Report to: Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

Date: 26 September 2006

By: Director of Children's Services

Title of report: Safeguarding Children – Member and Senior Management Oversight

of Services

Purpose of report: To advise Scrutiny Committee of the systems in place for senior

managers and Members to ensure that services to safeguard children

are properly co-ordinated and managed effectively.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

- 1. Note the systems in place for oversight of the safeguarding work of children's social care and the findings of the Lead Member visits and senior manager file audits.
- 2. Agree to receive an annual report on the monitoring and audits undertaken by the Lead Member and senior managers.

1. Financial Appraisal

1.1 There are no financial implications. The report describes services that are already provided from within Children's Services budgets.

2. Supporting Information

- 2.1 In 2003 the Victoria Climbié Inquiry by Lord Laming was published. This report included two recommendations about Member and senior manager oversight of work undertaken by social care staff:
 - that senior managers inspect, at least once every three months, a random selection of case files and supervision notes; and
 - senior managers and relevant Councillors regularly visit intake teams in their children's services department, and to report their findings to the chief executive and social services committee.
- 2.2 In February 2005 local social care services for children were inspected by inspectors from the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI). It was part of a national programme of inspections using agreed standards and criteria. As part of the inspection, they also evaluated the Council's response to the Victoria Climbié Inquiry (VCI), published in January 2003. An area for improvement identified by the inspectors was the arrangements for oversight of intake teams by Lead Members.
- 2.3 This report details the actions taken by senior managers and Lead Members to implement these recommendations of the Victoria Climbié Inquiry and to respond to the area for development identified by CSCI.
- 2.4 The Children Act 2004, section 19 requires a childcare authority to appoint a Lead Member for Children's Services to undertake such functions conferred on or exercisable by the authority as the authority consider appropriate. In response to the findings of the CSCI inspection in 2005 arrangements were made for the Lead Member for Children and Families to visit the four duty teams in the County. Between July 2005 and July 2006 13 Monthly visits were completed to the four duty teams

in Eastbourne; Battle; Lewes and the Disability team at Sorrel Drive, Eastbourne. A pro-forma was developed for recording the findings of these visits (see appendix 2) and on all visits the manager was seen along with other members of staff.

- 2.5 Issues discussed during Lead Member visits included:
 - use of computers and electronic social care records;
 - the development of the Children Index;
 - workloads; and the re-structuring of services.

Issues raised by the Lead Member with senior managers as a result of the visits included:

- training;
- computer access;
- re-structuring of services.

Lead Member's comments on the teams visited included:

- '..a committed team who share professional advice together';
- 'I was impressed by the calm atmosphere and business-like approach to everything.';
- 'A very tight and well-run team...'.
- 2.6 In addition to the Lead Member's visits to the duty teams the Deputy Director for Children & Families also visits each duty team at approximately six-monthly intervals meeting with staff in order to discuss any concerns they have and to ensure they are fully aware of any service developments.
- 2.7 Senior managers have been conducting quarterly file audits since 2003. Files are chosen at random from teams ensuring that at least one file from each worker in the team is reviewed. Managers then audit the files against a set of professional standards (Appendix 1 includes the pro-forma for the file audit). Following the CSCI inspection in 2005 the file audits were organised to ensure that one each of the four duty teams was audited each quarter. Findings from the file audits are reported to the Children's Social Care Management team and action plans are developed in response to the development areas identified by the audits.
- 2.8 Strengths identified within the file audits include:
 - compliance with child protection procedures and effective child protection conferences;
 - effective inter agency work to safeguard children;
 - good working in partnership with parents.

Areas for development include:

- continues to be difficult to evidence views and wishes of children
- concerns about feedback given to referrers and other agencies.
- issues re: geneograms but this may reflect the nature of duty work focussing on initial assessments and short-term interventions.

3. Conclusion

3.1 The monitoring arrangements in place meet the requirements of the Victoria Climbié Inquiry and provide effective mechanisms to ensure that Members and senior managers are informed about the quality of services being offered by their front-line staff, and are able to take appropriate action to remedy deficiencies as they are revealed.

Matt Dunkley Director of Children's Services

Contact Officer: Fiona Johnson Tel No. 01273 481289

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

The Victoria Climbié Inquiry - Report of an Inquiry by Lord Laming 2003Keeping Children Safe: The Government's Response to the Victoria Climbié Inquiry Report and Joint Chief Inspectors' Report Safeguarding Children 2003

Appendix 1

Senior Managers Audit – Name of Auditor					
		Looked After Child on Child the Regis	Child in ster Need	ed	
Case	Name	Team			
Keyw	orker	Practice Manager			
1.	Is the CF4 (chronol	ogy) appropriate and up to date	e? Yes	No	
	Is there an appropri	iate geneogram?	Yes	No	
2.	Is there an up –to-d (not necessary for a		Yes	No	
	Is there an up-to-da	te IAR?	Yes	No	
	Was there a clear d	ecision made at 24 hours?	Yes	No	
	Was the Assessme	nt completed within timescale?	Yes	No	
	Have all relevant ag	encies been contacted?	Yes	No	
	Has the child been	seen?	Yes	No	
	Is there a clear anal and a plan to resolv	lysis of family needs/difficulties	Yes	No	
	Have agencies beer	n informed of the outcome?	Yes	No	
	Is it clear what the safter the IAR is com	status of the child is pleted?	Yes	No .	
	Are there any issue	s re signature etc?	Yes	No	
	Comments:				

3.	Is recording legible, dated and signed Comments:	Yes	No
4.	Are outcomes of supervision recorded on the file Comments:	? Yes	No
5.	Is there evidence of management oversight on the file i.e. has the file been audited PM/OM? (On DAT files has the IAR etc been counter-signed by Comments:	Yes y the PM?)	No
6.	From the assessment is it clear what the family's n	eeds are regardin	g?
	Race	Yes	No
	Language	Yes	No
	Religion/Culture	Yes	No
	Disability	Yes	No
	Are these needs addressed in the care plan?	Yes	No
	Comments:		
7.	Are the views of the child clearly recorded?	Yes	No
	Comments:		
8.	Are the views of the parents/carers clearly recorded?	Yes	No
	Comments:		

If the child has been the subject of a CP investigation answer Questions 9-11.					
9.	Was the child protection investigation proceeded by a	hild protection investigation proceeded by a:			
	Strategy Discussion	Yes	No		
	Strategy Meeting Comments:	Yes	No		
10.	Were appropriate agencies consulted? Was the child seen? Comments:	Yes Yes	No No		
11.	Were referrers told of the outcome of the investigation Yes	n?			
	After the investigation was completed was the status the child clear?	of Yes	No		
	Comments:				
If the	child's name is on the CPR answer Questions 12-16				
12.	Is there a Core Assessment/child protection assessment on file? Was the Assessment completed within timescale? Comments:	Yes Yes	No No		
13.	From your reading of the file did the conference recor	rd reflect clear	ly the critical risks to		
		Yes	No		
	Comments:				

14.	Is there a CP plan using the agreed pro-forma?	Yes	No
	Does the CP plan safeguard the child?	Yes	No
	Comments:		
-			
15.	Is there a Core Group?	Yes	No
	How actively has it met between Reviews?	1 2 3 4	5 or more
	Was this sufficient? Comments:	Yes	No
16.	Is the child being seen every 10 days by a member of the core group?	Yes	No
	Is the child being seen every six weeks by the social worker?	Yes	No
	Has the social worker had seen the child alone? Comments:	Yes	No

Is the child Looked After? If so answer Questions17 – 19.

17.	Are copies of relevant documentation completed and up to date?		
	LAC Reviews	Yes	No
	Essential Information	Yes	No
	Care Plan	Yes	No
	Permanence Plan	Yes	No N/A
	PEP	Yes	No N/A
	Health Assessment Comments:	Yes	No
 18.	Are Statutory visits taking place	Yes	No
	Is the child being seen alone?	Yes	No
- 19.	Does record of statutory visit cover		
	Standard of care	Yes	No
	Child's view of placement	Yes	No
	Carer's view of placement	Yes	No
	Health	Yes	No
	Education/Training/Employment	Yes	No
	Social presentation/Self-care skills	Yes	No
	Comments:		

21 /	Any Issues to raise with Line Manager?	
Signed	dDate	
Signeu.	uDate	

Any Further Comments?

20.

Visits by Elected Members to Teams in Children's Services

Date of Visit	Team Visited
Manager(s) seen	
Staff seen	
Work Areas discussed with Mana	ger
Issues Discussed with staff	
Members views of the service	
Matters to be raised with Senior N	Managers
Any specific resource shortfalls	
Sign	ned
Dat	
1741	