.

Most importantly however, the activity described above enables WSCB to identify gaps, strengths and weaknesses in safeguarding practice across agencies as well as identifying areas for improvement through learning and development. It provides a targeted approach to addressing key safeguarding themes coming out of the audit thus improving the safety and wellbeing of all children and young people in the Borough.

**Phase 1**

The Questionnaire comprised of a set of 14 questions designed to be answered by all designations and grades of staff across all agencies, from school dinner ladies to front line professionals, therefore reflecting the fact that safeguarding is everyone’s responsibility. It was sent to the identified lead in all partner agencies which included Schools, GPs, Health partners, Police, Voluntary Organisations, Probation, Youth Offending and Council services for children and their families as required by Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015.

**Phase 2**

The second phase of the audit involved each individual agency collating the results of completed Questionnaires using a template designed by WSCB.

As stated in the Guidance note the purpose of the self-assessment was to help partner agencies understand the strengths and gaps in their staff’s safeguarding knowledge and to enable appropriate learning opportunities and training to be developed as a result.

Having individual agencies complete their own assessment and evaluation of the Questionnaire ensured a fuller understanding and, more importantly, ownership of the level of safeguarding awareness and skills existing amongst their own staff group. It is unlikely this would be the case if the Questionnaire analysis had been carried out centrally by the WSCB.

**Phase 3**

In many ways Phase 3 was the most important part of the audit, where having identified any gaps in safeguarding knowledge through self-assessment, each agency was now required to develop an Action Plan to address these gaps. The Action Plan template to be completed details each action required, how it would improve outcomes, who in the agency is
responsible for ensuring delivery, by when, and also what evidence would be produced to assure WSCB that successful delivery had taken place.

All Action Plans were to be returned to the WSCB to enable the Board to assess, monitor and provide support to all staff in safeguarding children effectively.

**Phase 4**

If an LSCB is to be “a highly influential strategic arrangement that directly influences and improves performance in the care and protection of children” as required by the Ofsted’s statutory reviews of LSCBs, then it, as with the agencies it challenges and supports, must operate within an environment of continuous improvement through feedback and consultation. The Phase 4 Interviews and feedback were carried out to help WSCB improve the S11 self-assessment audit process and consequently to better carry out its responsibility to scrutinise and monitor the quality and effectiveness of the local authority and statutory partners in safeguarding children.

This final phase of the Section 11 audit process involved selecting a cross section of agencies to be interviewed around their experience of completing the audit, how it could be improved and what else the WSCB could do to help raise awareness of safeguarding within the agency. It also asked agencies to provide an update on their 2014 Audit Actions Implementation Plan. The interviews consisted of a series of eight questions. Feedback was also received from 22 agencies who were not interviewed. The Feedback form contained an additional question which was “Is there anything the WSCB could do to improve the S11 questionnaire and S11 self-assessment audit process?” Analyses of both the interviews and the feedback forms are presented in the “Interview and Feedback” section of this report.

**Summary of responses**

Overall the questionnaire and self-assessment response was very positive. 100 agencies returned audits with 4812 workers completing the questionnaire this year. This is a 76% increase on the number of individual questionnaires completed in 2014. 39 audits were received from schools and educational settings (the same as last year). The Police completed 339 audits this year, which is a 10 times more than last year when only 34 were returned. This is a clear representation of the Borough Commander’s dedication to safeguarding which includes creating a new safeguarding unit within the borough that holds all areas that deal with safeguarding related matters in one unit/service. Other agencies have also increased the number of questionnaires completed, with St George’s NHS Trust doing 460 - 107 more than last year. These positive improvements only reinforce the view agencies expressed of how useful this annual process is in terms of reminding them of the core and basic safeguarding information that staff should be aware of and put into practice in the normal course of their day to day work. It also identified areas of strength or gaps.
Lessons to be Learned

- Consideration should be given to developing more targeted audits, particularly for Schools and GPs.
- Timings for sending out the questionnaire should be carefully considered to ensure optimum response.
- Consideration should be given to “test driving” the audit questions and the analysis process with a representative sample of stakeholders before going live to avoid any confusion and aid understanding.
- The issue of keeping the audit and safeguarding issues “fresh” is one which warrants further thought and discussion. If staff feel that they are consistently being asked the same questions in the same way, it is likely that interest and commitment to completing the audit could be lost.

Summary of Findings

Questionnaires
- As evidenced above, the overall response to the audit was very positive showing a high level of commitment amongst agencies in Wandsworth to carry out their child safeguarding responsibilities effectively. Agencies themselves were in the main confident that the majority of their staff were able to fulfill these responsibilities.
- In 2014 one of the major issues to emerge from the audit was that in almost all agencies there appeared to be a lack of understanding around what “See the Adult, See the Child” meant. Clearly this has been a focus for the Board moving forward into 2015 as this year’s audit showed a real improvement in this area (including a change of wording to the question), however there still appears to be further work to be done as a number of staff were still not sure of what this meant or how they might put it into practice in their day to day work.
- Although the CLA audit showed an overall confidence level of only 70%, it should be noted that this was due to the Administration staff where only two out of five were confident that they knew their safeguarding responsibilities. 100% of social workers were confident. This is reassuring, but Administrators are an important part of the team and often the first point of contact for clients and professionals. Thought should be given to training and awareness raising resulting in full confidence.

Action Plans/Interviews
- The submitted Action Plans give the strongest indication of where agencies believe gaps exist and need to be addressed and it is these which will inform WSCB of their focus for monitoring and evaluating child safeguarding performance.
- 68% of all agencies who submitted action plans felt that training/learning & development was a key issue to be dealt with at all levels. In terms of evaluating the audit process, during the interviews agencies consistently stated that they had found the audit an extremely useful tool for identifying training needs and this was by far the most dominant feature which arose out of the Action Plans.
- More than a quarter of agencies identified awareness of how and when to report safeguarding concerns as an issue to be addressed. Interestingly, this did not appear to relate to any one particular agency more than another. It featured across the broad spectrum of organisations completing the audit indicating that this is a generic issue. Questions should be asked around why this is the case.

- In fact, this year, more common issues such as having safeguarding as a standing item on team meetings, better understanding of when and who to share information with, “See the adult, see the child”, up to date policies and procedures, how to deal with allegations against professionals and the role of the LADO and having easily accessible safeguarding information were not concentrated in any single agency or group of agencies, but spread very widely. This may be due in part to the large increase in agencies taking part, but the WSCB may wish to assure itself that these areas feature in induction, agency training and ongoing awareness raising in terms of “business as usual”.

- Although in relatively small numbers, what appeared more this year than last were areas around understanding how to follow up concerns when it is felt they have not been adequately addressed and more information on the outcomes of referrals/concerns once they have been made (this features as an issue in many local authorities).

- Perhaps more importantly, some staff wanted more opportunities within their agency to discuss potential safeguarding concerns. It is very important that staff feel these opportunities are available to them, as having a level of uncertainty around what might constitute a concern can cause anxiety amongst staff and lead to potentially unsafe situations.

- Only 15% of agencies wanted to further analyse the audit and self-assessment themselves compared with 28% last year. This may indicate that agencies did not feel the need to state this as a specific issue as it had become part of their normal processes, however the Board may want to reassure itself that this is not due to agencies seeing less value in the audit exercise.

- What was most striking for the author of this report was that only a very few of 74 agencies who submitted Action Plans mentioned the following areas as needing to be addressed:

  - Better understanding of adult mental health, including common triggers and types of illness (Early Years/Intervention)
  - Improved learning from Serious Case Reviews including a better understanding of the importance / role of early intervention family support. (Early Years/Intervention)
  - Safer Recruitment Awareness and Monitoring (Independent School)
  - Missing Children/CME /CSE – Training put in place as well as clear processes and consistent recording (Police Borough Command)
  - Dealing with Extremist views/Radicalisation (Primary School)
  - FGM (GP)
  - E-Safety (Independent School)
These are some of the most current and relevant issues in the safeguarding arena today. These are topics which the WSCB should make a priority for agencies to consider as a matter of urgency.

**Conclusion**

- The WSCB Section 11 Audit has been an extremely useful process and tool for delivering service improvement in child safeguarding across all agencies. This is borne out by agencies in interviews and action planning.
- It is very positive that the number of agencies taking part in the audit almost doubled from the previous year. This shows a very strong commitment to safeguarding throughout the Borough and should be commended. Care should be taken however, to think creatively about the audit format and design going forward to ensure that it remains pertinent to all staff and enables them to continue to actively participate in the process.
- The most significant gap in 2015 appears to be around a lack of recognition on the areas mentioned in the last point of the Action Plan/Interviews analysis above. One secondary school in particular raised these as issues as requiring dedicated focus and it is important that the Board takes this on board for 2015/16. However the author recognises that the audit for this year did not include these areas in order to have a comparison between last year and this year’s audit returns. Assurance has been given that the audit questionnaire for 2015-16 will cover the WSCB’s current priority areas, which includes areas such as CSE, Prevent/extremism, missing children, FGM, etc.
- The exercise of self-assessment and action planning was very worthwhile and allowed agencies to think about how they incorporate child safeguarding into staff training and everyday practice. It is important now to ensure that the momentum is maintained and that identified agency actions are progressed and their successful delivery monitored by WSCB.
- As in 2014-15, this was a four phase audit which provided a wealth of detailed information summarized in this report and which is a valuable resource for WSCB and its constituent agencies in their continuous drive to improve child safeguarding in Wandsworth.

**Recommendations**

1. Where agency confidence in staff groups’ ability to fulfill their safeguarding responsibilities falls below 75%, this should be addressed as a matter of priority.
2. WSCB to rigorously monitor the delivery of agency Action Plans.
3. WSCB to ensure that learning from Serious Case Reviews and research is completely embedded across agencies and that this can be clearly evidenced.
4. WSCB to establish whether agencies are compliant with statutory guidance on Children Missing from Home and Care, and Children Missing Education.
5. WSCB to challenge all agencies on their approaches to dealing with safeguarding in terms of -
   - Adult mental health
   - Safe recruitment practices
   - Child Sexual Exploitation
   - Gangs
   - Peer on peer abuse
   - Radicalisation
   - FGM
   - E-safety and abuse using new technologies and social media

6. WSCB to consider whether to devise agency specific audits

7. WSCB to incorporate “Lessons to be Learned” into future Section 11 Audit Planning

8. WSCB to ensure that agencies allow sufficient opportunities for staff to discuss potential safeguarding concerns

9. WSCB to support agencies to use their audit self-assessment as a tool to inform service planning and a benchmark for assessing safeguarding performance.

10. WSCB to assure itself that agencies have effective Quality Assurance and Performance systems in place to be able to evidence good safeguarding practice and improve practice where this is not the case.

Anna Howson-Janes

Independent Consultant

July 2015
Appendix 1: Summary of Questionnaires and Self-Assessments

Below is a list of agencies who completed the questionnaire and submitted a self-assessment analysis as well as an Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/44 GP Practices (which, although one less than in 2014, is still a good response.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAS (provide Adult Substance Misuse services in the borough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s NHS Healthcare Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West London &amp; St George’s Mental Health Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School and other Educational settings’ returns were also positive with 39 completing the audit forms. Below these are broken down by status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools &amp; Educational Settings – Breakdown by Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (including 2 Academies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Referral Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.E. College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Years and Intervention Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare and Business Consultancy Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Settings x78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscan Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granard Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallwood Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southmead Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhill Enhanced Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siward Road Specialist Nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childminders x60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing &amp; Cultural Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Housing Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Rent Collection Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Associations X 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Culture Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In relation to Socially Rented Housing in the Borough it should be noted that 60% is Council owned and 40% by Housing Associations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council and Multi-agency Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Looked After Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Standards Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Social Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Standards &amp; Improvement Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Education Inclusion service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Welfare Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Recovery Project, Health Trainers. GAPS/BF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLL Wandsworth Libraries
Youth Offending
Youth Work Service & Teenage Pregnancy Team
Youth Support Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carneys Community (Boxing Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Contact a Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Children With Disabilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Start Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gap Youth Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignito Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Children’s Early Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Faith Groups completed the audit last year but only one in 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Road Chapel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Probation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The London Ambulance Service and London Fire Brigade’s Audits are completed centrally.
74 of the above agencies submitted Action Plans including:

12 GPs
All 5 Health agencies
26 Schools and Educational Settings
6 Early Years Settings
1 Faith Group
Borough Police and CAIT
National Probation Service and CRC
15 Council Services
2 Youth Services
3 Voluntary Organisations
Appendix 2 - Analysis of Responses

Self Assessments (Quantitative)

The self-assessment returns indicate that agencies assess the majority of their staff as being able to fulfill their child safeguarding responsibilities. It shows a very high confidence level of 89% across the board. This is the same percentage as 2014, but considering the number of agencies taking part almost doubled, this is a commendable figure.

The chart below shows this broken down by generic agency group.
Level of confidence can be further broken down across individual agencies as shown in these Pie Charts below:

**Percentage of Faith Groups Confidence**

- Trinity Road Chapel: 100%

**Percentage of Police Confidence**

- CAIT: 92%
- Borough: 77%
Percentage of Housing & Culture Confidence

- Council Housing Department: 80%
- Council Rent Collection Service: 70%
- Housing Association: 88%
- Leisure & Culture: 100%

Percentage of Vol Orgs Confidence

- Carneys Community (Boxing Club): 80%
- Home Start Wandsworth: 100%
- Contact a Family (CWD): 80%
- Gap Youth Club: 95%
- Ignito Project: 100%
- Spurgeons: 80%
- 4Children: 100%
As can be seen, every service who completed the self-assessment rated their average confidence that staff fulfill their children safeguarding responsibilities at 70% or above. Last year the Borough Police were the only agency who fell slightly short of this at 68%, whereas this year their percentage confidence had risen to 77% which is a significant improvement. Only one Faith Group completed the questionnaire as opposed to three last year, but it had an overall an overall confidence level of 100%.
• It should be remembered however that these are only average percentages and within individual settings some staff groups did fall below the 50% level. Some of these groups were not particularly surprising e.g. kitchen staff in an Independent school or Parent Readers. Of course these warrant timely address, however some staff groups were of more concern, for example the Children Looked After Service only had an overall confidence level of 70%. Naturally an element of self-assessment is subjective, but given that these staff are dealing with one of the most vulnerable groups of children it will warrant further consideration.

• It is positive that in the majority of cases these areas were addressed in Action Plans, however WSCB sees the rigorous monitoring of these Action Plans as a key priority which will lead to a demonstrable level of improvement which can be clearly evidenced through regular challenge and support as well as subsequent audits.
Appendix 3 - Action Plans (Qualitative)

As stated above, all agencies and services who completed the questionnaire and self-assessment which identified gaps in safeguarding knowledge were required to develop an Action Plan to address these gaps.

74 agencies submitted an Action Plan (see Summary of Responses above)

An analysis of the Action Plans shows that the areas for improvement can be grouped into 16 key themes. They are:-

- Training (L&D) – including shadowing Children’s Specialist Services, Refresher training, induction, training for new starters and training using case studies
- Awareness of how and when to report Safeguarding concerns
- Accessible Safeguarding Information easily available
- All staff to be clear on who the agency safeguarding lead is.
- Safeguarding as a standing agenda item for staff meetings/supervision. To include safeguarding training needs and circulation of relevant safeguarding updates
- Better understanding of the safeguarding responsibilities of an agency and that ALL staff groups are included (including Agency Staff and volunteers)
- Further analysis of audit and self-assessment leading to service improvement/L&D (both collectively and individually)
- Up to date Policies and Procedures
- See the Adult, See the Child. Raise awareness of the guidance and its relevance to the settings
- Information Sharing – confidence about how, when and who to share with
- Better understanding of the role of the LADO and procedures for handling Allegations Against Professionals.
- Understanding of how to follow up concerns when it is felt they have not been adequately addressed
- Clarity around who workers should contact, external to their agency/organisation, when concerned about a child.
- More information on the outcome of referrals/concerns once they have been made
- More opportunities within the agency to discuss potential concerns
- Improve safeguarding information for children & young people, parents and carers

The table below breaks down the number and type of agency who identified the above in their Action Plans. This is further analysed in the “Summary of Audit Findings” section of the report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total No. Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training (L&amp;D) – including shadowing Children’s Specialist Services, Refresher training, induction, training for new starters and training using case studies</td>
<td>Early Intervention, Primary School x9, GP x11, Special School x3, Voluntary Organisation x2, CCG, CEIS, Childcare &amp; Business Consultancy, CRC, Children’s Centre x3, F&amp;CS, Independent School x4, Pupil Referral Unit x2, FRP etc, GLL Wandsworth Libraries, Housing, IDAS, Leisure &amp; Culture Division, SW London &amp; St George’s MHT, National Probation Service, Housing Association, SSS, School Stand. &amp; Improvement, FE College, St George’s NHS Trust, YOT, Youth Support Team</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of how and when to report Safeguarding concerns</td>
<td>Primary School x4, GP x2, Special School, Voluntary Organisation, CCG, CRC, Children’s Centre x2, F&amp;CS, Housing, Leisure &amp; Culture Division, Independent School x2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Accessible Safeguarding Information easily available | • Early Years  
• GP x3  
• Voluntary Organisation x2  
• CCG  
• F&CS  
• Independent School x2  
• Children’s Centre  
• Primary School x 3  
• FRP etc  
• National Probation service  
• FE College  
• St George’s NHS Trust  
• Police Borough Command | 19 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All staff to be clear on who the agency safeguarding lead is. | • Special School  
• CCG  
• Primary School x3  
• EWS  
• F&CS  
• IDAS  
• National Probation Service  
• Housing Association  
• GP x2  
• FE College  
• Independent School  
• Police Borough Command  
• YOY | 16 |
| Safeguarding as a standing agenda item for staff meetings/supervision. To include safeguarding training needs and circulation of relevant safeguarding updates | • Primary School x4  
• GP x3  
• CEIS  
• EWS  
• FRP etc.  
• Special School  
• Independent School x2  
• FE College  
• Voluntary Organisation | 15 |
| Better understanding of the | • CRC |
| safeguarding responsibilities of an agency and that ALL staff groups are included (including Agency Staff and volunteers) | • Independent School x4  
• Primary School x5  
• Special School  
• Priory Group  
• School Stand. & Improvement  
• Children’s Centre  
• YOT | 15 |
|---|---|
| Further analysis of audit and self-assessment leading to service improvement/L&D (both collectively and individually) | • Special School X2  
• CEIS  
• EIS  
• EWS  
• Independent School  
• Housing Association  
• Primary School  
• SSS  
• FE College  
• St George’s NHS Trust  
• Youth Support Team | 12 |
| Up to date Policies and Procedures | • Voluntary Organisation x2  
• Childcare & Business Consultancy  
• Primary School  
• EIS  
• FRP etc  
• National Probation Service  
• GP  
• Police Borough Command  
• Children’s Centre  
• Independent School | 11 |
| See the Adult, See the Child - Raise awareness of the guidance and its relevance to the settings | • Early Years  
• Primary School x3  
• EWS  
• F&CS  
• Children’s Centre  
• GP x2  
• St George’s NHS Trust  
• Voluntary Organisation | 11 |
| Information Sharing – confidence about how, when and who to share with | • GP x2  
• Voluntary Organisation x2  
• Independent School  
• Primary School x4 | 10 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Better understanding of the role of the LADO and procedures for handling Allegations Against Professionals. | ● Early Years  
● GP X2  
● Independent School  
● Primary School  
● SSS  
● Children’s Centre  
● FE College  
● St George’s NHS Trust |
| Understanding of how to follow up concerns when it is felt they have not been adequately addressed | ● Primary School x4  
● Special School  
● Independent School  
● GP  
● IDAS  
● Voluntary Organisation |
| Clarity around who the external professionals are to contact when concerned about a child. | ● Early Years  
● F&CS  
● GP  
● National Probation Service  
● Pupil Referral Unit |
| More information on the outcome of referrals/concerns once they have been made             | ● Academy  
● Primary School  
● SW London & St George’s MHT  
● FE College |
| More opportunities within the agency to discuss potential concerns                          | ● Voluntary Organisation  
● GP  
● Priory Group  
● FE College |
| Improve safeguarding information for children & young people, parents and carers           | ● Pupil Referral Unit  
● Independent School |

Number of participants: 9, 9, 5, 4, 4, 2
Appendix 4 - Interviews and Feedback

41 interviews were carried out with:

- 14 schools and Educational settings
- 1 GP practice
- 5 Health organisations
- Police Borough Command and CAIT
- National Probation Service and CRC
- 3 Youth Services
- Adult Safeguarding
- Family and Community Services
- 1 Faith Group
- 11 various services within statutory partner agencies.

22 Agencies provided feedback but were not interviewed. This was made up of:

- 7 GP Practices
- 10 Schools
- 5 Voluntary Organisations

The final phase of the Section 11 Audit was the Interview and Feedback phase. The purpose of this was to review and evaluate the audit process itself as well as to scrutinise completed audits and action plans. This would complete the learning cycle and elicit further audit improvement going forward.

The interview consisted of eight questions designed to generate discussion. They were:

- What was it like for you undertaking the S11 audit? Were there any surprises for you /did it confirm what you already knew?
- Was it easy to administer?
- Did you understand the process of answers?
- How many staff do you have in your agency/service/school who could have completed the S11 questionnaire in your agency? How many actually completed it?
- What grade/range of staff completed the questionnaire and who did not complete it?
- Please give an update on the implementation of your action plan.
- Is there anything more the WSCB could do to raise awareness of child safeguarding in your workplace?

The following agencies were interviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools x7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools x2 (1 Community and 1 Academy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Schools x3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Pupil Referral Unit
• F.E. College
• Children’s Centre
• Police Borough Command
• Police CAIT
• Adult Safeguarding
• Children Looked After Service
• Early Years Service
• Education Inclusion Service
• Family & Community Services
• Family Recovery Project/GAPS/BF
• Housing
• Leisure & Culture Division
• Lifelong Learning
• Safeguarding Standards Service
• SNDP
• Youth Offending Service
• Youth Support Team
• Youth Work
• National Probation Service
• CRC
• GP Practice
• South West London & St Georges Mental Health Trust
• St Georges NHS Trust
• Priory Group
• Wandsworth CCG
  • IDAS
The table below summarises the responses given to the first seven interview topics.

The responses given with regard to what more WSCB can do to raise child safeguarding awareness are key and therefore listed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Topic</th>
<th>Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What was it like for you undertaking the S11 audit? | The overwhelming majority of agencies interviewed found the audit to be a very useful and helpful process. One Primary School commented how good it is to have staff rethink safeguarding from time to time. An Academy felt that the questionnaire was useful in identifying areas where staff were not very confident and didn’t have a good understanding. The Early Years Service was pleased to report that it completed more audits this year than last. A GP found the process to be straightforward, helpful and the questions easy to understand. The Safeguarding Standards Service thought it was a very reassuring experience as it showed they had significantly improved as a service. SEN found the audit a very useful tool and so did the staff who gave very positive feedback. Priory Group saw it as a follow on from last year’s audit and felt they completed it better due to addressing issues which arose from the previous audit. Lifelong Learning reported that colleagues didn’t deem the audit necessary at first as they felt it related more to Adults services, but they found it very helpful in the end. However one secondary school found it to be “A pain. System fails to recognise time constraints for those agencies who deal with...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>children ‘in bulk’ – school understand need for audit and purpose of it, but time constraints make it a chore”</td>
<td>And St Georges NHS Trust Acute Services stated that “The process took a long time (hours). Found the timescale very tight.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any surprises for you /did it confirm what you already knew?</td>
<td>Again the majority of agencies interviewed were not surprised by the audit results and most reported that it confirmed what they already knew, but there were four main areas which several agencies felt the need to comment on. They were:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “See the adult, see the child” – which some staff found very tricky to answer. The agencies who reported this included schools and Health as well as two Council Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concern that staff did not know how to report safeguarding concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concern that staff did not know who their safeguarding lead was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gaps in training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were also some welcome surprises. For example the Police Borough Command was pleasantly surprised at B Police the knowledge of new intakes although they recognized that staff being posted in and out of borough was a challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And CRC were pleased that all staff recognized “See the adult, see the child”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was it easy to administer?</td>
<td>All agencies interviewed, except for one, felt the audit was easy to administer, although some of the larger agencies pointed out that it was a time consuming process, particularly in terms of getting all the returns in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Georges NHS Trust Community did not find the audit easy to administer as it required going out into the community to distribute the questionnaire to staff who did not have access to computers or used shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you understand the process of answers?</td>
<td>All agencies interviewed stated that they did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many staff do you have in your agency/service/school who could have</td>
<td>Although all agencies interviewed reported the number of staff who completed the audit, 12 did not provide the total number of staff who could have completed it, therefore it is not possible to calculate percentage completion rates for these agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed the S11 questionnaire in your agency?  How many actually</td>
<td>The majority of small to medium organisations able to be calculated had a completion rate of between 50 – 100%. Only two fell below 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed it?</td>
<td>In general the larger organisations met their target sample of 10%. St Georges NHS Trust Services had a 5.7% completion rate, however it should be borne in mind that this represented 460 completed returns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police Borough Command had an excellent response rate of 62% which amounts to 339 out of a possible 550.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What grade/range of staff completed the questionnaire and who did not</td>
<td>There was representation from all grades across the board including volunteers, groundsmen, administrators, outreach workers, ICT staff, catering staff, physiotherapists, social workers, managers, teachers, probation officers, doctors, nurses and police officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete it?</td>
<td>One Secondary school did acknowledge that the staff who completed the audit were not a representative sample as it contained a disproportionate number of senior staff. The school pointed out however, that this due to two reasons, namely “their increased level of responsibility meant DMS wanted to ensure senior staff completed it and they are easier to ‘grab’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please give an update on the implementation of your action plan.</td>
<td>This question elicited mixed types of responses. The majority of agencies interviewed described what they would or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had put into their action plan, rather than an update on progress against their current action plan.

As this has been reflected in the Action Plan section of this report it will not be replicated here, however it is important to note that in virtually all cases, the implementation of action plans was underway.

One Primary School and CRC stated that all their actions had been completed and St Georges NHS Trust Acute Services stated that their action plan would be fully implemented by July 2015.

Is there anything more the WSCB could do to raise awareness of child safeguarding in your workplace?

Just over 25% of agencies interviewed felt that there was nothing more the WSCB could do to raise awareness of child safeguarding in their workplace.

Below are suggestions made by the remaining agencies

From Schools:-

Would like the multiagency training delivered on inset day.

It would be helpful to have questions that relate specifically to schools and the board to make schools more ware of its functions.

The role of the education adviser for schools is very important

It would be helpful to have a good link with LA to have updates on requirements to avoid complacency

Communication from Social Workers to schools could be improved, especially re: outcomes of meetings, referrals, investigations, MARAC’s etc. Perhaps the WSCB could do something to improve that it would be very useful

Leaflets for schools to give to parents

Training for schools needs more differentiation now for secondary schools – issues of concern at some are more heavily weighted to gang related concerns; children running out of parental control; criminality / drugs; radicalisation. Also issues re staff ‘behaviour’ – especially re e-safety – despite training and input having been provided. Adolescent mental
health also a huge concern – depression; self harm / suicidal thoughts; issues of sexuality.

Finds the Education adviser role very helpful. Find twilight meeting very helpful

Find Family information service very helpful.

From the Police:-

Would appreciate comments and suggestions from the Board.

To strengthen the police relationship with Health

The police would like to contribute to agenda items for discussion for the WSCB meetings

From Other Agencies:-

Having access to multi-agency training

To see if HR can embed Ofsted DBS requirement

Would like to see disability safeguarding training

Small safeguarding information sheets that staff can carry about. E.g. a bookmark for diaries

Having a multiagency focus group for WSCB

How do we capture the needs of special needs children? Is it about parental choice/carers?

Are we assured that people in contact with the children are aware and recognise the issues?

To think through ‘Missing’ and ‘missing from care and education’ and including this in the Section 11 audit.

To hold partners to account and challenge

Issues with feedback regarding concerns

Training for staff (L&C)

Providing safeguarding leaflets for staff.

Named nurse of MHT to be copied into invites for CP conferences

To have guidelines for safeguarding training

Linking more with multi-agency safeguarding group.

To have safeguarding training programme/content evaluated by the WSCB to ensure it is fit for purpose

Board to give a brief awareness before the exercise comes up
To recognise risk associated with the adolescents and think about developing an associated training programme
Appendix 5 - Feedback from Agencies NOT Interviewed

22 Agencies who were not interviewed also provided feedback. They were –

- 7 GP Practices
- 10 Schools
- 5 Voluntary Organisations

The questions on the Feedback Form were the same as those asked at interview, with one additional question which was:

Is there anything the WSCB could do to improve the S11 questionnaire and S11 self-assessment audit process?

The responses to this question along with the question what more can WSCB do to raise child safeguarding awareness are listed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was it like for you undertaking the S11 audit?</td>
<td>All the agencies who fed back found the audit a useful evaluation exercise, however some found the process of administering it challenging. One school stated that despite finding the audit relatively easy it was necessary to read the instructions more than once to make sure it was being done properly. This view was echoed by a Voluntary Organisation who initially found the audit quite confusing and had to telephone the Board in order to clarify a number of the questions and talk through the process. However another Voluntary Organisation stated that at first it seemed as if the audit was going to be a very difficult task looking at the information that needed to go into the spreadsheet, but once the information was collated and they began inputting it onto the spreadsheet they realised it was easier than first thought. A Voluntary Organisation found it interesting to be able to check the safeguarding knowledge of their staff, rather than just assuming they are up to date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because they have done their training in a certain time frame.

A school commented that the audit questions asked were consistent with questions raised by OFSTED in a recent inspection (school were graded outstanding)

The majority of GPs who fed back while recognizing the benefits of the audit found it to be a very time consuming process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were there any surprises for you / did it confirm what you already knew?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In almost all cases the audit confirmed what agencies already knew. If there were any surprises it was mostly around gaps in training which were not expected, or caused by staff misunderstanding the questions (which was resolved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were some concerns that key staff did not appear to know who to contact when following up concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Voluntary Organisation was very surprised when they had a conflicting opinion with a volunteer (who was also a qualified social worker in Wandsworth) over whether they required refresher training every three years. The social worker/volunteer and their line manager did not believe this was necessary as safeguarding was a key element of their everyday job, however the Voluntary Agency did not believe this was consistent with the information they had around Refresher training and the social worker/volunteer was booked to go on this. It will be worthwhile for WSCB to clarify ongoing safeguarding training requirements for qualified social workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Special School was surprised that some agency staff said they had not received safeguarding training although when they questioned this with the supplier agencies themselves they were told that they undertook this as part of the induction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
process. It is possible that agency staff may have interpreted the question as to mean when they had undertaken training at the Special School itself.

In a Pupil Referral Unit one of the Governors had responded that they did not have responsibility for safety and wellbeing of the children that their organisation was responsible for. This was a big surprise as the PRU works firmly within an ethos that safeguarding is everyone’s responsibility. Addressing this issue was the first priority on their action plan.

Finally, one GP was pleasantly surprised that several colleagues commended him/her for helping to improve safeguarding in the practice.

| Was it easy to administer? | Almost all agencies who fed back found the audit to administer  
|                           | The only real challenges were identified by some Voluntary Organisations. These were due to staff working irregular hours (some only one night per month) or coming in to deliver specific sessions. Several staff did not understand or respond to the “See the adult, see the child” question  
|                           | Similarly, one GP found it difficult because there wasn’t an opportunity to have all staff complete the audit simultaneously, therefore he/she had to supervise 3 separate groups doing the audit at 3 different times |
| Did you understand the process of answers? | Three agencies clearly stated that they did not understand this question or what was meant by “the process” of answers, pointing out that sometimes although the actual meaning of the question may be clear to the setter, it isn’t always clear to others. |
| How many staff do you have in your agency/service/school who could have completed the S11 questionnaire in your  | There was a very good response rate from the agencies who fed back with around half reporting 100% completion. Of the |
agency? How many actually completed it? remainder, the completion rate did not fall below 50% other than one school with a completion rate of 25%.

Two agencies did not provide the total number of staff who could have completed the questionnaire.

What grade/range of staff completed the questionnaire and who did not complete it? As with the agencies who were interviewed there was representation from all grades of staff.

Please give an update on the implementation of your action plan. Seven schools, three GPs and one Voluntary Organisation all reported their action plans fully implemented. All action plans were well underway for the remaining eleven agencies.

Is there anything the WSCB could do to improve the S11 questionnaire and S11 self-assessment audit process?

9 of the 22 agencies who fed back made suggestions as to how the audit could be improved. These are summarized below

**From GPs:-**

*It could be more targeted at General Practice – i.e. the questions could potentially be more specific?*

*keep promoting it and why it needs to be done.*

*Time wise it would be ideal if this could be done at a different time of year as the end of financial year/QOF year as well as winter time is the most busy time a year in general Practice.*

**From Schools:-**

*One issue – which is a perennial issue with Safeguarding – is how to keep the issue of Safeguarding ‘fresh’ with staff – something that delivers the basic message clearly and unequivocally – but isn’t just repeating the same few things over and over. It’s a bit the same with this audit – some staff didn’t fill it in as they said – ‘I did this last year’ - perhaps look into a carousel of audit activities (maybe 3 or 4?) that you could rotate so people don’t feel they are covering old ground and would be more motivated to complete the activity – you could also choose specific topics some year to drill down into people’s awareness of them eg*
FGM / self harm / prevent strategy

Also – ‘test drive’ the questions with all stakeholders in the audit first before going live – in this way obscure or jargon based or acronymic questions can be highlighted and rephrased.

Will be good to have some specific issue questions next year as this will help move things forward

The areas for improvement are more around our concerns about thresholds.

Change the questions slightly each year so a fresh prospective can be given on any gaps that need to be filled.

From Voluntary Organisations:-

The spreadsheet on which we had to input the data was really confusing. It seemed to want the answers transferred into numbers, but had no information as to how we were supposed to do that. I am sure I got it wrong when I sent it off, but I couldn’t work out what I was supposed to do.

Consider wording of questions & instructions to administer ~ all extremely confusing!
Perhaps trial with one or two willing centres & amend as advised before distributing more widely?

Happy with the questionnaire and the audit process. I think it is important to keep reminding all our team of the importance of safeguarding and to get them to think about our own procedures here as well.

Is there anything more the WSCB could do to raise awareness of child safeguarding in your workplace?

34% of agencies who fed back felt that there was nothing more the WSCB could do to raise awareness of child safeguarding in their workplace.

Below are comments made by the remaining agencies

From GPs:-

The Named GP for child safeguarding in Wandsworth is based at Bridge Lane so we have regular discussions about safeguarding children. We have asked before for feedback on cases where things ‘went well’ as a useful educational and motivational tool. Succinct bulletins of the safeguarding board priorities might also be useful.

Maybe watching an on-line video would be easier to refresh knowledge, as part of level training

Staff are well aware of policies and procedures regarding safeguarding and this is very
reassuring. Regular training sessions will still be needed for new staff who join and current staff for updates

I would like to suggest that non-clinical staff should be trained like before.

**From Schools:**

Wandsworth are very good at keeping the school informed of safeguarding matters – e.g. model policies, new guidance, summaries etc. and this is greatly appreciated. Please continue to send useful information. Safeguarding support is more comprehensive than other areas.

It is really the school staff that raise awareness of safeguarding in schools so supporting the Designated members of Staff is a high priority. I know my DMS colleagues and myself really appreciate the expertise and support of the Education Advisor in delivering Safeguarding to a high standard.

We think you send good reminders about courses plus relevant posters and information that we pass to staff an put up around school.

The Education Advisor has been fantastic and completed an audit with me and our school. She also met our pastoral year leaders and has been amazing at sending through updates. Thank you very much!

**From Voluntary Organisations:**

We do all of our safeguarding training through Wandsworth TPD but sometimes the training days are few and far between, it can be hard to find one in the near future.

More about safeguarding disabled children would be good – we would be happy to work together in this area.

In relation to the issue of needing refresher training every 3 years ~ it was very hard to find anything written on the Intranet/safeguarding page to confirm this or show this is the recommended frequency.

Improvements could be made by you agreeing to come and do safeguarding training with us and not expect us to apply for the general courses you run for volunteers. There are too many of us to fit into your group sessions and we have been long awaiting your agreement to come to us. As we provide such a valuable support for so many vulnerable families in the Borough, all without Borough funding (apart from a recent short term project with Public Health) it seems a small thing to ask in return.

We do provide good Safeguarding training of our own but I feel it important that volunteers should have some training delivered by the Local Authority as well.

More access to refresher training.
### Appendix 6 - Audit Process - Strengths and Areas for Development

In line with its purpose, the Interview and Feedback phase identified strengths and weaknesses in the Audit process. These are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The S11 audit was a useful tool to assess and address areas to develop</td>
<td>Can be time consuming to get all staff to complete and then analyse all the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helped throw up things and reinforce things already known</td>
<td>Time constraints make it difficult to complete in some organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really excellent for identifying needs and gaps in training.</td>
<td>Q7 probably needed to be rewritten to be made clear – a number of returns did not understand the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process very useful, not just as a paper exercise but also the areas of improvement that came out of it were reassuring.</td>
<td>It could be quite confusing initially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice, efficient way to audit- helpful and easy to use</td>
<td>Can seem like a daunting task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helped identify gaps particularly for non frontline teaching staff.</td>
<td>It can be challenging to get part time and voluntary staff to complete the audit when they work irregular hours and not frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process was quite straightforward and good as a follow on from last year’s audit. Very helpful. It gave a snap shot of what’s happening</td>
<td>Difficult to administer if staff out in the field do not have access to computers or printers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An excellent experience as it was a formal way to elucidate how well the staff were informed about safeguarding procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It triggered other areas of safeguarding and identified specific training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The S 11 audit was much better this year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the questionnaire is to enable the local safeguarding children board to support all staff properly to safeguard children.

This questionnaire is to be completed by as many staff as possible within your organisation, agency, school or setting who do not have a designated safeguarding responsibility. This will include receptionists, premises officials, volunteers, contracted staff, school governors, teachers, social workers, mental health workers, stakeholders, trainees, as well as any other direct employee of your organisation.

Analysis of the completed questionnaires will help you to understand the strengths of and gaps in your staff’s knowledge. This will enable you to develop appropriate learning opportunities and training.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS 5, 6, 9, 12, 13 & 15 MUST BE DEFINED BY YOU BECAUSE THE ANSWERS DIFFER FROM ONE SAMPLE GROUP TO ANOTHER. PLEASE DO SO BEFORE YOUR STAFF FILL IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

ADMINISTERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. PLEASE ALLOW BETWEEN 10-20 MINS TO COMPLETE THIS EXERCISE

2. FOR LARGE AGENCIES, SELECT A RANDOM (MINIMUM) 10% SAMPLE OF YOUR STAFF TO UNDERTAKE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

3. PLEASE ARRANGE FOR THIS COHORT TO FILL IT IN AT THE SAME TIME AND WITH NO CONFERRING

4. PLEASE TELL STAFF BEFORE THEY FILL IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE THAT YOU WILL BE COLLATING THE ANSWERS FROM ALL COMPLETED FORMS IN ORDER TO PRODUCE A REPORT TO THE WSCB. ALL ANSWERS WILL BE ANONYMISED

5. PLEASE NOTE THE GUIDANCE COMMENT WITHIN THE ANALYSIS FORM
Appendix 8 - WSCB S11 Self-assessment Safeguarding Questionnaire (Section 11 Children Act 2004)

Guidance for completing the audit analysis form of completed S11 Self-assessment questionnaires

Section 11 of the Children Act 2004 places duties on a range of organisations and individuals to ensure their functions, and any services that they contract out to others, are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

The S11 self-assessment questionnaire designed by the Wandsworth Safeguarding Children Board (WSCB) is one of the key tools being used by the WSCB to assess and monitor to support all staff properly to safeguard children. This questionnaire is to be completed by as many staff as possible within your organisation, agency, school or setting who do not have a designated safeguarding responsibility. This will include receptionists, premises officials, volunteers, contracted staff, school governors, teachers, social workers, mental health workers, stakeholders, trainees, as well as any other direct employee of your organisation.

The analysis of the completed S11 self-assessment questionnaires will help you to understand the strengths of and gaps in your staff's knowledge. This will enable you to develop appropriate learning opportunities and training.

Please note that the answers to questions 2, 4, 5, 8, 9 & 13 must be defined by you because the answers differ from one sample group to another. Please do so before your staff fill in the questionnaires and you complete your analysis. The answer for Q 3 is 'As soon as practically possible'. The answer for Q 7 is 'Do you have any caring responsibilities for any child?' as the aim of this question is to identify whether staff understand the principle of 'See the Adult See the Child'. Please note an additional breakdown for Q 13 - please indicate for WSCB's information who many of your staff have had training in each of the timeframe periods. Please aggregate an average for Q14 of how confident your staff are in recognising safeguarding concerns and seeking advice/support to appropriately fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities.

In the top row, add your organisation, school, agency or setting’s name. The columns 'Staff group 1', 'Staff group 2', etc. needs to changed and defined by you - to reflect who undertook the self-assessment in your service, school, organisation, etc. If more than 8 different cohorts/groups have completed, you will need to expand the range within the template and add the additional number of columns required.

Please remember that if you have identified some areas for learning and improvement, to complete an action plan and return this with your audit analysis form to the WSCB by 13th March 2015- wscb@wandsworth.gov.uk

If you have any difficulty in doing this, please feel free to contact Linde Webber, WSCB Manager on 020 8871 8610 or by email lwebber@wandsworth.gov.uk.