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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 is the third year where WSCB has completed their S11 audit using the methodology described below. This follows the Ofsted Inspection of services for children in need of help or protection, children looked after and care leavers and Review of the effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board which took place between 24 November – 17 December 2015. The WSCB Section 11 audit was viewed extremely favourably by the Ofsted inspectors, and in the Inspection report published in February 2016 it stated:

“The LSCB has ensured that safeguarding is a priority for all its partners through an exemplary range of Section 11 self-assessment audits. The format of these has enabled extensive engagement of agencies and practitioners, including close involvement from General Practitioners. Learning from these was incorporated into an independent report and widely published. This has enabled the LSCB to help partners improve their individual safeguarding practice and to identify some common areas that required improvement. These have been systematically addressed by the board, for example to ensure all staff and volunteers know who their safeguarding lead is and who to speak to if they have concerns”.

This report will build on this very positive foundations built during the past two years. It provides an update on the recommendations which came out of the 2015 Audit, looks at trends over the past three years then sets out the detail of the Section 11 Audit carried out in 2016. 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 2016 and into the following year.

Section 11 Audit Report 2015 – Update on Recommendations

The 2015 Section 11 Audit report made 10 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>Agencies who have staff who do not feel able to fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities (that fell below 75%), were called in for interviews with S11 Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review group and discussed strategies and actions to be taken to</td>
<td>address this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to rigorously monitor the delivery of agency Action Plans.</td>
<td>This has partly been addressed through the S11 Audit Review Interview process and analysis of action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to ensure that learning from Serious Case Reviews and research</td>
<td>This is an ongoing matter which is being monitored through Serious Cases Improvement &amp; Learning (SCIL) Sub-Committee. Part of the audit process will be to re-audit previously considered audit themes, which will include lessons from SCRs, to ensure that practice has improved as a result of actions taken and implementation of action plans. A learning from experience event is held for practitioners to share the lessons and recommendations, which will include local learning and lessons from key national reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are completely embedded across agencies and that this can be clearly</td>
<td>evidenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to establish whether agencies are compliant with statutory</td>
<td>Due to competing priorities, this has not been audited this year, but ‘Missing Children’ is most likely to be on the audit programme for 2017-18. Missing children guidance and policies are reviewed annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance on Children Missing from Home and Care, and Children</td>
<td>Missing Children guidance and policies are reviewed annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to challenge all agencies on their approaches to dealing with</td>
<td>The WSCB requested all members to deliver presentations at the Network Board re. action taken to raise awareness and address CSE and FGM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safeguarding in terms of -</td>
<td>The WSCB also calls in lead agencies on Gangs, CSE, Prevent/Radicalisation, Online safety, LADO, etc. – to report to the WSCB on an annual or bi-annual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adult mental health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safe recruitment practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Child Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gangs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peer on peer abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Radicalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FGM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- E-safety and abuse using new technologies and social media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to consider whether to devise agency specific audits</td>
<td>This action was taken and the audit questionnaire was adapted for specific agencies, such as social care, CAIT and St George’s Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to incorporate “Lessons to be Learned” into future Section 11</td>
<td>I.e. Step Up/Step Down audit was undertaken, following queries/comments raised during interviews, alongside previously agreed audit themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCB to ensure that agencies allow sufficient opportunities for staff to discuss potential safeguarding concerns</td>
<td>This was incorporated in the revised questionnaire for 2015-16, which highlighted majority of staff do have opportunities to discuss and raise safeguarding concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</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>During 2016-17 audit evaluation interview process it was highlighted by all interviewed that they are finding this is useful process and tool and that some are incorporating it into their induction process, linked to Performance Management Targets and reviews of staff, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agencies are requested to provide evidence of single agency safeguarding audits and QA processes, which is reviewed within SCIL. Within education sector just under half of schools have undertaken a detailed safeguarding audit, supported by the Safeguarding in Education Advisor. Health undertake a number of audits annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Section 11 Audit 2016

**Methodology**

The audit was carried out over four phases which took place between February – May 2016

- **Phase 1** – The Audit Questionnaire
- **Phase 2** – Analysis of returns and Self-assessment
- **Phase 2b** – Strategic Safeguarding Self-Assessments
- **Phase 3** – Action Planning
- **Phase 4** – Interviews and Feedback

As shown above, an additional element was introduced into Phase 2 this year - Phase 2b - in the form of the WSCB Strategic Safeguarding Self-Assessment Audit Form (SSSA), which was designed to evidence the commitment of Senior Leadership Teams (SLTs) to driving forward safeguarding as a key part of their agency’s strategic agenda,

These four different types of activity provide both qualitative and quantitative 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. At the same time the SSSA was completed by Senior Leadership Teams.

Following this, Wandsworth Safeguarding Children Board (WSCB) requested that each agency carry out an analysis of the results of the Questionnaire. 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 and to give the audit some context.

Most significantly 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 16 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 2b**

This second part of the self-assessment phase was a new element introduced to the 2016 Section 11 Audit. It contained 8 safeguarding objectives which senior leadership teams were required to evidence progress against by answering a series of questions under each objective. This was to ensure that agency leaders were fully aware of their position in terms of safeguarding practice and were able to demonstrate a strategic understanding and grip of what their agency needed to do to...
ensure child safeguarding was addressed throughout all aspects of their work and was high up on the strategic agenda.

**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. The interviews consisted of a series of questions/discussion topics. Analyses of the interviews are presented in the “Interview and Feedback” section of this report.

**Summary of responses**
Overall the questionnaire and self-assessment response was the most positive received so far. It demonstrates a year on year improvement in agency engagement and effectively demonstrates the benefit agencies see in taking part in the Section 11 audit. 127 agencies returned audits (7 more than last year) with 5,118 workers completing the questionnaire this year. This is a 6% increase on the number of individual questionnaires completed in 2015 and marks a continuing improvement in the number of staff members across the partnership taking part. 60 audits were received from schools and educational settings This increases the number of schools/educational settings taking part by almost a third and is an excellent response. Other agencies have also increased their number of returns e.g. Early Years returned a very impressive 927 completed questionnaires. 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

- The Audit questions should be reviewed to take on board differences in role, responsibilities and understanding of staff completing the questionnaire.
- Consideration should be given to the language used in the questionnaire and guidance to avoid any confusion around their meaning, what answers are expected and the fact that all members of staff should complete the questionnaire.
- WSCB should consider agency feedback relating to the timing of the Audit to ensure it meets with periods of agency capacity therefore eliciting maximum response and minimum burden.
- Thought should be given to the best way to administer the audit and whether to use the Survey Monkey tool.

Summary of Findings

Questionnaires

- Once again, 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 and the majority confidence level was 80% and above.
- Where agencies confidence levels fell below 70% (4 agencies) this was as a result of particular groups of staff who would not have a high instance of contact with child safeguarding issues e.g. the Bereavement Team in Enable Leisure and Culture, who are responsible for booking burials and cremations. This should be taken into account.
- The question which appeared to cause the most confusion what that around who staff would contact if they had concerns about a colleague’s behaviour with children. Responses to this question varied and for some agencies produced surprising results. Through the interview process, it was established that many staff members were not clear if the question referred to the LADO, the Designated Safeguarding lead or the staff member’s immediate line manager. But agencies interviewed stated that their staff would certainly tell one of these three roles if they did have a concern which is reassuring.

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.

- Following trends of the past two years, training came out as the area which every agency felt had to be addressed. All 83 agencies who submitted action plans felt that training/learning & development was a key issue to be dealt with at all levels. This is an increase from the 2015 audit when 68% of agencies included training in their Action Plans. No other for area for action came close to being included at this level. Whilst it is commendable that agencies wish to ensure that their staff are suitably
skilled at the appropriate level in pertinent safeguarding areas, care should be taken not to see training as a magic bullet which will address every gap, and perhaps more thought should be given to evaluating the impact of training rather than simply looking at whether training has taken place.

- The next most frequently stated actions were “All staff and volunteers are clear about when concerns and worries should be discussed and with whom” and “Ensure every staff member knows the name of the safeguarding lead(s)” which were identified by 11 and 10 agencies respectively.

- The remaining 16 areas identified for action fell into single numbers in terms of number of agencies who included them in their Action Plans (see table below). Understanding the role of the LADO and being aware of the 7 golden rules of information sharing appeared in this group as did ensuring that staff are aware of the London Child Protection Procedures and to a lesser degree, Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015. Staff being aware of how to escalate concerns was also highlighted as an area for action for six agencies.

- 8 agencies (including 5 Primary Schools) included “Feedback and further analysis of S11 audit to identify gaps in staff knowledge and ensure these are addressed” as an action. This is a slightly smaller percentage than last year, but it may be that agencies do this as a matter of course and didn’t feel the need to explicitly identify it as an action. Certainly the interviews indicate that agencies see the audit and self-assessment as a very useful tool which is used in different ways as outlined in this report.

- It is interesting to note that “Embedding learning from Serious Case Reviews” did not feature strongly in Action Plans, and yet when this was specifically asked about in the Strategic Self-assessments, there was little evidence to suggest that leaders were actively addressing this issue.

[NOTE IN 3 YR ANALYSIS HOW SAME SUBJECTS COME UP AGAIN AND AGAIN]

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 and individuals taking part in the audit showed an increase yet again from the previous. This shows that the Borough maintains a commitment to child safeguarding and should be commended. However WSCB should take note of the comments made in interviews regarding type of questions and language used in the questionnaire going forward and evolve the process accordingly. This will enable WSCB to gain a more insightful understanding of child safeguarding awareness and learning across all groups of staff.

- The introduction and use of the Strategic Self-assessment is an interesting development, and those that were completed provided a wealth of detailed information that in its own right could be subject to greater analysis, however as noted in this report, the number of agencies completing it along with the self-assessment and action plans, was very low. As well as this, a small number of agencies only completed the SSA and no other part of the audit. This warrants further exploration. It is interesting to note that the picture presented from senior manager level in the SSAs did not always equate with that coming out from the staff.
on the ground through the questionnaires. A detailed piece of comparison work might provide some interesting results.

- The interview phase this year involved the author of this report as chair of the interview panels. It is the author’s view that this is a positive step forward and allowed a greater understanding of the context of the self-assessments, as well as providing richer information which is included in this report. It would be helpful to continue this practice in future audits.

**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, including partners, to review the questionnaire and ensure the questions and language used are appropriate for different groups of staff – this may involve creating tiered questionnaires.

5. WSCB to provide clear agency guidance regarding expectations of levels of training for different groups of staff.

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

7. WSCB to consider ways of measuring the impact of training.

8. WSCB to review the use of the Strategic Self-assessment in the light of the completion rate and explore why some agencies only took part in this phase of the audit. It should be borne in mind however, that the SSAs which were completed provide a wealth of rich information and triangulating this with the self-assessments arising from questionnaires and interviews would be of benefit in understanding where the two don’t match and how this might be addressed.

9. WSCB to work with partners to put a system in place for identifying areas for improvement in child safeguarding and also encourage staff to get involved in this. Identified improvement areas to subsequently feed into planning and service development.
**Summary of Responses**

Below is a list of agencies who completed the questionnaire and submitted a self-assessment analysis.

### Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 GP Practices – which is five more practice responses than last year and amounts to almost half of all GP practices in the Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West London &amp; St George’s Mental Health Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priory Hospital – Roehampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Community Drug &amp; Alcohol Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School and other Educational settings’ returns were also very positive with 58 completing the audit forms. Below these are broken down by status.

### Schools & Educational Settings – Breakdown by Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Referral Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Schools</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.E College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home &amp; Hospital Tuition Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Academy of Dance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Early Years

- Franciscan Children’s Centre
- Granard Children’s Centre
- Hillbrook Children’s Centre
- Early Years PVI
- Early Years Children’s Centres
- Early Years & Intervention Support Services
- Child Minders

### Housing

- Wandsworth Council Housing
- Rent Collection
- Hanover Housing Association
- Octavia Housing Association
- A2 Dominion Housing Association
- Wandle
- Peabody Services in Wandsworth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Police</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Council Services</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Education Inclusion Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Leisure &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Welfare Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community &amp; CLA Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Numeracy Support Service (LNSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Standards Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Pregnancy Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Independent Living Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Offending Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Support Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Statutory and Partner Agencies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Probation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Schools &amp; Community Psychology Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Voluntary Organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Baked Bean Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Action Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupwork &amp; Parenting Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place2Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Parenting &amp; Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South London Swimming Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurgeons – Battersea Family Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Faith Groups</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Hill Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Road Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaweh Christian Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Church Battersea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Safeguarding Self-assessments

29 agencies submitted Strategic Safeguarding Self-Assessments. They were:

21 Schools/Education Settings
8 Statutory services and partner agencies

Action Plans

83 of the above agencies submitted Action Plans. They were:

14 GP Practices
6 Early Years groups and Children’s centres
2 Housing Associations
37 Schools and education settings
18 Statutory services and partner agencies
5 Voluntary Organisations
1 Faith group

Interviews

48 interviews were carried out with:

20 Statutory services and partner agencies
12 Schools
7 GP Practices
4 Health agencies
2 Voluntary Organisations
2 Faith Groups
1 Housing Association
Analysis of Responses

Self Assessments (Quantative)
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 Health Confidence
Percentage of Housing Confidence

Percentage of Police Confidence

Percentage of Borough Police Confidence

86%
Percentage of Council & Partner Agencies Confidence

Percentage of Voluntary Organisations Confidence
As can be seen, every agency group who completed the self-assessment rated their average confidence that staff fulfil their children safeguarding responsibilities at 80% or above.

Looking across all 127 individual settings who responded, only 4 fell below the 70% level. They were:

- Hanover Housing Association 67%
- CARAS 65%
- Enable Leisure & Culture 55%
- Royal Academy of Dance 55%

It is of some concern that other than Hanover HA, the remaining three agencies have direct contact with children and young people however these agencies were all interviewed and concerns were explored. It should also be noted that with regard to Enable Leisure and Culture, their percentage was reduced by the fact that Bereavement staff only had a 43% confidence level. The role of these staff is to book burials and cremations, therefore a response proportionate to these roles is not unexpected.

For CARAS, their overall score was brought down by the one Intern who completed the questionnaire and only rated her/his self a confidence rating of 3. Similarly, in the Royal Academy of Dance, the staff group who impacted on their collective level of confidence were non-teaching staff who have no contact with children and who returned a 30% confidence level.

It has to be said that other groups within these settings did not score particularly highly – around 65-70% confidence rates, but taking their roles into account this is an acceptable score, especially as the
majority knew who to talk to if they had any safeguarding concerns. It may be advisable for WSCB to consider a discrete piece of work analysing scores against roles as well as comparing similar roles across settings. When a comparison is made between the nine agency groups overall confidence level in 2015 and 2016, it has dropped by 3% this year. This is not a significant difference, but it is worth bearing in mind and exploring in which agencies it has specifically changed and why.

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 should lead to a demonstrable level of improvement which can be clearly evidenced through regular challenge and support as well as subsequent audits.

**Strategic Safeguarding Self-assessments**

As stated in the introduction above, the Strategic Self-assessments were a new element introduced into the Section 11 Audit process this year. The Strategic Self-assessment contains 8 safeguarding objectives which senior leadership teams were required to evidence progress towards by answering a series of questions under each objective. In answering each question, clear evidence had to be provided in terms of examples or explanations showing how desired outcomes had been achieved, thus demonstrating that agency leaders have a strategic understanding and grip of their agency’s current position in their journey to ensure child safeguarding is addressed throughout all aspects of their work and was high up on the strategic agenda.

21 schools and education settings as well as 8 other statutory and partner agencies completed the Strategic Self-assessment. Of these 29 returns, 12 agencies (41%) had **ONLY** completed the Strategic Self-assessment and not taken part in any other phase of the audit. (N.B The London Ambulance Service completes its audit centrally). These are marked with red asterisks in the table below. This means that the remaining 17 agencies amount to only 13% of all agencies who returned self-assessments/Action Plans or were interviewed. The reasons for this should be explored by WSCB. If agencies do not see the value in completing the Strategic self-assessment, or indeed in completing all three/four phases of the audit, then consideration should be given as to why this is, particularly as research has shown that the role of leaders in the safeguarding arena is vital if outcomes for vulnerable children are to be improved.

The agencies who returned the Strategic Self-assessment are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies who completed Strategic Self-assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Ross primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balham Nursery School and Children’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadwater Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church CE Primary School Battersea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dolphin School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Bevin College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eveline Day School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garratt Park School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatton School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Primary School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillbrook Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby House School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlin School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Heaven RC Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkgate House School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney High School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheringdale Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael’s Primary School **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas’s Clapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thames College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafcass **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation NPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Council (this was a council wide Strategic response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis Housing **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Ambulance Service **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police CAIT **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this section of the report, general results of the analysis will be provided then reported on by exception i.e. areas of good practice, or areas which may be of some concern or queried will be highlighted.

**Schools & FE College**

**Q1. Senior management commitment to the importance of safeguarding and promoting children’s welfare**

Schools and FE College all had a safeguarding lead, the lead varied from Head Teacher in some of the smaller schools to a member of the Senior Leadership team and DSLs.

Roles and responsibilities of the safeguarding lead also varied from fairly general e.g. “Ensuring the overall safety of all children at the school, training all staff on safeguarding issues” to lengthy and detailed responsibilities such as Thomas’s Clapham who listed the roles and responsibilities as:

- Deputy Designated Safeguarding Officer
- Deputy Designated Early Years Safeguarding Officer
- Designated Staff Allegations Officer
- Safeguarding policies
- Arranging and chairing bi-termly meetings
- New staff induction
- Staff training
- Risk assessments
- VLE page
- Bulletin messages
- Facilitates staff, student and parent training with external agencies
- Single Central Register

and Hornsby House School who stated it was:
“To take responsibility for the safeguarding of the children in the school. To update the policies in line with changes to safeguarding regulations and make sure they are available on the website. To attend meetings with external agencies when necessary. To monitor the wellbeing of the children in the school. To advise staff of any changes to regulations and update their knowledge accordingly.”

All schools have a statement of their safeguarding responsibilities towards children and which explains that safeguarding is everyone’s responsibility. This is available to all staff, mostly via the school website and many schools asked their staff to sign stating they had received and read it.

Policies are updated in line with safeguarding developments and training does take place. What was less evident was how schools embedded learning from Serious Case Reviews and multi-agency partnership reviews. Although this may be implicit in the general responses, only one or two specifically mentioned how they disseminated and took on board information from SCR and other reviews. This an area worth further exploration.

Around only a third of schools provided concrete examples of how information from WSCB were shared with managers and front line staff e.g. St Michael’s Primary stated:

“We have completed the WSCB 11 from and were commended in 2015 for the results. We take this survey seriously and if aspects arise which require addressing the individual member of staff has refresher training. In 2015 survey the Premises Officer needed clarification on certain documents relating to safeguarding and therefore had 1:1 refresher training. A final and important point to note: Safeguarding is on the Staff/Office/Leadership Agendas”

One school did not state what its safeguarding priorities were. Of the remainder, some gave general priorities such as ensuring the safety and wellbeing of all children, but many were more specific identifying e.g. FGM, Prevent, Forced Marriage, gangs and criminality as priorities. Four schools stated that WSCB priorities were included and one reported that “no - WSCB priorities are not included (good learning point here)”

Four schools indicated there were no areas for improvement in relation to safeguarding. Of the others, areas were mentioned such as training, confidence in recognising signs of Forced Marriage and Honour Based Violence, building closer ties with WSCB and staff to be updated on procedures. One school stated that its improvement areas were outlined in their action plan, and another that they awaited the results of the S11 audit to see what improvements were required.

Q2. A CLEAR STATEMENT OF THE AGENCY’S RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS CHILDREN IS AVAILABLE TO ALL STAFF

All schools had this in place as well as a complaints procedure for staff & other people to make a complaint about non-compliance to the agency’s procedures.

With regard to the complaints procedure being accessible to children and young people, there were various ways in which this was addressed. Some examples are given below

“The avenues the children have to explore complaints are: self-refer to Place 2 Talk to discuss any worries they have, and the school council so can speak to their designated school counsellor about things they are not happy about”.
“Our children speak to an adult of their choice and then the concerns are passed on to DSL”.

“Assemblies led by the Deputy Head and Year Leaders. Student questionnaires throughout the year. Posters around the school, in children’s planners and on the TLP”.

“Via the school website which is shared regularly with children. The children understand the ‘Paperweight Code’ and getting messages that are important and urgent to the Headteacher’s attention. We also have a ‘Listening Post’ post-box where children can write messages if they have a worry/concern and it is addressed by the Inclusion Team and if need be directed to the Headteacher.”

One Academy Primary School stated “At the moment there is only one for parents. I would like to see one in place for children. We have asked the school council to come up with an appropriate child friendly form, keeping it very visual and simple”.

And one Independent Secondary School stated that “Pupils are educated by pastoral staff on who to contact regarding safeguarding issues”.

It is perhaps this last response which seems least satisfactory, however it is difficult to assess the efficacy of these different methods without further analysis of complaints by children across schools.

Where the respondent was a commissioning agent, their arrangements included monitoring of S11 responsibilities. One school mentioned renting out hall space for clubs etc. It would be interesting to understand how schools ensure S11 is adhered to in these cases, particularly if clubs meet at the weekends when school staff are unlikely to be present.

Do policies and procedures have a positive impact on outcomes for children? This is not a particularly easy question to answer, as was demonstrated by some of the responses given e.g. “There have been no critical incidents in the school community amongst families who have NOT been identified by the school” and also “Policies and procedures are always referred to during meetings/review relating to children’s provision”

Whilst these are welcome statements, they do not necessarily evidence positive impact on children’s outcomes. On the other hand, some schools appeared to have potentially good systems in place for monitoring this. E.g.

“Through regular review and self-audit as well as external audit carried out by Ofsted, and the Local Authority. Through feedback from other professionals and as seen by pupil progress (academic and SMSC progress). Pupil questionnaires. Parent feedback/questionnaires: ‘Does your child feel safe at school?’ (98% of respondents said their children feel safe and are happy at school (Autumn 2015)”

As well as -

“We have a number of students monitored through our wellbeing panel whose attendance and progress is clearly being supported by interventions organised by us or through external agencies”

Good practice in this area should be shared amongst schools.

Q3. A clear line of accountability within the organisation for work on safeguarding and promoting the wellbeing of children
The majority of schools have a safeguarding governor in place and organisational charts on display, however one independent school warrants further development as their response was “At the time of writing, (this school) does not formally have a Governance structure. The Principals are consulted by the DSO and the Heads of school if required”. Clearly this is not an ideal situation and should be addressed. In two other cases the governance structure was identified simply as “the proprietor of the school”. Advice on a more formal structure should be explored here.

All schools who took part have safeguarding responsibilities towards children’s welfare explicitly stated in job descriptions, and all have effective supervision in place.

With regard to monitoring safeguarding practice within the school, most have an audit programme in place and some have carried out the Schools Safeguarding Audit. All schools should encouraged to go through this process. Monitoring also takes place through annual appraisals, termly and half termly monitoring meetings and several schools cited the S11 Audit as a key part of this process as well. From the responses given, there appear to be no significant gaps in this area.

Q4. Service development takes into account the need to safeguard and promote welfare and is informed, where appropriate, by the views of children & families

This objective explored how service users views are sought and what has been changed as a result of this. In the majority of cases, this is addressed by surveys/questionnaires completed by children and parents annually and throughout the academic year. As well as these, Parents Forums and PTA meetings are used.

One school holds fortnightly coffee mornings for parents where at least once a term parents who attend are asked to complete a questionnaire expressing any improvements that can be made in the school regarding services and support for families. Children’s views are most often heard through Student Council meetings. All but two schools reported that various changes have been made as a result of these consultations e.g. an electronic gate was fitted, first aid reporting was changed, the establishment of a wellbeing panel, policy on the use of mobile phones and photography, a dedicated member of staff for mentoring Yr 6 pupils and in one school user views have led to a greater focus upon anti bullying initiatives and supporting pupils who feel they are bullied. As a result of the work the school community did in this area the school gained accreditation from B.I.G. (Bullying Intervention Group) in 2015 and was the first in the Borough to achieve this.

Feedback from both parents and children on these changes has been very positive indicating high levels of co-operation and partnership working between schools, pupil and parents. Clearly this is seen as an important aspect of school life.

Q5. Effectiveness of training

Safeguarding learning and development is clearly embedded within the culture of all schools who completed the Strategic self-assessment. This takes place through Induction, INSET days and by attending formal training courses. Most schools carry out safeguarding training at two yearly intervals

One schools exceeds this by holding annual training at the start of each academic year for all staff and Governors with Local Authority input biannually. In addition to this, there are also termly refresher reminders as part of the ‘3 Rs Admin’ (Roles, Responsibilities and Reminders and designated Officer training is up to date and reviewed according to the LA guidelines. This is an excellent model and schools should give consideration to putting similar in place.
Although the majority of schools maintain a training log which ensures individual training is carried out within the required timescales, this was not reported in every self-assessment. Assurance should be gained that all schools are able to identify when training needs to be updated.

It is of some concern however that safeguarding training and development is not always included in appraisals, with the general response being – only if necessary. This seems to be a missed opportunity for identifying individual safeguarding training needs and should become a standing item on the appraisal agenda.

Schools frequently commented that the S11 audit was a valuable tool in assessing the impact and effectiveness of training and would welcome further ideas from WSCB on other methods of doing this. In addition, one school reported that “Prevent training and updated Safeguarding training has resulted in refining work scrutiny to include identifying curriculum areas where pupils may demonstrate being at risk of radicalisation”. This is a good example of a practical development which can arise directly from training.

One school repeats questionnaires and audits to ensure higher level of understanding/awareness following training. This is commendable.

Learning from Serious Case Reviews is variable. However some schools do incorporate it into annual training updates and some send staff to Learning from experience courses run by WSCB. In some cases schools do recognise that this is an area which can be improved upon.

Two schools did give good examples of the impact that learning from SCRs had on their practice. They were:

“Giving updates through briefings means that items are constantly highlighted on the agenda with reference to any learning from other reviews. Recently we reviewed the taking of medication by staff as a result of a case that was reviewed in the borough”

and

“For example PS attended meetings following a Serious Case Review / Coroner’s report on a serious case at a local school – which led to us establishing a wellbeing panel to avoid overlooking a case”

At the same time, another two schools demonstrated a need to understand that any SCR conducted in any local authority could identify lessons to be learned by any agency. This is illustrated by their comments which stated “Current no serious case reviews. Would amend policy if needed” and “n/a as we have never had any of the above here”. WSCB should work with these schools to ensure they are clear that lessons from SCRs can be learned nationally across agencies.

Q6. Safer recruitment

All schools reported having safer recruitment & selection procedures in place in line with statutory guidance, and if recruitment was not carried out by HR then at least one person on the recruitment panel had completed Safer Recruitment Training.

DBS checked are always completed before a new member of staff starts and this also applies in the case of volunteers, parent helpers, agency, temporary, sessional, contracted or self-employed staff. However one school did not respond on this point and they should be asked about this.
In terms of staff knowing the process and arrangements for dealing with a child protection / safeguarding allegation against a member of staff, professional or carer, the majority of schools stated that it is included in their safeguarding policies and included in induction and training, however the schools who had also completed the S11 audit felt that results showed that more work was needed to ensure that staff fully understood it and how it differed from whistleblowing. There was also evidence of this in the Strategic self-assessments submitted by those who didn’t complete the audit.

Six schools had made referrals to the LADO in the last two years. WSCB should assure itself that where schools had made no referrals it was not due to lack of understanding of the LADO process.

Q7. Multi-agency working

Schools overall demonstrated commitment to multi-agency working and they are engaged with EHitS and complete EHAs. They attend TAC meetings as well as Child Protection Conferences relating to their pupils.

Where there appears to be inconsistency is around resolving inter-agency differences in relation to thresholds, actions to be taken, decision-making, roles/responsibilities. Perhaps this is unsurprising considering that the S11 questionnaires showed that few respondents were aware of the WSCB Escalation Policy and addressing this was frequently included in Action Plans. Clearly this has been an area of uncertainty.

Below is a sample of responses schools gave relating to resolving inter-agency differences:

“Open communication and clear line of communication between concerned parties. (We have not had any disagreements to quote – but contact Stella at Wandsworth if we are unsure)”

“Any differences are raised promptly and all difficulties have always been able to be resolved”

“Look at the Action plan, Discuss with the lead professional, Take it to the local authority”.

“We would communicate our concerns through contacting the relevant staff members”

In addition, 3 schools responded by saying that this issue was not applicable to them.

WSCB should ensure that agencies have clarity on escalation.

Half of schools who completed the SSA were not represented on WSCB or its sub-committees had no involvement in WSCB meetings.

Another issue worth noting from this section were in relation to “See the Adult, See The Child”. The following question was asked – “How have you ensured that those workers in your agency who work with adults who are parents or carers or who may have caring responsibilities for children or young people, are familiar with safeguarding procedures and practices?”

The only response stating that “See the Adult, See the Child” was part of their safeguarding training came from the FE College. Some schools interpreted the question as relating to making parents/carers aware of Safeguarding policies, but the majority either didn’t give a response or said that this was not applicable to them. WSCB should endeavour to work with schools on developing knowledge in this area.
Q8. Effective Information Sharing

One school gave no answer to any points of this question, however by and large, most schools seemed confident that information was shared appropriately and in line with the seven golden rules of information sharing, although another school stated that “All staff know that information sharing is highly confidential”. It may be that WSCB should further explore this with the school.

Looking at inter-agency communication as a whole, schools did describe some difficulties with this e.g. “Communication in terms of navigating pathways, referral processes and availability” and “Sometimes information is difficult to obtain from certain multi agency partners such as health”. One school also stated “We are occasionally concerned at the lack of feedback from Children’s Services following requests for information on specific pupils. We also find the high rates of staff turnover in some aspects of Children’s Services in some boroughs makes it difficult to establish relationships and networks”. Another school cited difficulties with “Other agencies informing us when agency staff changes for whatever reason”.

Effective communication is vital in safeguarding children, therefore it is important that when difficulties arise they are resolved promptly and with commitment.

Other Statutory Agencies

Eight other statutory agencies completed the SSA. They were:

Cafcass
Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group
Probation NPS
Wandsworth Council (this was a council wide Strategic response)
Genesis Housing
London Ambulance Service
Borough Police
Police CAIT

Below is an analysis of their responses.

Q1. Senior management commitment to the importance of safeguarding and promoting children’s welfare

All agencies had a safeguarding lead operating at a senior level. As with schools, however, their roles and responsibilities varied. For instance the Borough Police safeguarding lead has responsibility for the missing persons unit, gangs & safeguarding team (including local response to Child Sexual Exploitation), Community Safety Unit (investigating domestic abuse & hate crime), JIGSAW (managing Registered Sex Offenders, some of whom have offended against children), Schools Officers & Volunteer Police Cadets, MPS contributions to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub, Youth Offending Team and Family Recovery Project & Licencing. Whereas in CAFCASS, safeguarding responsibilities lie with The Operational Management Team where “each senior operational manager is responsible for the quality of practice within their service area(s) and has one or more safeguarding matters within their portfolio on which they hold lead responsibility such as private/public law policy and practice developments, child protection policy, area quality reviews or support to the Family Justice Young People’s Board (FJYPB). These roles are supported by central Cafcass functions”.
These agencies have clear safeguarding policies, some of which are set centrally. They do have safeguarding priorities, but these are not necessarily devised at individual borough level e.g., the Borough Police priorities are set by the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and are outlined in the Policing & Crime Plan for London 2013-2016. The priority for Police Cait is to prevent and detect intrafamilial child abuse and child sexual exploitation”. Their priorities are set across the Met. Wandsworth Council on the other hand have Corporate Objectives which include 8 relating to children and families e.g. Improve children and young people’s health and reduce teenage pregnancy, as well as promote and ensure the safety of children and young people, including children and young people who go missing or are at risk of sexual exploitation. The Council Chief Executive states that “Whilst the WSCB objectives are not explicitly included our objectives do reflect the needs of CLA, vulnerable young people, the importance of Early Help and key area such as CSE and missing. Our Corporate Objectives will be refreshed in June 2016”.

In terms of areas for improvement, the Chief executive goes on to say “The recent Ofsted inspection has highlighted areas for improvement, which are being taken forward via an Improvement Plan”.

The CCG’s areas for improvement are outlined in a Safeguarding Work Plan which “sets out how the current objectives relating to safeguarding will be taken forward, including actions agreed with NHS England at the safeguarding ‘deep dive’”. Police Cait on the other hand state that they have no areas for improvement.

Genesis Housing has three areas for improvement – raising safeguarding awareness in staff groups e.g. contractors, putting on specific safeguarding training and to “Develop a review mechanism to ensure all learning from serious and/or complex safeguarding cases is captured and disseminated across Genesis”.

**Q2. A clear statement of the agency’s responsibility towards children is available to all staff**

All of these agencies have a safeguarding policy which includes their responsibility towards children, as well as a published complaints policy. In terms of making this accessible to children and young people, Wandsworth Council cites the recent Ofsted Inspection Report where it was stated “Advocacy is provided through commissioned services. This is supporting young people to engage with the multi-agency meetings that concern them and helping to constructively resolve any complaints they may have”.

Borough Police state that “Access to the complaints procedure is available to anyone via the 101 telephone number or via the MPS website. Presentations on the complaints procedure were included in the most recent public meeting of the SNB, to which the youth council and police youth think tank were invited. Schools officers are posted to all the borough’s secondary schools and attend the quarterly Police Youth Think Tank meetings to provide advice on all police interactions with young people, which frequently involve discussions on the complaints procedure”.

However some agencies, such as Genesis Housing do not refer to accessibility at all, and Wandsworth CCG simply states that their complaints policy is on the website. This should be further explored.

The impact of policies in terms of improving outcomes for children is measured in varying ways, some of which are clearer than others. Most agencies refer to management information as the
mechanism for reviewing performance, although Borough Police state that they have no formal mechanism for measuring the medium and long term impact on children’s outcomes, and whilst the London Ambulance Service states that the Safeguarding Committee meets every 6 weeks, it lists Staff job descriptions (includes safeguarding roles and responsibilities), minutes of supervision sessions and meeting minutes as the ways it knows that outcomes are being improved. This is a weak area.

Q3. A clear line of accountability within the organisation for work on safeguarding and promoting wellbeing

As you would expect, statutory agencies have strong governance arrangements in place. Genesis Housing, of course, is slightly different from the others in size and status, and in terms of governance states that “Safeguarding is everyone’s responsibility from the Board down to the front line and back up again”. This should be strengthened.

The SSAs show that safeguarding responsibilities are made explicit in job descriptions and effective supervision is in place. In terms of monitoring safeguarding practice, Borough Police have reported that although they work to the Met pan London arrangements “It is intended that for the next year (April 16- April 17) every member of staff at Wandsworth will be set a PDR objective in relation to safeguarding”. This is an extremely innovative step to take and must be commended. It would be hoped that the Metropolitan Police across London will follow in Wandsworth’s footsteps and also adopt this practice which would demonstrate a real commitment to safeguarding.

Q4. Service development takes into account the need to safeguard and promote welfare and is informed, where appropriate, by the views of children & families

Overall there is a good level of engagement with children & young people and all agencies take into account the views of service users in service development. This happens in different ways; in some cases it comes from the analysis of complaints and by conducting surveys e.g. the national service user feedback survey conducted by CAFCASS on an annual basis. Wandsworth Council also engages with children and young people via Click (which the CEO attends regularly), the care leavers forum (which he has also attended) “and the Youth Forum, who are actively engaged in consultation exercises targeted at young people and who also have presented to members at Committee”

The London Ambulance Service carries out a wide range of engagement activities including:

“Materials (puzzles and quizzes etc.) are available on the LAS website (Key Stage 1, with Key Stage 2 materials being developed) to engage children.

Insight in to management Programme, where we work with a group of six-formers on a project.

**Wide range of activities across the Trust to engage children and young people, including:**

- **School visits (all ages)**
- **Cubs, scouts, brownies, guides etc.**
- **Junior Citizen Schemes (mostly year 6)**
- **Knife crime education (all ages); this includes visits in specialist units such as pupil referral units, youth offending teams and prisons etc.**
- **Road safety activities**
- **Careers events/ development activities**
- **Fairs, fetes, and fun days**
Whilst these activities are not mostly directed at the design/development/delivery stage, they do provide opportunities for children and young people to give us feedback about services and express their views.

Wandsworth Borough Police also seek young people’s views by having “a quarterly Police Youth Think Tank, which allows a cross-section of local young people comment on our services; the agenda and content for these meetings is set by the Youth Council and are specifically targeted at those policing activities that the Youth Council feel have most impact on younger people. These structures are supported by a range of public engagement events at ward level throughout the year, led by Safer Neighbourhood Teams, which include virtual ward panels as a consultative group”.

Although not every agency gave an example of the impact of consultation, WCCG reported that “Within the Children’s Therapies service redesign the work with service users influenced the development of a training and empowerment programme for parents. We learnt that parents felt disempowered by our systems, and they wanted more skills so they could more effectively support their children”.

And Wandsworth Council stated that “A recent example of the impact of consultation can be seen in Paper 15-437, which deals with proposals relating to Children’s Centres”.

Borough Police also provided the example of “The quarterly Borough Stop & Search Scrutiny Panel is now supported by a six monthly Youth Stop & Search Scrutiny event”

Q5. Effectiveness of Training

All agencies have safeguarding training programmes in place. WCCG provide Level 1 training every 3 years and annually for safeguarding staff.

Wandsworth Council demonstrate a whole staff approach to safeguarding training. In their SSA the CEO states that “Completing this questionnaire has highlighted to me that whilst we have good safeguarding training, it is not easily accessible to officers in departments such as Administration or Finance as they are not used to using TPDOnline. I have therefore asked colleagues in HR to make sure that safeguarding courses are more visible to all staff”.

And Genesis Housing demonstrated their commitment to training by reporting – “There is a current programme of safeguarding training available for staff, dependant on their role. All staff have to undertake a mandatory e-learning module around safeguarding which sets out their and Genesis’ key responsibilities and how they would deal with a safeguarding concern, including the making of a referral and the immediate involvement of the emergency services where appropriate. Staff that have direct contact and/or caring/support responsibilities will then also be required to undergo further mandatory training that takes place on a face to face basis. This is part of a new training strategy around safeguarding and is currently being rolled out”.

The majority of agencies have a system in place for monitoring take up and attendance at training and many report on this at a senior level e.g. Wandsworth Council where the CEO states that – “Multi-agency safeguarding training take-up and attendance is monitored by the Training and Development Service throughout the year; including twice yearly reporting to the WSCB. They were able to tell me that 600 council staff have attended WSCB safeguarding events since 1 April 2015”
In terms of impact of training he goes on to say “Impact evaluations were introduced to all Multi agency safeguarding events from July 2015. These are sent to attendees via email 12 weeks after the training event to complete online. For training events starting on or after 1st April 2016 Impact evaluation questionnaires will be sent to both the attendee and their manager to complete online”

WCCG also evaluate impact and state that “We have reviewed the staff questionnaires on safeguarding awareness which suggests that some aspects of the current mandatory training are not being embedded which will be taken forward in staff briefings during the coming year”.

What is less evident is how these organisations ensure that the lessons from Serious Case Reviews and Internal Management Reviews are integrated into their agency’s practice and that front-line staff are familiar with the lessons to be learned. Despite the fact that agencies assert that they do cascade lesson to be learned, being able to evidence that they have become part of practice appears to be much more difficult. This difficulty presents itself not only in Wandsworth but throughout the country, however it is an area which WSCB should actively pursue.

Q6. Safer Recruitment

Police recruitment is managed centrally by the Met so Wandsworth have no input to this locally. Genesis Housing state that a DBS check is obtained for each post which requires it, but do not give an indication that interview panel members undergo specific recruitment training.

In Wandsworth Council all staff involved in recruitment are trained, and in other agencies recruitment is either carried out by HR staff, or at least one panel member has undertaken recruitment training.

In agencies where volunteers are used, the same process applies.

In relation to ensure that staff know the process and arrangements for dealing with a child protection / safeguarding allegation against a member of staff, professional or carer, agencies state that they have policies in place to address this despite the fact that not every organisation has a designated “Allegations Manager”. As with schools however, there needs to be more awareness of the LADO role. This has been noted in many action plans.

Of the eight agencies who completed the SSA, none had made any referrals to the LADO except for Wandsworth Council Children’s Services who have made 48 referrals in the past two years.

Q7. Multi-agency working

Agencies demonstrate commitment to partnership working in various ways. Some examples of this are given below

WCCG – “We are building a number of key partnership relationships with Wandsworth Borough Council, St George’s Hospital, and Schools across the borough and parents. We recently hosted a multi-agency workshop for all of these partners and discussed the development of child health services within the borough”.
Genesis Housing – “Staff are encouraged to work with other agencies to resolve safeguarding issues and to establish good links so concerns can be discussed both ways. In Camden, Genesis engages with the Camden High Risk Panel and ensures all staff are familiar with the referral route”

Borough Police – “There is a dedicated police team in place to investigate CSE. This ensures consistency and effectiveness in working with partners in the SEMAP process. This is also the case with the gangs response in Wandsworth. The Wandsworth DCI chairs the GMAP and the gangs team ensure they work closely with statutory partners and the third sector (e.g. Redthread)”

Not every agency addressed the issue of resolving inter-agency differences and none referred to the WSCB Escalation Policy. Of those who did comment, it was generally around building and maintaining good working relationships or resolving issues through a manager to manager conversation. Whilst this is commendable, there can always be situations which require something more than this and WSCB should ensure that agencies are made aware of the escalation policy and refer to it should the need arise.

All of the agencies who completed the SSA have representation on the WSCB other than Genesis Housing. Wandsworth Council Housing does have a representative who attended one of the SSA interviews where he agreed to be the conduit for disseminating information to Housing Associations with properties in Wandsworth. Agencies were also clear that they attend all other multi-agency meetings (e.g. child protection conferences) when they are required.

The final question in section 7 was around how agencies ensured that those who work with adults who are parents or carers or who may have caring responsibilities for children or young people, are familiar with safeguarding children procedures and practices, but it did not elicit a strong response.

WCGG stated that this was covered in their safeguarding training, newsletters and 121 discussions whilst Wandsworth Council reported that it had a policy in place which covered this. However no other agency addressed this. It may be that the question itself was badly worded as some answers from schools appeared to indicate a misunderstanding, but given that this is such a key safeguarding area, WSCB should look into this.

Q8. Effective Information Sharing

In general, agencies were confident that staff shared information appropriately in line with their policies and adhered to the seven golden rules.

However Borough Police reported that “Resources are committed to the MASH. BUT Data sharing is subject to significant national policing debate at present and the National Police Chiefs’ Council have a dedicated lead for this subject. Challenges relate to the existing legislation, which is potentially at odds with ministerial ambition and with lack of compatibility across agencies’ IT systems. Local arrangements work relatively well for MPS Wandsworth, but there are wider challenges beyond the remit of this report”.

Despite this, they also reported that “Wandsworth FRP is seen as one of the best examples of a Troubled Families based initiative in the UK and has been featured in the NPCC Good Practice Guide to all 43 Police Forces in England & Wales”
This demonstrates that effective multi-agency working can take place within the context of the Data Protection Act and that it does not need to be a barrier to working together on a daily basis.

**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.

83 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 19 key themes. It is important to note that 100% of agencies identified training as an area to be addressed.

They are:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans – Emerging Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training (L&amp;D)- particularly around CSE, honour based violence, forced marriage, FGM, radicalisation/Prevent; domestic abuse and including volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved attendance at training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity about chain of reporting concerns in particular about colleagues and around “Abuse of Trust”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every staff member knows the name of the safeguarding lead(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff are aware of the London child protection procedures and Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-iterating the role and contact details of the LADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information from meetings and training cascaded to all staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are aware of 7 golden rules of information sharing and share information appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff and volunteers are clear about when concerns and worries should be discussed and with whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update as necessary existing child safeguarding policies and protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff know how to challenge and/or escalate concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More regular staff safeguarding meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor training undertaken to ensure all staff receive training within required timescales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Encourage staff to think how we can improve our safeguarding practice and act upon suggestions.

Feedback and further analysis of S11 audit to identify gaps in staff knowledge and ensure these are addressed

Repeat Questionnaire process to monitor impact of training

Improve process of feeding back outcomes of concerns that have been raised re children’s safety.

Staff to be clear about the follow up of safeguarding concerns.

Improved Safeguarding Supervision

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>Further training - (CSE; honour based violence; forced marriage, FGM; radicalisation/Prevent; domestic abuse)</td>
<td>Childminders, EY Section &amp; CC, Providers (SR&amp;IK), Children’s Centre x4, GP x17, Housing Association x2, Nursery School, Independent School x8, Primary School x19, Special School x3, Home &amp; Hospital Tuition Service, Royal Academy of Dance, FE College, PRU, Borough Police, CCG, Enable Leisure &amp; Culture, EWS, F&amp;CS, FRP, Housing, LNSS, Probation NPS, Priory Hospital Roehampton, Rent Collection Service</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| All GPs and practice nurses to continue to have Level 3 face to face training every 18 months | • Safeguarding Standards Service  
• St George’s NHS Trust  
• Teenage Pregnancy Team  
• Wandswoth Community D&A Team  
• YOT  
• Youth Service  
• East Hill Baptist Church  
• G&PS  
• Place2Be  
• PP&C  
• The Baked Bean Company |
| Improve attendance at training | • Royal Academy of Dance.  
• SWL & St.Georges MHT  
• St George’s NHS Trust |
| Ensure clarity about chain of reporting concerns in particular about colleagues and around ‘Abuse of Trust” | • Children’s Centre x2  
• Special School  
• FE College  
• FRP |
| Ensure every staff member knows the name of the safeguarding lead(s) | • GP x3  
• Primary School x2  
• Independent School  
• Royal Academy of Dance  
• Enable Leisure & Culture  
• Probation NPS  
• YOT |
| Ensure everyone is aware of the London child protection procedures and Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015 | • GP  
• Primary School x2  
• Independent School x2  
• Safeguarding Standards Service  
• St George’s NHS Trust  
• East Hill Baptist Church |
| Re-iterate role and contact details of LADO | • GP x2  
• Nursery School  
• Special School  
• Housing  
• St George’s NHS Trust  
• YOT |
| Information from meetings and training cascaded to all staff | • GP x3  
• Primary School x2 |
| Ensure staff are aware of 7 golden rules of information | • GP  
• Primary School x3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sharing and share information appropriately</td>
<td>Special School, Borough Police</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff and volunteers are clear about when concerns and worries should be discussed and with whom</td>
<td>GP x2, Special School, Primary School x4, Independent School x2, Royal Academy of Dance, Youth Service</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update as necessary existing child safeguarding policies and protocols</td>
<td>GP, Special School, Primary School, PRU, South London Swimming Club</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff know how to challenge and/or escalate concerns</td>
<td>GP x2, Special School, FE College, Primary School, St Georges NHS Trust</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More regular staff safeguarding meetings</td>
<td>GP x2, Housing Association, Independent School, Primary School x2, FRP, Place2Be</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor training undertaken to ensure all staff receive training within required timescales</td>
<td>GP, SWL &amp; St Georges MHT, St George’s NHS Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage staff to think how we can improve our safeguarding practice and act upon suggestions.</td>
<td>Nursery School, Primary School, Independent School, Safeguarding Standards Service, Teenage Pregnancy Team, Wandsworth Community D&amp;A Service, G&amp;PS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and further analysis of S11 audit to identify gaps in staff knowledge and ensure these are addressed</td>
<td>Primary School x5, Home &amp; Hospital Tuition Service, Special School, Youth Service</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Questionnaire process to monitor impact of training</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improve process of feeding back outcomes of concerns that have been raised re children’s safety.

- Primary School

Staff to be clear about the follow up of safeguarding concerns.

- Primary School x2
- Independent School

Improved Safeguarding Supervision

- EWS
- Place2Be

---

**Interviews and Feedback (Qualitative)**

48 interviews were carried out with:

- 20 Statutory services and partner agencies
- 12 Schools
- 7 GP Practices
- 4 Health agencies
- 2 Voluntary Organisations
- 2 Faith Groups
- 1 Housing Association

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, scrutinise completed audits and action plans as well as providing an opportunity for discussion between the interview panel and agencies which could give context to the audit results, thus completing the learning cycle and eliciting further audit improvement going forward.

For the first time since this Section 11 process began in 2014, the Independent Author of the WSCB Section 11 reports chaired the interview panels. The author found this allowed her to gain a much better insight into the agencies who took part and how they experienced the audit, which added value to her understanding. This particular aspect of the interviews will be analysed in this section.

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

- What was it like for you undertaking the S11 audit?
- How many staff do you have in your agency/service/school who could have completed the S11 Questionnaire? How many actually completed it?
- What grade/range of staff completed the Questionnaire and who did not complete it?
- Did the audit process and completion of the audit return identify any areas of strength and areas of development/gaps?
- Were you already aware of these? Were these addressed within your action plan?
- Please give an update on the implementation of your action plan.
- Any additional comments/question by panel?
- Any additional comments by agency representative?
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>• Borough Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enable, Leisure and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GP Practices x5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St. George’s NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priory Hospital Roehampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SWL &amp; St George’s Mental Health Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wandsworth Drug &amp; Alcohol Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive Parenting &amp; Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CARAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adult Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• East Hill Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yahweh Christian fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary Schools X8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nursery Schools &amp; Children’s Centres x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peabody Housing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wandsworth Housing Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rent Collection Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teenage Pregnancy Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safeguarding Standards Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family Recovery Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WW Schools and Community Psychological Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education and Inclusion Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below summarises the responses given to the first seven interview topics. It should be noted that the interviews were free flowing discussions which did not have a rigid format or strict order of questions. The analysis below is therefore not divided specifically by question, but this year focuses more on key areas which emerged from the interview process. These are categorised below.

**Administering The Audit and Timing**

One of the key areas for consideration going forward was whether to carry out the audit using an electronic web-based survey tool such as Survey Monkey. The benefits of this can be automatic collation and analysis for agencies as well as automatic production of charts and graphs, however it does have limitations around providing the detailed breakdown of staff groups etc required for the overall analysis contained in this report. Agencies views on this were sought in interviews.

**Early Years** - All settings have IT now, but not so much Childminders so they were e-mailed the form to complete.

**EL&C** - Administration was done via online and some hard copy. No problems collating the information.

**Battersea Fields Practice** – Timing of the Audit could be improved to allow time for all of the staff to sit and complete the questionnaire. Before February or before Christmas or summer time would be better. The last six months of the year as opposed to the first six months of the year.

**Chesterton Primary School** - Printed off the questionnaires, distributed them after a staff meeting. E-mailing it was not the preferred method for her in a large school.

A face to face discussion is always good before it is done.

**Christ Church Battersea** - Printed off the audit and distributed it. Staff were asked to return the completed audit by a specified time. HT had no objection to completing the questionnaire online, but she felt that human contact/interaction and discussion is very important before completion. Everyone should be sat down and spoken to and asked to read through the questionnaire before completing it.

**East Hill Baptist Church** - Prior to the audit taking place the safeguarding lead spoke to many of the participants explaining that the audit would be taking place the following Sunday. Safeguarding lead and the Pastor were present while the audit was being done. The Audit was completed in a group
session. AHJ said it was a good representation of those involved in the process and it was at least 98% of potential respondents who completed the questionnaire. They covered the staff in Toddlers group, youth group, Sunday school as well as caretaker and administration.

**Eastwood Nursery** - Launched the questionnaire on an inset day and gave staff enough time to fill it out. Eastwood will use the Governor’s meeting to have them complete the questionnaire next year.

**Housing** - The process was positive. The circulation was done via e-mail. First time it has been done this way because now staff are located in lots of different buildings. Seventy one staff members filled out the questionnaire.

**John Burns Primary** - It was good. A cross section of staff completed it, teachers and the Governors. It was a paper exercise.

**Linden Lodge School** - Pleased with the responses this year as compared to last year. Used the Monday morning meeting to distribute the questionnaire to staff. Everyone had to complete it before they left the meeting! Those staff members who did not attend that meeting were then given the questionnaire by their managers. Majority of the questions were straightforward, a few staff members had some queries but these were internal other than that no major problems with the form being completed. The questionnaire is very straightforward.

**Peabody in Wandsworth** - The questionnaire was very helpful/useful for them at the Peabody. It was very different from any other S11 Audit that his organisation had completed in the past. It was the most helpful of all! The staff are based at different offices. He contacted the managers to ask them to have the staff complete the questionnaire on a specific day. Some staff completed the questionnaire online and others did it using the hard copy.

**PP&C** - Thought the whole process was really good! It was at a challenging time for the organisation. Had to make it more tangible for the staff, Safeguarding lead is social worked trained. Staff had questions about the questionnaire and she was happy to assist staff to consider their responsibilities. The questions were very good re: procedural issues, discussing it within a team based setting worked well. She felt the team setting for staff to answer the questionnaire worked well for them. It made it less formal but it was more about the relations in the staff. She related the questionnaire to the Working Together framework which allowed her to get the staff past the mental blocks.

**Priory Roehampton** - Took the questionnaires to the staff and asked them to complete them while she waited on them. There was an increase in those staff members who had identified that they knew what constituted safeguard concerns. Not sure that online training would be effective with staff where English is not their first language?

**Rent Collection** - Very useful tool for the team. Printed off the forms and gave them in a group.

**SSS** - WSCB has covered more agencies and individuals that other S11 audits the Head of SSS had been involved in. She felt it was really positive that it reached so many people.

**St George’s NHS Trust** - Easier doing it via survey monkey as it collated the data. Last year was a big push to get the numbers of completed questionnaires up to 400. Used Survey monkey this year for
easier administration and analysis. Five clinical leads were identified to co-ordinate the surveys to targeted areas which were: paediatric medicine, Emergency dept, Maternity services, Community Services and medical staff from the adult services who have paediatric cases. Will target different groups next year in an annual rolling programme. Questionnaire returns were less than last year, but this was a pilot using the computerized returns. Had some technical problems at the beginning which created a bit of hiatus but finally link was distributed and it was then accessible by the staff. The time frame was short, the previous year individuals went to groups of staff to get the questionnaire completed. In principal the survey monkey method was beneficial in terms of making collating results much less laborious. As this was a pilot – would like to take it forward to 2017 using what we have learned this year to elicit improvements.

**Teenage Pregnancy Team** - The team sits under Prevention and Intervention and is based in the Family Recovery Project. The form was e-mailed to the members of staff and they completed it and submitted it to Ms. Melton

**Wandsworth S&C Psychology Service** - All staff were asked to complete the questionnaire. There are 22 members of staff. The questionnaire was done by distributing them to the staff. All papers were to be returned to 1 staff member. A deadline date for receipt of the questionnaires was given.

**Central EIS/EWS** - It would be good to move to an online version as there is a lot of online training. it would be more efficient and effective.

**Falconbrook Primary** - It was a useful exercise and it was well timed for the staff. HT appreciated it as the paper exercise, but she would also like to try it using of Survey Monkey. She was surprised by Wandsworth’s S11 report – and she liked it! HT hadn’t done anything like this before

**FRP** - It was a mixture of online and paper returns. No problem in administering it. The delivery of the questionnaire is done at the right time of the year for the Unit because it feeds into appraisals.

**Haider Practice** - Questionnaire was printed out and filled in by the staff.

**Hillbrook CC** - This is the third year we have taken part and we find it works really well. Different questions were included this year. It’s a useful exercise for staff. It was done in a team meeting with all of the staff present.

**LNSS** - A cohort was given the paper version and then some of the staff were e-mailed because staff are located on different sites.

**Probation NPS** - It’s been a learning event. We understand it more now than when we started in 2014 and can now see how useful it is. It was e-mailed to staff who completed it.

**Ravenstone Primary** - It is done via paper copy and distributed individually.

**Riversdale Primary** - The whole staff complement were given the questionnaire. This was done at the Early Morning meeting. One member of the Premises staff did not speak English so the questions had to be mimed to him to get his responses. There was also an interpreter who assisted that member of staff.
Royal Academy of Dance - It is an international organisation with branches region wide and worldwide. They are also an examining body, train teachers, offer degrees and diplomas for a variety of dance/ballet courses. There are some community outreach programmes. The questionnaire was distributed to 200 people who work in Wandsworth Borough. It was all distributed online. The representatives felt the questionnaires are best distributed online – like Survey Monkey.

Southfield Practice - It was done via hard copy distribution which was a bit clunky. The practice would have appreciated having it via electronic format.

Southmead Primary - A staff member selected the cohort of staff and those selected members were given a copy of the questionnaire to complete. The administrator did the collection of the questionnaires upon completion.

Yahweh Christian fellowship - It was done via hard copy. It would normally be done on the Training Day but the questionnaire arrived after the training day.

Trinity St Mary’s - It was much easier this year, this time last year there were a lot of new and younger staff.

Wandsworth D&A - The process was good. Each pathway has a Team Leader who was responsible for getting the questionnaire distributed to the staff. The questionnaire was distributed during team meetings with the various staff groups. The use of survey monkey would assist the service as the staff members are all across the Borough.

YOT - The process of administration of the questionnaire is fine. It allows the organisation to pinpoint areas of weaknesses. The Team Administrator followed up with the return of the questionnaires.

Youth Service - Difficult as most staff are sessional workers. There are still people who don't fully understand the process. We will need to address the questionnaire in small groups.

Earlsfield Practice - Advised the staff to read through the questionnaire before completing it. She had a discussion with the staff and they then completed the forms.

SW London & St Georges MHT - The MHT serves 5 LSCBs but Wandsworth is the only one that initiates a S11 audit in this way which is inclusive and covers a wide range of disciplines. This is the third year this methodology has been applied and the trust is very supportive of this approach. This year yielded the highest returns from the MHT with a wider staff cohort. Some of the questionnaires were submitted via online and others were printed and handed out to the staff.

Staff Response

Borough Police - Almost 50% of staff. All categories of staff – general and specialist

Early Years – Over 900 individual responses from all categories and levels of staff. An excellent response.
EL&C - The questionnaires were distributed from gardeners up to Principal Officer level. The agency lead would meet with a group of staff and have them complete the questionnaire and then discuss the results.

Adults – 20% of staff who were sent the questionnaire responded. Difficult to get a high response rate as the questionnaires were sent out late due to volume of work. An Administrative Officer circulated the questionnaire and collated the responses. The entire staff had been emailed but the agency rep was unsure what grade and level of staff had submitted a response.

The Begg Practice - 10 members of the Administrative staff, 2 Doctors, 2 salaried Doctors, 1 Nurse, 1 HCA.

CARAS - Only 2 staff members did not complete it, some staff are part time. There are only 5 staff members in total.

Chesterton Primary School - 20 teachers, 18 – Teaching Assistants, 4 – Admin staff, 10 - support staff. Disappointed with the staff responses. HT had to chase up a lot of staff to get the forms submitted to her.

Christ Church Battersea - 13 Administrative staff, 10 Teaching staff. (100% teaching staff and admin). The Council commission the catering staff. Need to get a feel for their level of safeguarding knowledge.

East Hill Baptist Church - At least 98% of potential respondents completed the questionnaire. They covered the staff in the Toddlers group, Youth group, Sunday school as well as caretaker and administration staff.

Housing – 71 staff out of 300 completed the questionnaire.

Ibstock place School - Senior Management and Middle Management were included. 30% of management, 20% teachers, 30% Prep school staff.

John Burns Primary – Almost 100% of staff completed it.

Lifelong Learning - Community workers, administrative staff. Twenty staff completed the questionnaires.

Linden Lodge School - All of the staff were given the questionnaire. These staff groups involve the locum staff as well. There are 250 staff members so a 2/3 return rate is what she had for this year. Teachers, TAs, Residential Staff, Therapy, HS/VS services, governors completed the questionnaire.

Peabody in Wandsworth – Peabody have properties in 29 local authorities across London. Twelve staff members completed the questionnaire. They represent a reasonable cross section of the staff complement. Caretakers, Caretaker Managers, call centre staff, repairs staff and Community Support were included in the audit.

PP&C - All of the staff completed the questionnaire. She did the completing of the questionnaires in two parts with two groups - Family support workers who are home based, these members of staff have NVQ training. Then the other group was with the administrator/s.
Priory Roehampton - 120 staff had completed the survey which amounts to 10% The numbers are similar to those in 2015. HR/Administration/Health Care providers. Not many consultants took part.

Rent Collection – 21 out of 26. Good response

SSS – Initially 50%, however when it became apparent that all staff did not complete the audit and that an error in the self-assessment had been made, the Head of SSS said she would have all staff complete the audit and re-submit the self-assessment no later than June 8, 2016. This was duly completed within timescale.

St Georges NHS Trust - Total survey requests approx. 500. Return Rate – 134 made up of Acute services 89, Community Services 45. This represents 1.5% of the workforce and a response rate of 27%. Much less than the 460 received in 2015. Some respondents partially completed the survey.

Teenage Pregnancy Team – all four members of staff completed the questionnaire

Wandsworth S&C Psychology Service – all 22 members of staff completed the questionnaire.

Youth Service and WILS – 50% of staff completed the questionnaire

Balham Nursery & CC - Had a good return from the staff. Questionnaire was disseminated at a staff meeting. Not a good return from the Governors, if it was distributed at a full Governors meeting it would be improve.

Falconbrook primary - Approximately 80% of staff completed the audit. Including teachers, admin, premises staff, and support staff.

F&CS - 53 staff members completed the questionnaire. – around 60%. Some CLA staff had also completed the questionnaire.

FRP – 22 out of 24 staff completed the questionnaire.

Haider Practice - A cross section of the staff completed it including admin, receptionists and GPs.

Hillbrook Primary - 6 – All staff which included an administrator and outreach workers.

LNSS - 16 members of staff completed the questionnaire. – virtually all – 95%

Probation NPS - 29 staff or 74% - quite a lot of staff are off on long term sick.

Ravenstone Primary - 29 staff completed the audit which represents 1/2 of the staff complement.

Riversdale Primary – All staff completed the questionnaire except for one Governor.

Royal Academy of Dance – 100 staff (50%)

Junction Health Centre - 23 staff members completed. Permanent staff and contract staff are included in the audit. Management, Admin, Nurses and GPs.

Southfield Practice – 10 members of staff, GPs, Administrators, Nurses.
Southmead Primary - Selections from caretaking staff, teachers – newly qualified, males and females, teaching assistants, dinner staff.

Yahweh Christian fellowship - Sunday school, department staff and ministers – whole range.

Trinity St Mary’s - 26 staff members completed the audit. 70% of staff

Wandsworth D&A - 24/44 staff members completed the questionnaire (around 50%)

Youth Service - 24 staff filled in the questionnaire out of 80 total

Earlsfield Practice - Practice nurses, locums and administrative staff were the ones who had completed the questionnaires. 13 staff in all. No GPS were asked. The WSCB Business Manager said she would check the wording of the guidance to ensure that it is clear that organisations know that ALL staff should fill out a questionnaire. There are also some additional practitioners who come in who are therapists. Panel said these members of staff should also complete the questionnaire along with the GPs who hadn’t been originally been included.

Stated that the Practice would like to re-do the questionnaires including the GPs and the locum staff as she was not comfortable with the first attempt. The GP said she would try to get the form completed within a 2 week time frame.

SW London & St Georges MHT – There are 450 staff in the Directorate

How do you ensure a high response rate?

Borough Police - High return of completed questionnaires. Success is down to underlining the importance of the message. There were weekly meetings on safeguarding which reinforced this.

Early Years Service - The settings that are overseen by the EY Unit asked when they were going to be sending out the S11 Safeguarding Self-Assessment form! They are very keen. The EY Unit continues to use incentives with the staff by giving Free First Aid training when the audit is carried out.

Staff were told the completion of the assessments was linked to the OFSTED inspections so their returns are very high in recent years.

A useful tool?

Early Years - Settings are now very comfortable to complete the questionnaire. The forms are used by the settings when they have OFSTED Inspections as evidence towards achieving an outstanding rating.

Eastwood Nursery - It is an analysis tool. Eastwood will re-run it and look at the returns to identify training needs.

Housing – The Wandsworth S11 Audit is excellent.

Balham Nursery & CC - The process is helpful and it is a useful tool. It enables the Action Plan to be drafted thereafter. It helps to assess what staff know about the issues. It is a self-improvement system for the organisation.
FRP - It is used as a working document. The results are fed into the induction pack for the unit. Also used in annual appraisals. Gaps in training are fed into the L&D Plan.

Language and Questions

Borough Police - There are generalists and specialists in Borough Police. Therefore different uses of terminology which might confuse the response - officers answers might be different to the reality because of their lack of familiarity of the language used in the questionnaire e.g. Training – Officers understand “training” to be that delivered in a formal classroom setting whereas it could also be practical and “on the job”. Terminology would not be used like that for the Police. He said “learning” might be better for his officers to focus on as it is this which needs to be demonstrated.

EL&C - Q 12 needed some explanation for staff to ensure they had full understanding.

Chesterton Primary School - some of the staff were unclear about the language in the Question 2.

St Georges NHS Trust - perhaps wording of the questionnaire should be reviewed, given the cohorts of employee that they are trying to reach.

Wandsworth S&C Psychological Service – They felt that some of the questions could have been written differently e.g. in their case, Question 3’s answer was Designated Lead and she expected that her staff knew this. She said some of the answers given by the staff was their supervisor.

Balham Nursery & CC - A gap/concern is the phrasing of the questions but the interviewees were very confident that their staff members know who to contact for any CSE issues.

F&CS – Head of F&CS felt that the questionnaire was not at the right level for SW staff as staff are involved in speaking of concerns on a daily basis. Panel suggested it would be good to have a social care representative for the group that will review the questionnaire for 2017.

FRP - Some of the questions were ambiguous – could have led to lower response e.g. in terms of who to report allegations to. There may be some need for qualitative feedback even though it is a quantitative questionnaire.

Hillbrook CC - Again – as with many agencies – raised the issue of Q9 – not sure if correct answer is LADO or DSO or line manager? The WSCB Business Manager agreed wording needs to be thought about.

Riversdale Primary - Some staff thought the questions were asking a deeper question but once these members were engaged in conversation it was evident that the staff knew the pathways for referrals. Some of the jargon/abbreviations had caused a bit of confusion for the staff. The recognition of language posed a challenge to understand in some questions.

Yahweh Christian Fellowship - Some of the workers/staff did not understand the questions due to the language that was used.

SW London & St Georges MHT – The questionnaire and responses do not appear to acknowledge that staff may be working at a range of levels across the Trust with regard to safeguarding children. The majority of MH practitioners work primarily with adults will complete training at Level 2 of the Intercollegiate Training for health staff. These staff should have a good knowledge but will not be
working to the level of CAHMS practitioners or safeguarding children leads in teams. The questionnaire and template do not appear to differentiate between the different knowledge bases and clinical work.

The question regarding allegations against staff relates to the role of the LADO. In the Trust, the process of escalation and reporting to the LADO is through the Named professionals for safeguarding children and the Trust HR safeguarding lead. The responsibility of staff is to report this as an incident and to escalate. The Named Nurse sits on the Trust Incidence Governance Group and reviews all safeguarding children incidents that are reported.

The Trust would like to suggest that future audits include a question regarding staff knowledge of how to make a referral and the role of MASH.

**Working in Partnership**

**Borough Police** - Officers were engaged in more formal training e.g. the FGM training that would be deliveres by the Designated Nurse was being taken up by members of his staff and once they had completed it, they would deliver it to other officers.

**Self-assessment results**

**Borough Police** - What appeared to be low responses to identifying signs and indicators following training may have been due to the terminology of the questions although the high rate of staff turnover is a challenge. Formal training versus learning is what may have been the response for the low numbers of those who said there were not sure re: their training on CSE.

**CARAS** - Staff know their safeguarding responsibilities. They all deliver training on this area. They are very clear on the volunteer responsibilities to escalate any concerns to the agency rep who is the DSL and the Project Co-ordinator.

**Chesterton Primary School** – HT felt that a lot of her staff did not read through the questionnaire before completing it. FGM training/sensitization had occurred only the day before the questionnaire was distributed yet the results were not as high as they ought to have been on FGM.

**East Hill Baptist Church** – Good communication. People feel that they can contact the safeguarding lead at any time. Good general awareness – online training is being done.

**Gap** – A proper awareness of FGM is not clear. Booklet on Protecting Children Abroad needs to be available for to the members. The membership should be aware of the signs, symptoms being displayed in the children.

Everyone knows who the safeguarding lead is, so although answers to the questionnaires indicated a low response, everyone knew who they would report concerns to. – the low response was probably because of the language used. Where the numbers were low in the responses the safeguarding lead had followed up on those questions with staff.

**Housing** – Identified gaps are addressed in the Action Plan

**Ibstock Place School** - Staff said they were pleased with regular training available. There are also frequent policy reminders. These policy updates and reminders are done digitally throughout the
year on the school’s intranet. The safeguarding lead said he felt staff did read these policies especially due the use of the word statutory or legal requirements - this tends to nudge staff to be up to date on issues. Approachable DSL is also a strength identified by the other staff members.

**John Burns Primary** - Staff felt that when a concern was referred to the Safeguarding Lead, action was taken. Although that didn’t appear to be reflected in the answers given to the questionnaire, when it was followed up staff actually did know – they just hadn’t really understood the question. Staff felt concerns were taken seriously.

**PP&C** - Overall - We have procedures and people know them and how to use them. Positives – Processes in place are working for the staff. There were conversations about identifying the issues and how to have staff members to think about the critical issues. She disseminated an article on FGM so she has sent them the links of these practical issues that were highlighted.

**Rent Collection** - The questions No.s 12 & 13 were new to the questionnaire and she was unaware that the staff needed to be trained in the specific areas highlighted in those questions. They did not think it was relevant because staff felt they had no direct contact with children, but clearly the issue is much wider than this. Panel said there will be upcoming guidance that will advise the differing levels of training that staff would need at the specific organisations that do not interact with children on a regular basis. **Board expectations re role specific levels of training is a priority.**

**SSS** - Due to time constraints with the resubmission of the self-assessment the subsequent interview was conducted between the chair of the panel and the Head of SSS by telephone. Prior to this conversation, the remaining interview panel members were invited to submit any questions they had to the Chair who would raise them with Head of SSS. Head of SSS felt that the self-assessment now showed a very positive position amongst staff.

**St Georges NHS Trust** - Key things identified as strengthens – staff knew about information sharing which is reassuring. Most staff had the training within the 3 year time frame. Most of the staff who responded were dealing with children on the estates. The work with See the Adult/See the Child work is bearing success as she is receiving phone calls on that leaflet. No major area of concerns from the audit. A high number of staff knew who to speak to re: safeguarding concerns.

**Teenage Pregnancy Team** - Good feedback on the CSE issues. There are good networks in the department. Some of the questions were a challenge for some staff members but once Ms. Melton spoke with that individual those uncertainties were cleared up.

**Wandsworth S&C Psychology Service** - Question 9 indicated few staff knew about the LADO but this has now been addressed in a team meeting since the questionnaire had been completed.

**Balham Nursery & CC** - The areas of Honour Based Violence, Forced Marriage and Prevent were three areas which were unknown to the staff. Consequently there will be be staff training done via other senior members of staff who would take the training.

**Central EIS/EWS** - The weaknesses were highlighted in the OFSTED report e.g. Advisory Teachers. In the EWS – Training courses on offer were commended.
The guidance states that the DSL should be contacted re: any safeguarding concerns but the staff queried if they could contact the LADO? The WSCB Business Manager stated they can contact the LADO directly as well. All staff knew that they should report the concern, but the query was to whom. Multi-agency working was identified as a strength, but also identified that there was room for improvement. Embedding Signs of Safety and Wellbeing in the department was required. This would be followed up in supervision and it would be linked to PRP targets.

**Falconbrook Primary** - Didn’t tell the HT anything she didn’t already know, but it was done almost immediately after carrying out a school Safeguarding Audit. Some staff members were from agencies and they had been briefed on the relevant systems, they did not recognise that the briefing was the training. Those staff members were then taken through the training again

**F&CS** - Some of the staff who had the training answered that they were not sure of their confidence levels to deal with an FGM case. Head of F&CS said there are lot of locums on staff and these may have been the ones who hadn’t had the local authority training. Or couldn’t remember when they last had it. She spoke to her Managers to discuss it in their teams and ensure that the front line workers had the relevant training. She felt her social work staff would understand the terminology. She said some of the admin staff may have not had the training or know a lot of the terminology.

**FRP** - The shortfalls will be addressed in the action plan and incorporated into the department’s development plan. The targets in the action plan would be reviewed upon completion.

**Hillbrook CC** - All understand and talk about safeguarding in the centre. Generally staff know the procedures to follow re: any concerns and their responsibilities. There is the use of the Signs of Safety and Wellbeing.

**LNSS** - Staff are asked a safeguarding question at interview. They are also offered a booklet at induction. The specialist areas outlined in the audit were not well known by the teaching staff –not all covered in terms of training. Staff do know how to follow up concerns – they have been spoken to about it.

**Probation NPS** - Disappointed on response re knowing who to speak to if you have a safeguarding concern. There is some work to be done with the administrators of the various NPS teams.

**Ravenstone Primary** - Confident that everyone understands safeguarding. Some staff commented that they would speak to their Manager re: safeguarding concerns.

**Riversdale Primary** - Lunch time supervisors – results indicated that there is a gap in terms of training. They would need to now have the training and this has been amended in the school’s recruitment process. The kitchen staff provider had been contacted to ascertain if the staff had the relevant safeguarding training. The Cleaning Company provided a certificate to show their staff had undertaken safeguarding training.

**Royal Academy of Dance** - There has been a new policy drafted which was done in collaboration with the NSPCC. The confidence level of some of the staff was a bit revealing.

**Southfield Practice** - All of the clinical staff have had training with FGM. Identified some gaps in Admin training but there has been a high turnover of staff. Most respondents were able to identify
and areas of accessibility of safeguarding. All staff felt that they could benefit from some additional training.

**Southmead Primary** - There has been a high turnover of staff over the years the return questionnaires were quite a good reflection of the staff. As part of the audit one of the suggestions for improvement was a weekly drop in during the lunch time period.

**Trinity St Marys** - There were some gaps in the training and the HT decided that there would need to be some training set up for the staff right away.

**Wandsworth D&A** - A lot of the staff are spread across the Borough. The staff training in CSE was lacking. The fact that the staff knew the process was an advantage for the service. New staffing had some teething problems, now there are also some new policies in place. Level Three training has been completed by some of the staff at St. Mungo’s. The first point in the action plan has been completed. Areas for improvement include improving communication between other agencies. This can be improved by attending other department’s team meetings.

**YOT** - The number of volunteers completing the questionnaire needs to increase. There are 20 volunteers. The training requirements outlined in questions 12 & 13 may not have been pushed as compulsory for the volunteers. Happy with the response from the staff on the See the Adult/See the Child. The Honour Based Violence training will be addressed for the organisation’s training needs.

**Youth Service** - Only 6/24 Youth Workers are confident in fulfilling their child safeguarding responsibilities. This will be addressed with training for the staff and has been discussed with her management team. Exploring e-learning with The Administrative staff. There will need to be an internal audit of the organisation.

**SW London & St Georges MHT** - A lot of staff are not clear on what the Section 11 specifically pinpoints.

**Training**

**Borough Police** - Networking through the Board is excellent here. There is now an online CSE package that has been devised which has been good for the officers. One facet of Borough Policing is a high turnover of staff so online training which can be accessed by new staff as and when is very beneficial.

**Battersea Fields Practice** - What types of training have the staff had? Receptionist training needs are different from those of clinical staff. Identifying FGM by the receptionist is not too in-depth apart from signposting patients. Honour based violence basic training for receptionist staff would need to be given. Training would need to be done to ensure that the terminology used in these areas is understood. However Receptionists are aware that they can access the GP of a young person if they are underage and they think they might be at risk of CSE. There were two people who said they didn’t remember when they last had training. It is not certain who these staff members are as individuals did not put their names on the forms. She suspected that those individuals were receptionists and newly employed staff. There will be some face to face training for GPs in the next 18 months.
The Begg Practice - Level 1 training of the staff is done by Dr. Begg. He had some staff roll over, but the new staff will be trained. It was they who stated on the questionnaire that they couldn’t remember when they last had training. He keeps in touch with the receptionists to see if they have noticed anything “untoward” with the patients.

CARAS - Particular types of training may be needed for the staff and volunteers. It would be helpful to have guidance for volunteers training requirements. WSCB Business Manager advised that basic safeguarding training should be delivered to all volunteers but it would be further discussed with the Training and Workforce Development Sub-Committee to determine which types of training could be done via online and which ones should be done face to face. Agencies should have training within 3 years. Volunteers may need awareness training depending on what type of work they’re involved in. All WSCB training is free to voluntary groups.

Chesertton Primary School - HT advised she would like to have the caterers trained so they are invited to the next session that she has organised.

Christ Church Battersea - Staff meeting time was identified for some further training. There are also some plans to train a trainer for the school

East Hill Baptist Church - TPD online training was being rolled out to those who would be liaising with children in various age groups. There is safeguarding training is currently being done and when this is finished then the FGM would be the next level/type of training to be offered. CSE would be included in the upcoming training that will be offered. The Pastor said there are two days set aside in October for training on a weekend. There will be other aspects of training during the year.

Eastwood Nursery - Training had covered FGM, CSE etc. and it was good. The centre recently had an OFSTED audit where some staff were arbitrarily selected and he found the responses they gave in these areas were quite good. A lot of staff were subscribing to safeguarding training via TPD online. Eastwood will ask staff members who attend training to cascade it down to their colleagues.

Housing - The training is normally delivered face to face. It is anticipated that in the future training would be done online as well.

Ibstock Place School - Training is conducted by a company in Essex but the training for Level 1 Safeguarding Child Protection did not include such areas of honour based marriage and FGM. CSE, FGM and Honour based violence would be conducted in the new semester. Panel queried if Ibstock place had received a copy of the leaflet “Protecting Children Abroad…..” and confirmed that in the booklet there was mention made of those three aforementioned areas that staff could utilise.

John Burns Primary - Training on the PREVENT module could be increased. Safeguarding in house training has been good but want to do an update on a yearly basis for training.

Linden Lodge School - A big challenge with the staff complement is the training. There is some training scheduled for July 2016. She continues to promote the online safeguarding training. Queried if the online training could be used to deliver training to a large group at the same time. WSCB Business manager said she thought it could but she would confirm this with the provider.
Peabody in Wandsworth - There is a massive training programme in Peabody. There are 300 places a year for staff on safeguarding training. All of the specific areas mentioned in the questionnaire are touched upon. Some of the courses are half day courses while others are full day. He said specific groups such as Community Safety would have had external training. In the Community Safety team there was a member of staff who had been able to raise a concern of FGM in the Tower Hamlets area. Police and Social Services were involved with the child who had been at risk. Areas of staff who didn’t know to identify the safeguarding were low. He said the specific training would target this group.

PP&C - Training for HBV and Neglect and FGM would need to be increased

Priory Roehampton - Training is consistently run every month. It helps to cope with the high turnover of staff. They use bank/agency staff. A new social worker is now on staff and she is an asset to the hospital. All staff get Level 3 training. The non-clinical staff still have some gaps in their knowledge. There is a role play exercise for the training for CSE and FGM

SSS - There were some issues around training which warranted addressing particularly around administrative staff where this will need to be carried out within the next three months. All training needs will be incorporated into individual staff Personal Learning & Development Plans. All Social Care staff should have training in specialist areas such as Forced Marriage etc. the level of this would be dependent on the staff roles involved.

St Georges NHS Trust - Different elements of training would need to be separated going forward. Training programme is being revised to bring in the topics in Q12. Prevent in particular. In Acute services there is no capacity to attend training for the day sessions offered.

Teenage Pregnancy Team - Need to increase the FGM/Honour based training. Training has been booked for the staff member who has resumed work from maternity leave.

Wandsworth S&C Psychology Service - The safeguarding policy had been updated. The administrative staff have now completed the online training. The casual staff will have access to the TPD online training. The core staff would go through a two to three year cycle for training. The WSCB Business Manager suggested that all staff should have the CSE training, followed by Neglect and that safeguarding leads would need to do higher level training, their training should be at least level 3.

Balham Nursery & CC – the manager keeps a documented spreadsheet of all of her staff members that have had training and when it took place. E learning has been very good for the organisation.

FRP - Everyone will have been trained in all six questionnaire specialist areas by the end of November 2016. E-learning has been beneficial to the staff due to the flexibility of the administration of the courses. Some staff have had training in a number of areas including FGM and those individuals will then share the information with other staff members. Refresher Training for managers would be helpful.

Hillbrook CC - There were some gaps. All staff had not done the Prevent training, it would be done on June 2nd, 2016 in a twilight training. FGM and Neglect training had been done by some members of the team. The staff have all utilised e-learning for FGM, CSE and Honour Based Marriage. We
think online training is really helpful and effective. Need to reflect on how to address Whistleblowing.

**LNSS** - Staff indicated that they would like more information on Domestic Violence. There may be some requirement for training resources to be utilised at the service.

**Probation NPS** - I have added Safeguarding as a standing item for supervision. NPS Civil Service learning is mandatory for all staff but there is an urgent business need for the majority of staff to undertake refresher training in areas such as FGM, neglect, forced marriage, radicalisation/prevent etc.

**Riversdale Primary** - All staff will be doing online training on the INSET days. A lot of certification works well for the Teaching Assistants in the school.

**Royal Academy of Dance** - We run safeguarding training for all teachers including free lance, musicians and pianists on an annual basis. Training is done for Designated Leads and for the members of the Safeguarding Training group. We’ve used WSCB e-learning, but we are now working with the same provider who does the e-learning for WSCB. We need to tailor it more as we have a much wider spread of staff.

**Junction Health Centre** - Lead Nurse if going to deliver Specialist area training to admin and reception staff.

**Southfield Practice** - Training will be done in June with the entire staff complement. Online training will be utilised by the Practice and this will be done as part of staff induction.

**Yahweh Christian Fellowship** – Panel advised that once Yahweh Christian Fellowship had signed up for TPD online the members can partake any courses of relevance for the organisation.

**Trinity St Marys** - Staff said they wanted some more formal training. FGM training would be done in the September term.

**YOT** - There is some scheduled training for Referral Order Panel members, safeguarding will be included.

**Youth Service** - There be training of staff who deal with Children with SEN. There would need to be evening or twilight training sessions to try and address the needs of sessional workers.

**Earlsfield Practice** - There was FGM training on Feb 3, the trainers came to do the training. There was Prevent training that had also been done in January 2016. There was 100% attendance of the non-clinical staff

**Positive Progress**

**Borough Police** - Every officer in the Borough will now have a question about safeguarding in their annual professional development review starting in June. **This is a really positive step forward in putting safeguarding high on the police agenda**

**Early Years** - Having a safeguarding advisor (came from last year’s S11 Action Plan) now allowed training to be conducted in the specific areas that were highlighted in the spreadsheet returns. Also,
they are now using business cards for the child minders and sending out newsletters via the internet. New regular audit programme is in place. Child minders also give advice to other new child minders who want to join that service. Liz and Francis are the ones who conduct training because of the good contact they have with them.

Christ Church Battersea – Had carried out a School Safeguarding Audit with the Education Safeguarding Advisor and this had helped her with the questionnaire. An Action plan was devised from this and it covered actions from the S11 Audit. DSL name is outlined on the schools lanyard for visiting staff. Apparently a number of other schools are now doing this as well.

Ibstock Place School – There is a key information card that has contact details on it for those who are visiting. This card is also a useful document to show the OFSTED inspectors when they come for inspection.

Lifelong Learning - MASH referral system has worked well when her department has recently called to make a referral and also for some advice.

Linden Lodge School - Due to the number of times that it has been conducted the process continues to be well received at Linden Lodge. Gave feedback from the audit to staff using a Powerpoint presentation at the Monday morning meeting. (Presentation was sent to WSCB). The Panel noted it was good to see the improvement in the responses in 2016 as compared to previous years.

Rent Collection - Over the three years the audit has been carried out staff have improved in their safeguarding awareness – so it is definitely of benefit. When the audit started staff were not as aware of those issues.

Balham Nursery & CC - All new agency staff are taken through an induction when they visit the building/organisation.

Central EIS/EWS - Panel queried Children Missing Education. HoS said these children are followed up by his team through the schools. They have an effective tracking system. Came out favourably in the Ofsted Inspection. He said the numbers have decreased.

Falconbrook Primary – Panel were highly impressed and advised the Headteacher to keep up the good work. Panel suggested that Governors undertook the audit next year. HT thought this was a very good idea and was sure Governors would be more than happy to take part. Ofsted had inspected the school and rated it Good.

Haider Practice - The practice has recently used an alert system that reception uses re: any emergencies. All doctors have a screen showing their appointments. If receptionists have a concern about anything they see or is happening in the waiting room a yellow line comes across the screen with a message so they can respond to it immediately.

Ravenstone Primary - There is a worry box provided for any concerns to be submitted by children. Safeguarding training is in September. Every agenda has safeguarding issues. Phased Leaders and Support Staff agendas all contain safeguarding issues. On the back of the visitor’s badges the safeguarding policy is outlined.
**Riversdale Primary** - The use of Operation TeaRose has been very helpful at the school. The feedback has been very good.

**Junction Health Centre** - It is impressive that most of the staff have had training within one year.

**Southmead Primary** - Training has been done for the Governors. The safeguarding information is in the induction pack.

**Yahweh Christian Fellowship** - Use of the intercom system for those individuals coming into the building. Signage and announcements to make parents of children aware of the need to escort children to use the washroom during main services at Sunday service.

**Trinity St Mary’s** - The safeguarding procedures were enhanced at the school and the school safeguarding Audit was completed with the Education Safeguarding Advisor. They had been graded OUTSTANDING by OFSTED and they wanted to reach that standard again. The Governors took part in the training, she asked them to complete the training and to send their online certification to her, which they did. Approximately 4 of the Governors completed the online training. There are now 4 new Governors and they have all attended the training.

Staff members said they would like a specific place where they could find any information on safeguarding, so there is now display board near the staff room for the staff to place and find information on safeguarding. The TeaRose Project is an asset to the school.

**Challenges**

**Borough Police** - Given the tragedy in Paris in November 2015, the enhanced counter terrorism approach in Britain led to the further recruitment of 800 police constables to that team so 140 probationers have come on board. The challenge is to build up capability as quickly as possible once officers are employed.

**EL&C** - A lot of staff are casual – some are sports coaches, they have specific guidance in their areas of specialty. A lot of the governing bodies require them to take a Safeguarding course before being able to work with the department as well as take on the responsibility for DBS. There is a policy in place to ensure that these checks are conducted. Some coach adults some also coach children.

**Adults** – An area of concern was the response to the question about staff knowing who to contact if allegations had been made against a colleague or other professional and the LADO representative as the first person that the staff should escalate a concern to. The agency rep felt it would be useful to send the See The Adult/See The Child information to the staff.

There was a low response to training and recognition overall. The agency rep advised that not a lot of staff in the Adult services undertake child safeguarding training. The Panel stated that this is a significant issue and not the normal practice in other institutions especially from the See the Adult/See the Child perspective. **The Panel asked for this to be noted as a formal concern** as clearly there are overlapping issues in both sectors and it is imperative it is addressed.

**Battersea Fields Practice** - Staff don’t know what the London guidelines are called. Lack of clarity re: speaking to the LADO or the Practice Manager or the DSL at the practice.
The Begg Practice - The Practice was too busy at the time to produce an Action Plan, but Dr Begg said he would do so in the future and send a copy to WSCB.

Ibstock Place School – The safeguarding lead said the captioning of the phrase “See the Adult, See the Child” was viewed as a catch phrase. He did not understand what the question really was asking.

Peabody in Wandsworth - Reluctance of caretaker managers to allow caretakers to go on training – this needs to be addressed.

PP&C - Honour based violence was not well recognised/known. There was a discussion around it not to only think it was an Asian issue but to look at it from other communities as well e.g. the Caribbean community which she is from.

St Georges NHS Trust - SW are not returning calls or information to others in the partnership to keep SGH updated on the progress of the particular case. Feedback is not being sent back to SGH after cases have been MASHed.

Probation NPS - There are mixed levels of knowledge amongst the staff group about the purpose and functions of MASH

Ravenstone Primary - MASH - The professional advice and consultation conversation that should be occurring is not happening on occasion when phone calls are made to MASH by the school. She said there is more of a directive given re: completing the form when there may be a conversation to be had regarding having some advice, yet it goes straight to referral.

Wandsworth D&A - There is sometimes a lack of understanding about roles for social care and D&A – need to keep working on communication

Moving Forward

Borough Police - A number of overlapping portfolios need focus – safeguarding is one of them. A Professional Development Day will be hosted in June. The whole morning of that day will be focused on safeguarding. Operation TeaRose has been very successful where police involvement for any domestic abuse incidents is notified to primary schools the following morning. Schools report this is very beneficial in terms of knowing what a child has gone through the previous evening. He said one detective would be assigned to deal with these notifications.

All officers across the borough should get safeguarding training. This gives a basic message of its importance for staff.

Early Years - Safeguarding Advisor will do seminars from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m to accommodate staff working hours.

Adults – The agency rep stated that request for Adult staff to undertake child safeguarding training should be raised at the Board level. From the Adults perspective it would not be a priority for his unit’s staff being trained. He had spoken to the Assistant Director – Children’s Services re: restarting the Adult & Children Sub-Committee

He said there is a greater understanding of children’s safeguarding services. WSCB Business Manager said that Children’s Services staff would also benefit from increased training in Adult safeguarding.
Agreed that both Adult and Children’s Safeguarding Board Business Manager would meet to further discuss this.

**Battersea Fields Practice** - There would be some role playing done on the FGM issues. FGM Champions would be used for the clinical staff training. The CQC training on FGM included a lot of role play work around how to have a conversation on the issue.

**The Begg Practice** – The Panel suggested it would be helpful to produce a leaflet with all details of safeguarding contacts etc. Dr Begg agreed with this.

**East Hill Baptist Church** – The Pastor said it would be good to have a follow up visit from the Council to give feedback after an audit. This would build communication channels with those in the Council. He extended an invitation either on a Sunday or a Wednesday afternoon.

**Eastwood Nursery** – Panel suggested it would be useful to include peripheral staff in the questionnaire as well e.g. admin, premises, catering.

**Housing** - Panel pointed out that Peabody in Wandsworth had raised the issue that they provided services in 29 different London Boroughs so it was difficult to attend all these LSCBs. Wandsworth Housing said there were 40 different Housing Associations with properties in Wandsworth, but they are happy to be the conduit for information sharing from WSCB.

**Ibstock Place School** - Support staff – technicians, administrative staff. Kitchen staff, premises staff and the nominated Governor for Safeguarding are to be incorporated in the future audits.

**Lifelong Learning** - Staff made some suggestions. There would be a poster produced with the three main safeguarding leads on it so that staff know who to call. The posters would also be placed in the toilets.

**Peabody in Wandsworth** - There is a whistle blowing policy which is not well publicised in the company. This would be added to the Action Plan.

**PP&C** - They hope that there could be an employee who would be able to speak on radicalisation issues as there are a lot of African families that her staff are liaising with, although one of the employees is a member of the Jehovah’s Witness and her views she said were sometimes thought as being radical. Panel stated that she had taken the right approach to use the questionnaire as a tool to get these issues highlighted with her staff/volunteers.

**Priory Roehampton** - Panel suggested that during an induction process the S11 questionnaire could be issued/used as a good means of identifying where new staff’s training needs lay. Priory agreed with this.

**Rent Collection** - Future apprentices would have the questionnaire in their induction packs. From the first year of the audit when the results were not very favourable she put a one pager on the boiler in the kitchen outlining the Safeguarding Lead.

**SSS** - A clear and mapped out audit programme will allow SSS to provide the challenge and support required to improve practice.
Probation NPS - An induction pack is to be co-ordinated for new members of staff which can include the S11 questionnaire as suggested by the Panel.

Ravenstone Primary - There will be some further work done on the training for Honour Based Violence and Forced Marriage. Another survey will be conducted after half term. Governors are to have safeguarding training. The Panel commented that it seems as if staff are very confident and well trained. Generally it is a good return.

Riversdale Primary - Want to make Governonrs aware of the wide issues that are covered by safeguarding

SW London & St Georges MHT - The questionnaire would be a good practice to build into appraisal. Panel suggest they include Admin next year as they observe children and adults in reception. MHT agreed.

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

Borough Police - The use of acronyms may not be helpful for the Police. There is pretty good communication with the Board at Inspector level. The officers on the beat may need to have some knowledge of what resources are available in partner agencies. It would be helpful if partners made each other aware of the teams in their service and what they do. Wider access to e-learning would also be helpful.

Early Years - WSCB Newsletter language is not always relevant to the providers/settings. The Deputy Head of Early Years will interview child minders and nursery workers to see how it can be improved.

EL&C - Understanding where resources are on the website. Having an app on the Wandsworthi would be helpful. EL&C are now no longer part of the council but they still have access to the website.

Battersea Fields Practice - Feedback from social workers is an issue. They send out a lot of information but there is no feedback re: the outcome of the request of the information. It would be good to have a response back to the practice by the social workers. She said it is important to have some feedback so that the practice would know what was the outcome of the case. The follow up is very important for any future issues with some of the families.

RISK – Step Down from CIN to Universal – if this happens to the family and the GP isn’t made aware then this is a risky situation.

The Begg Practice - The work done by WSCB is very good.

CARAS - Communication with the WSCB and CSC is not as always clear in terms of what CARAS could approach the Board to assist with. The agency rep said the organisation works with lots of LAC. She said she has a fairly broad cohort. CARAS sees approximately 60 – 70 young people a week who are LAC or UASC. This cohort could be accessible to the Board in terms of consultation and participation.
Chesterton Primary School – HT stated she had received a lot of help to date through Mrs. Macaulay and other training avenues.

Christ Church Battersea - School nurses change very frequently so follow up areas are not always addressed. This leads to a lack of consistent service for children on Looked After plans/EHCP. There are seven children on EHCP plans. Panel member advised that the School Nurse Service had been recommissioned and started in the Autumn term, however HT stated that said there had been no recognisable improvement in service since this happened. Familiarity and consistency is needed for school nurses to execute their jobs effectively.

Another area of challenge is on Friday afternoon, when children are to go home and can appear anxious at the prospect. HT stated there is never an easy process to get in contact with a social worker, but there is an improvement in MASH responding to her on matters.

East Hill Baptist Church – The Safeguarding Lead said she would like to see good practice shared among the partnership so that it could be used in other organisations.

John Burns Primary - The PREVENT and FGM training would be beneficial as there was a case where it was suspected that a student had had the procedure conducted on her. She said this was an ongoing concern. She would like there to be something in place to help to curtail the occurrence of it in her schools. FGM as a concern only seems to focus on high school students whereas it affects primary age children as well. Perhaps parents would be more likely to come to training if it was badged in a different way and not directly as FGM.

The agency rep stated there are no links with the Madrassahs in the Community. WSCB Business Manager said consideration would be given for links to be enhanced.

PP&C - There is a gap in social care services making referrals. There is a lot of work PP&C have been doing and there are some things that they can offer to social workers given the specific area of focus that they are involved with e.g. HIV training – as an organisation they have 8 years experience in this field. That is the struggle with statutory services, communication with the statutory service providers.

Priory Roehampton - Question 12 is one that staff answered “yes” to, even though they did not have the training. The relationship that the Priory has with Wandsworth provides such a wealth of information. It would be helpful if more front line staff able to participate in training here at the Council.

St Georges NHS Trust - Time frame could be expanded for the return of the audit. Good to have input in drafting of the questions. Time pressures impacted on the ability to follow up with dept. leads encouraging staff to complete survey. Plan is to send link to survey monkey out at a much earlier date but this has yet to be agreed.

Teenage Pregnancy Team - As she is dyslexic the agency rep would have appreciated the possibility of WSCB having a drop-in session (also for new staff members) around the questionnaire. WSCB Business Manager said there would be a drop-in session offered next year. The interviewee said an informal session of the Board mandate and functions could help enhance the relationship with the two departments.
Youth Service and WILS – Stated that the overlap with issues dealing with children and adults is sometimes challenging to address. The WSCB Business Manager said the Adults and Children Sub-Committee would be re-started.

Balham Nursery & CC - Requested some booklets on Protecting Children Abroad. There is a need for an ongoing supply of What is Safeguarding leaflet. Overall the Board does do a good job.

Central EIS/EWS – an induction for new members of WSCB would be helpful

F&CS - With the frequency of audits the Head of F&CS would appreciate prompts as reminders of the deadlines and extract bullet points from them highlighting what is to be done and she has to provide.

FRP - Visibility of the WSCB is a concern. The WSCB Business Manager stated that she would meet with the staff in the agency, and also offer her services to other agencies to educate them on the work of the Board.

Haider Practice - E-mail updates would be helpful and the information would be circulated to the staff. Also request that leaflets on private fostering be emailed to the practice.

LNSS - Tailored training for the organisation’s needs.

Probation NPS - Some MASH input would be helpful concerning thresholds for referrals.

Ravenstone Primary - The Board will need to raise the issue with MASH so that these issues can be addressed and the advice that is requested from the school be given.

Riversdale Primary - Suggest WSCB looks at awarding certs to agencies who complete the audit. Certificated courses would be good to have for the Teaching Assistant staff. The preamble for the questionnaire would be helpful to explain what the requirements are for completing questionnaires.

Royal Academy of Dance - The links with the Board are very beneficial.

Junction Health Centre - We need guidance on what level of training is expected for staff at different levels.

Southfield Practice - We are on the border with Merton and Wandsworth is significantly better at communicating and much more joined up.

Southmead Primary - Real challenge to deliver all the training. Need more input from LA and WSCB. E-learning is ok, but there is real benefit in having face to face discussions. There is need for training from the Council staff. The Forced Marriage leaflet would be beneficial. WSCB Business Manager said these leaflets were available on the WSCB website.

Yahweh Christian Fellowship – WSCB Business Manager to e-mail the details of the faith and voluntary group representative on the WSCB.

Youth Service - Understood there would no longer be training sessions in the evening? The WSCB Business Manager suggested that sessional workers could be accommodated with the TeaRose training sessions.
**SW London & St Georges MHT** – There is a lack of awareness, information and education on mental health issues. This is still a major concern. Perhaps the Board could facilitate more broad learning around this?
**S11 Questionnaires and Action Plans – 3 Year Comparison 2014 - 2016**

Fig 1. Number of Agencies Submitting Self-assessments

![Number of Agencies Submitting Self-assessments](image)

Fig 2. Number of Individuals Submitting Self-assessments

![Number of Individuals Completing Questionnaires](image)
Overall Percentage of Agency Confidence that Staff are able to fulfill child safeguarding responsibilities.

2014 – 89%
2015 – 90%
2016 – 87%

Fig 3. GP Staff Confidence Levels

GP - Staff Confidence Levels

Fig 4. Health Staff Confidence Levels

Health Staff Confidence Levels
Fig 5. Schools & ES Staff Confidence Levels

**Schools & ES Staff Confidence Levels**

- 2014: 89%
- 2015: 91%
- 2016: 86%

Fig 6. Early Years Staff Confidence Levels

**Early Years Staff Confidence Levels**

- 2014: 92%
- 2015: 96%
- 2016: 92%
Fig 7. Police Staff Confidence Levels

Police Staff Confidence Levels

- 2014: 82%
- 2015: 85%
- 2016: 86%

Fig 8. Probation Staff Confidence Levels

Probation Staff Confidence Levels

- 2014: 100%
- 2015: 74%
- 2016: 77%
Fig 9. Housing Staff Confidence Levels

**Housing Staff Confidence Levels**

- 2014: 84%
- 2015: 88%
- 2016: 85%

Fig 10. Council & Partners Staff Confidence Levels

**Council & Partners Staff Confidence Levels**

- 2014: 82%
- 2015: 88%
- 2016: 89%
Fig 11. Vol. Orgs Staff Levels of Confidence

Vol Orgs. Staff Confidence Levels

- 2014: 91%
- 2015: 93%
- 2016: 90%

Fig 12. Faith Groups Staff Confidence Levels

Faith Groups Staff Confidence Levels

- 2014: 84%
- 2015: 91%
- 2016: 90%
Action Plans

Number of Agencies Submitting Action Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training vs Other Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions Identified broken down by S11 Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Safeguarding Information easily available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Recruitment Awareness and Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of how to report Safeguarding concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding as a standing agenda item for staff meetings/supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to date Policies and Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with allegations against professionals and the role of the LADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Children/CME – clear processes and consistent recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See the Adult, See the Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further analysis of audit and self-assessment leading to service improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff to be clear who the safeguarding lead is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of the safeguarding responsibilities of an agency and that ALL staff groups are included (including Agency Staff and volunteers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of how to follow up concerns when it is felt they have not been adequately addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity around who the external professionals are to contact when concerned about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Ensure everyone is aware of the London child protection procedures and Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015

Information from meetings and training cascaded to all staff

Staff know how to challenge and/or escalate concerns

Monitor training undertaken to ensure all staff receive training within required timescales

Encourage staff to think how we can improve our safeguarding practice and act upon suggestions.

Repeat Questionnaire process to monitor impact of training

Improve process of feeding back outcomes of concerns that have been raised re children’s safety.