Safeguarding Training:
Best Practice Matrix

April 2014
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This document is intended to be used to support the commissioning and delivery of Safeguarding Children Learning events. This matrix can be used by all involved in safeguarding learning delivery to clarify ‘what is best practice?’

This matrix can support all involved to ensure that the learning experience for the delegates is of best value and of a high quality.

This matrix can be used to:
- Guide organisations / those commissioning training to support them in discussion with the potential provider and support them to make an informed choice about who may best meet their learning requirements.
- Guide potential providers / trainers to support the learning that they provide.

It is recognised that formal training and learning events are a significant investment for organisations in terms of resources (time, finances, and commitment) and it is essential that organisations strive to get high quality learning events delivered by credible, skilled and experienced providers.

This document is to be used alongside the Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Safeguarding Children Learning Best Practice in Safeguarding Training Guidance which gives detailed information about best practice in safeguarding learning.

'The Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Learning, Development & Training Strategy and associated documents are the intellectual property of Leicestershire & Rutland and Leicester City Safeguarding Boards, and cannot be used without expressed permission of those LSCB’s and must not be reproduced or used for commercial or financial gain.'
The Matrix:
When commissioning or developing a formal learning activity: discussion should take place which should consider the indicators in the matrix which then support a learning activity being commissioned that is **relevant, meaningful and engaging**, and also acknowledge the particular complexities that can occur when delivering safeguarding children learning.

The matrix addresses 3 areas which should be considered in the process of commissioning:

- Attributes of the **organisation / ‘commissioner’**
- Attributes of the **trainer / provider**
- **Content, planning and delivery** of the commissioned learning event including trainer and organisation expectations.

We have used the format of outlining some of the expectations of best practice in safeguarding learning and examples of positive and negative indicators to help support and guide discussion between the organisation / commissioner and provider. The responses can guide the commissioner / organisation to make an informed decision about a provider.

---

**It is important when using this matrix to consider the indicators in a balanced way – as not all providers would meet all of the positive criteria, but a negative indicator may be offset by other positives.**

The commissioner needs to take a **pragmatic** approach, and the process for commissioning learning should **always** include discussion about the organisation, delegates, trainer expertise / credentials, learning requirements, delivery methods and evaluation.

A skilled and experienced trainer / provider will undertake a discussion with the commissioner and support the process of accessing the best learning opportunity for the organisation. **This is best practice.**

---

There are some indicators that the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Training Commissioning and Delivery group have deemed to be essential, these are highlighted in the matrix; if the provider cannot evidence this, please consider carefully before progressing with the provider.

**Many organisations have the responsibility of organising their own learning events, this matrix can assist the organisation in making a considered decision about providers; however the ultimate responsibility and decision will be with the organisation about whether to commission.**
It is important to take a pragmatic view using this matrix; for example for training that happens on a regular basis or delivered to an organisation where there is an established relationship with the provider, the ‘Training Needs Analysis’ may not be as detailed for each event, and the discussions may be more or less extensive given the course content, existing relationships etc., however this guidance is thorough to cover a range of consideration points to support the commissioning of high quality safeguarding events. Further advice and support about this is available from the LSCB Training Project Development Officer: Contactable on 0116 4546523.

**Examples of how to use the ‘Matrix’**

**Trainer attributes – Making a decision about a formal teaching / training qualification:**

1. A formal training / teaching qualification is seen as a positive indicator.
   A provider may not have a formal qualification however this may be offset by evidence of extensive experience of delivery of safeguarding children sessions and a significant number of other courses on child development. The provider also has a good understanding of adult learning theory, learning cycles and training needs. The provider has also attended a ‘Training for Trainers’ course in safeguarding children training, however this was not an accredited course.
   *In this case although the provider does not have a formal qualification – the other related skills, experience and knowledge could offset the lack of a formal qualification.*

2. A provider may have a formal qualification in teaching and adult learning, however this teaching qualification was gained over 15 years ago in an unrelated field (i.e. business management), and the provider has no experience or relevant experience in delivering training on safeguarding children, though did deliver IT training for a local authority 6 months ago.
   *Although the provider would have understanding about adult learning – the delivery has been in an unrelated field and there is no evidence of safeguarding learning being delivered, therefore the qualification does not mean that the provider would automatically meet the organisation’s needs.*

These 2 examples demonstrate that it is essential that a pragmatic approach is taken when commissioning a provider to develop and deliver a learning event; it is important to have a discussion to context the information, in order that a **balanced decision** can be made.
**The Matrix – The Organisation:**

**Best Practice: The Organisation**

‘Does the organisation have a strong safeguarding culture and commitment to learning and development to support staff being able to undertake their safeguarding roles and responsibilities in a confident and competent manner?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations:</th>
<th>Examples of Positive Indicators</th>
<th>Examples of Negative Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has a clear understanding about the skills and knowledge requirements of their workforce that allows them to undertake their safeguarding responsibilities in a confident and competent manner</td>
<td>The organisation fully understands their role and responsibilities in relation to safeguarding. The management understand their responsibility for Safeguarding. The organisation has accessed and understood the LLR Competency Framework to identify the required knowledge base for the workforce in order to commission the right learning opportunities.</td>
<td>The organisation does not see safeguarding as part and parcel of their role and duties. The organisation has not identified particular roles and responsibilities for different staff. The organisation has not accessed the safeguarding competency framework and considered it in relation to their workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has a commitment to safeguarding children, and this is integrated and integral to their organisation and day-to-day practice?</td>
<td>The organisation has their own child protection policy that reflects the LSCB procedures, and is written to reflect the process that their own organisation follows. The policy is reviewed and updated on a regular basis, and has details of the contact person within the organisation, staff are clear about who to contact with a concern. The policy is accessible and staff are aware of how to access this and have their own copy. The policy is easy to understand and not overly lengthy and does not include unnecessary information. The policy has a quick process flow chart, which clarifies the process of reporting. The workforce understands how to apply the policy in a practical way.</td>
<td>The organisation has no child protection policy. The organisation has a generic policy, which has no details about support, reporting process within their organisation and contacts numbers. The policy is inaccessible / unavailable / difficult to find. The policy is written in an over-complicated way, and difficult to understand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Best Practice: The Organisation**

‘Does the organisation have a strong safeguarding culture and commitment to learning and development to support staff being able to undertake their safeguarding roles and responsibilities in a confident and competent manner?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations:</th>
<th>Examples of Positive Indicators</th>
<th>Examples of Negative Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has a commitment to supporting staff to access relevant learning opportunities, and has a culture that supports learning and development.</td>
<td>The organisation prioritises workforce learning, allows protected time to support the learning and allow staff to access relevant learning events. The organisation understands the needs of the workforce and their own organisation. The organisation promotes a culture where learning is valued and seen as an ‘on-going’ process, not seen as a one off event. The organisation will discuss the purpose and aim of the learning need with the delegate prior to and after the formal learning event, and support the learning being embedded. The organisation will allow the learner to consider their own learning needs, and support them being met as appropriate. The organisation is clear with the workforce about the purpose of attending the learning event, and expectations around this. The organisation promotes reflective practice and proactively discusses the learning event with the delegate. The organisation supports the workforce in meeting their safeguarding competencies. The organisation provides opportunities to support the learning being embedded. The organisation is able to identify blocks and challenges to learning, and consider this when commissioning / organising safeguarding learning. The organisation considers the timing of the learning activity, and ensures that the learning is delivered under the most positive conditions.</td>
<td>Learning, training and development opportunities are not available. Learning, training and development is considered on a one off basis, as a single event with no discussion with the delegates prior to or after the learning. No explanation of why the learning is required is made to the delegates. There is a ‘poor’ learning culture where the importance of learning is not valued. There is no consideration of learning support needs. The organisation does not recognise a range of opportunities that learning can be gained. Training events are seen as a waste of resources and time, or not as important as ‘the day job’ or viewed as ‘a day off’. The organisation does not share / allow access to essential information, i.e. agency issues that may impact on learning, or let the provider access appropriate policy and procedures. Delegates are blocked from attending the training, or disturbed during the training due to work pressures. No time off is allowed for learning events or to complete pre or post learning activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Matrix – The Provider/Trainer:

Best Practice: The Provider / Trainer
‘Does the Provider have the required skills, knowledge, expertise and experience to deliver relevant and meaningful learning that is credible and supports the workforce in meeting their safeguarding competencies?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Positive indicators</th>
<th>Examples of Negative Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The trainer / provider has a training qualification and / or appropriate and significant knowledge and experience of delivery of adult learning</td>
<td>The provider has a Formal ‘Trainers 4 trainers’ qualification, adult learning / teaching qualification. The provider can demonstrate ability and evidence of delivering high quality; credible, competent safeguarding learning that is delivered with authority. The provider has appropriate, related and extensive knowledge, experience and expertise in the delivery of safeguarding learning. The provider undertakes a Training Needs Analysis and includes evaluation processes. The provider has knowledge and understanding about Adult Learning Theory and different learning styles and adapts the training to meet these needs, (as appropriate). The provider has understanding of the learning cycle. The training is adapted to meet the organisations requirements.</td>
<td>The provider has no qualification and / or experience in delivering adult learning events. The provider has no experience in delivering safeguarding learning. All training delivery / work experience has been in a totally unrelated field. The provider does not undertake a training needs analysis. The provider does not ask for information about the organisation, roles of delegates and aims of the training. The provider has no background in safeguarding and / or working with children and their families. The provider is unable to explain about different methods of delivery, and identify about how they fit in with different learning styles. The provider does not have understanding about adult learning theory. The provider is unable to provide examples / evidence of similar successful training events that have been delivered. The provider is unable to provide a reference / recommendation to evidence their experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Examples of Positive indicators</td>
<td>Examples of Negative Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The provider has an understanding and experience of managing the potential complexities and challenges of delivering safeguarding children learning                                                                 | The provider has appropriate, related and extensive knowledge, experience and expertise in the delivery of safeguarding learning.  
The provider has understanding and the ability to manage the ‘emotional component’ of safeguarding learning.  
The provider understands some of the blocks and challenges that arise within safeguarding session and strategies and ability to manage these constructively and appropriately.  
The provider has the ability to adapt to challenges and adapt a programme appropriately to respond to emerging issues both in the planning and delivery of the learning event.                                                                 | The provider does not show evidence of understanding the ‘emotional component’ or evidence of how they could / would manage issues within a learning event.  
The provider does not ask for any information about local sensitivities current issues for the organisation, and takes no / little interest in the organisation.                                                                                                                                          |
| The provider has experience, skills and knowledge about children's safeguarding issues.                                         | The provider has appropriate and relevant experience and understanding about working with children and families and safeguarding issues. (essential)  
The provider demonstrates that they are aware of current and relevant research, policy and procedures.  
The provider has expertise in the area of the learning.  
The provider asks the organisation about current practice issues and other related procedures that impact on the workforce in relation to safeguarding.  
The provider has experience which is both credible and authoritative in safeguarding.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | The provider has no experience of working with children and their families and / or no related safeguarding experience.  
The provider refers to outdated legislation, policy, procedures and research.  
The provider uses unrelated experience that is not transferrable to the requested learning topic.  
The provider has no relevant experience.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
**Best Practice: The Provider / Trainer**

‘Does the Provider have the required skills, knowledge, expertise and experience to deliver relevant and meaningful learning that is credible and supports the workforce in meeting their safeguarding competencies?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Positive indicators</th>
<th>Examples of Negative Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The provider has a network of professional support that also offers development opportunities. | The provider has access to professional supervision.  
The provider accesses the LLR trainer’s network.  
The provider accesses regular updates and sector information, and attends conferences which allows networking opportunities.  
The provider has a support network (formally or informally) which supports them professionally in safeguarding training. | The provider does not attend any regular development sessions.  
The provider has no network to support when challenging or difficult situations arise.  
The provider works in an organisation, where no / limited time for development or supervision is given. |
### Content, Planning, Delivery and Evaluation of the Learning Event:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice: Content, Planning, Delivery &amp; Evaluation of the Learning Event.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning:</strong> A training needs analysis is undertaken, in which the organisational aims are fully understood, and an event is planned that will support staff to meet their safeguarding responsibilities and competencies, via the delivery of a high quality learning event.</td>
<td>There is a clear understanding of the workplace context and roles and responsibility of delegates. The delegates past experiences and previous learning experiences are considered when developing the learning. Any local or national sensitivities or events are considered which may affect the learning experience. Learning support needs are identified in advance of the delivery and fully addressed with strategies which allow the delegate to fully participate. Health and safety requirements and disability discrimination legislation is considered and are met. The appropriate level of liability insurance is available. The learning event is reviewed prior to and after each delivery. The learning event reflects and uses appropriate methods to deliver the content, considering different learning styles, adult learning theory, learning cycles etc. The learning relates to the LLR Safeguarding Competency Framework and will support delegates in meeting competencies and is clear about which competencies are met. The learning event reflects the Leicester, Leicestershire &amp; Rutland ‘Golden Threads’ There is agreement made about how to address any concerns re practice issues, support needs etc and a feedback mechanism is agreed with contact details exchanged. Any pre requisite skills and knowledge are identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Best Practice: Content, Planning, Delivery & Evaluation of the Learning Event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Positive Indicators</th>
<th>Negative Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected behaviour change and / or outcomes are identified, and processes to measure this change are considered. The target audience for the training is clear. The delegates have appropriate information about the learning event. Clarity on minimum and maximum numbers for the event in order to meet the objectives successfully. There is an evaluation process that tests pre and post learning knowledge, skills and attitudes. There is a plan to support the learning being embedded.</td>
<td>The delegates have no information about the training event prior to the delivery. The delegates do not know what the training is about or ‘why they are there?’ Training is seen as a ‘one off’ event. There is no contact between the commissioner and provider after the initial discussion. There is no consideration of numbers of delegates or pre-requisite skills or knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Content & Delivery:

A high quality learning event to support staff to meet their safeguarding competencies.

- The venue is accessible in terms of appropriate venue, and has appropriate access to the relevant equipment to facilitate a positive learning environment.
- The event has a clear registration process, certificated and records are kept about who attended and which competencies the learning contributed to.
- There is a partnership / ‘working together’ statement at the start of the training which also specifically highlights issues around the ‘emotional component / support’ and confidentiality issues.
- Delegates have appropriate comfort breaks and refreshment breaks to promote an environment conducive to learning to create the best learning environment.
- The ‘emotional component’ of safeguarding learning is anticipated, acknowledged and strategies are in place to address these.
- Safeguarding learning is delivered by at least 2 trainers to manage difficulties / support issues.

- The venue is poor quality that is inaccessible and has inappropriate equipment / space to facilitate learning.
- There is no course outline provided.
- The event does not meet a range of learning styles.
- The event is poorly planned, in terms of timings: comfort breaks, topic content etc, which impacts on the learning experience.
- There is no reference to confidentiality, or the ‘emotional component’ of safeguarding learning.
- There is no advice about where to get support from.
- There are no supporting materials prepared for the delegates.
- The training is delivered by one person, with no additional support mechanisms / plans in place.
- Research, policy, procedures etc. are outdated.
## Best Practice: Content, Planning, Delivery & Evaluation of the Learning Event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Positive Indicators</th>
<th>Negative Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If only one trainer available there is consideration made of how support needs or challenges that arise during / from the training, would be addressed prior to the learning and an agency representative would be available to offer immediate support. Reference to relevant National and local guidance policy and procedures, to a depth that is relevant and proportionate to the delegate. The provider demonstrates learning that is grounded in recent and relevant research, policy and procedures. The provider has expertise in the area of the learning. Learning outcomes are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Reviewed and Timely.) Delegates are encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning. The learning reflects the core values as identified by the Leicester, Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Training Strategy. Feedback / debrief is given to the organisation after every event.</td>
<td>There is no link to local policy and procedures. There are no learning outcomes, or they are vague, or unachievable in the time allowed for the session. The programme is a generic training course which has not been adapted for the audience. The trainer is inflexible and unable to respond to the delegate’s needs / emerging issues. The methods do not encourage the delegates to learn and contribute, and there is not a variety of delivery methods. There is no registration process, or records kept of attendance. There is no contact with the organisation prior to or after the event. The organisation is only contacted if there is a specific difficulty / issue arising on the learning event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: There is a clear evaluation process that is appropriate for the learning event.</td>
<td>There is an evaluation process in place, and feedback is reflected upon and addressed. The evaluation system tests knowledge prior to and immediately afterwards and post learning in order to test out and assess change in skills, knowledge, attitudes and behaviour. Different use of evaluation methods are used to capture behaviour change / impact of learning over a period of time. Evaluation processes use a mix of qualitative and quantitative data.</td>
<td>There is no consideration of evaluation processes. The information on the evaluation form is not used or utilised, or shared and discussed with the organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>