

Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board Business Development Plan 2017-18

Priority: LSCB1 CSE, Trafficking and Missing

Priority Statement: Children at risk of CSE, trafficking and missing are effectively safeguarded

Rationale:

CSE, Trafficking and Missing continue to be high level safeguarding priorities at national and local levels. During 2016/17 changes to the governance of multi-agency CSE work has focused the LSCB's role on scrutiny and challenge and a key priority for the coming year is to strengthen this role and ensure the new governance arrangement continues to secure improvement.

In addition learning from a range of arenas has identified some specific areas of work to target:

- Learning from audit work has identified multi-agency practice issues
- The findings of the Ofsted review of the LSCB have identified the need to improve analysis of missing return interview content
- A Serious Case Review undertaken during 2016/17 set out recommendations regarding Online Safety.

What do we want to be different?:

Delivery of CSE Strategy and Action Plan

An improved approach to safeguarding missing children informed by the outcomes of return interviews

Effective online safety information is supporting young people to be safe online

(Compliance with Safeguarding standards in independent provision [sport/theatre/etc.])

Partnership Lead: Police – Simon Cure

Board Officer: Gary Watts

Key delivery mechanism: CSE Operations Group tbc

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?	Progress made	Impact / what difference did it make?
To extend our 'Missing' quality assurance arrangements better to evaluate causation and identify service improvements required Ref: LLR CSE Ops Group Action Plan 2.1; 4.3	Review the dataset used to monitor the prevalence of missing	June 2017	CSE, Missing and Trafficking Operational Group	Revised data set agreed and operational		
	Agree a framework through which analysis of the outcomes of 'Return from Missing' interviews can be presented highlighting any key causes/themes	July 2017	SEG	Framework for analysis of return interviews agreed and reports submitted on a regular basis		

	Develop a means by which we can trigger service improvements in response to the analysis of 'Missing' interviews from across the partnership	November 2017		Evidence of service impact and reduction in number of repeat missing incidents		
Clear assurance regarding analysis and response to return interview findings Ref: LLR CSE Ops Group Action Plan 3; 2.1; 2.2	Receive reports on the impact of service changes triggered by the return interview analysis	March 2018	CSE, Missing and Trafficking Operational Group	Evidence of service impact and reduction in number of repeat missing incidents		
Assurance re: Delivery of CSE Strategy and Action Plan Ref: LLR CSE Ops Group reporting to LLR CSE Exec Group	Agree a quality assurance and performance management framework through which the CSE Strategic Group and CSE, Missing and Trafficking Group will report on progress and impact of the CSE Strategy and Action Plan	Quarterly Reporting	CSE Strategic Group and SEG	Quality Assurance and Performance Management framework agreed, in place and operational		
Identify potential areas for action re: safeguarding compliance assessments in sport and other voluntary organisations across Leicestershire and Rutland Ref: LLR CSE Ops Group Action Plan 5.1; 5.2	Audit and review the number of historic and current alleged abuse cases in sports clubs and other voluntary activities for children and young people including arts and drama clubs Identify any compliance issues from the voluntary sector assurance project work Devise an awareness raising campaign to alert such organisations to safeguarding expectations	March 2018	This might require a Task and Finish Group since we no longer have a communication and engagement group	Rate of engagement of targeted organisations Outcomes of compliance audits in participating organisations – levels of compliance in initial audits and then ongoing improvements post audit / in subsequent audits		

	<p>Engage organisations in a compliance audit process</p> <p>Consider a programme of support to enable improvements in safeguarding compliance across these sectors</p>					
<p>Effective online safety information is supporting safeguarding of children and young people online</p> <p>Ref: LLR CSE Ops Group Action Plan 1.8</p>	<p>Implement the recommendations arising from the relevant SCR</p>	<p>As set out in SCR action plan</p>	<p>SCR Subgroup / Training and Development Group / SEG</p>	<p>As agreed in SCR action plan</p>		

Priority: LSCB2 Children With Disabilities

Priority Statement: Safeguarding risk with regard to children with disabilities is understood and responded to

Rationale:

A national review of CWD identified that children with disabilities were disproportionately at safeguarding risk but that this risk was not always identified due to service focus being on the child’s disabilities and not their safeguarding needs.
 Cases where those that have been assessed with safeguarding needs have not been identified as CWD.
 Understanding of and response to additional risks to children with disabilities is under-developed.
 Risk that CWD safeguarding needs are missed and that they suffer harm as a result.

What do we want to be different?:

- Clarity of definitions – SEN, CWD etc.
- Understanding issues from local research and audit – dip sampling and focus on safeguarding
- Ensuring bespoke provision or differentiation of services to ensure CWD secure appropriate support
- Focus on Multi-Agency contribution to identification and support (LAC) (CSE).

Joint work with Leicester City

Partnership Lead: LCC – Christine Finnigan

Board Officer: Sanjiv Pattani

Key delivery mechanism: LLR CwD Task and Finish Group

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?	Progress made	Impact / what difference did it make?
Have assurance that additional safeguarding risk re: disabilities is understood and responded to across partner agencies	Carry out an audit to determine whether the issues identified in the national research are present in Leicestershire and Rutland	Timescales to be determined by CwD Task and Finish Group	LLR CwD Task and Finish Group	Need to design indicators arising from issues identified in audit		
	Identify any other issues that create additional safeguarding risk for C&YP with SEND	November 2017	LLR CwD Task and Finish Group	Profile SEND population and monitor outcomes		
	Carry out Organisational self-assessment to test the effectiveness of current	September 2017	LLR CwD Task and Finish Group	Assurance and effectiveness of overarching		

	arrangements			assessment of Safeguarding standards for C&YP with SEND		
	Carry out Multi-agency Case File Audits to test the effectiveness of current arrangements	October 2017	LSCB Multi-Agency Audit Subgroup	Assurance and effectiveness of overarching assessment of Safeguarding standards for C&YP with SEND		
	Agree a plan for improvement that enables us better to safeguard CWD	November 2017	LLR CwD Task and Finish Group	Compliance with national recommendations for Safeguarding (C&YP) with SEND across LLR		

Priority: LSCB3 Signs of Safety

Priority Statement: To embed and ensure consistency of practice across the partnership in delivering the Signs of Safety model of practice in Early Help, Child Protection and Care

Rationale:

Evidence has suggested that the Signs of Safety model has supported improved multi-agency safeguarding assessment, review, planning and delivery and enabled children, young people and parents/carers to engage more productively in these processes. Both Leicestershire and Rutland are now promoting this model of working. The purpose of the LSCB's involvement is to promote and support the engagement of all agencies, most importantly schools, to support the embedding of the model and to secure assurance that the approach continues to secure improvements in service delivery and safeguarding outcomes for children and young people.

What do we want to be different?:

All agencies effectively engaged in Signs of Safety
Specifically Schools engagement in Signs of Safety
Consider common approaches with Leicester City

Partnership Lead: LCC – Moira O’Hagan & RCC – Tracy Holliday

Board Officer: Helen Pearson

Key delivery mechanism: Signs of Safety Task & Finish Group

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?	Progress made	Impact / what difference did it make?
To promote and support the embedding of Signs of Safety across the partnership	Ensure that all relevant agencies understand the benefits of Signs of Safety and enable staff to attend the appropriate training and development to participate in the new model of delivery	Ongoing throughout the year since new staff will need training as they are appointed	Signs of Safety Task and Finish Group	Numbers trained across all relevant agencies as a proportion of the whole that require such training Audit of the quality of individual and collective contributions to Early Help, protection and care processes as set out in the QAPM framework (see below)	LLR Signs of Safety Task and Finish Group will develop a new Action	

<p>Increase schools awareness, engagement and skills in engaging in the Signs of Safety model</p>	<p>Ensure that there is a targeted programme to engage schools at both strategic and operational levels</p>	<p>July 2017</p>	<p>Signs of Safety Task and Finish Group</p>	<p>Numbers trained across all relevant school postholders as a proportion of the whole that require such training</p> <p>Audit of the quality of individual and collective contributions to Early Help, protection and care processes as set out in the QAPM framework (see below)</p>	<p>Plan on April 27th</p>	
<p>To agree a quality assurance and performance management framework to test the impact of Signs of Safety on the quality of safeguarding services/practice and safeguarding outcomes for children and young people</p>	<p>To work with the two Local Authority leads to agree a QAPM framework that enables the Board to test the impact of Signs of Safety in the areas set out in the rationale</p>	<p>April / May 2017</p>	<p>Signs of Safety Task and Finish Group and SEG</p>	<p>Performance Framework agreed against the four quadrant model – data, qualitative audit, user perspectives, staff perspectives.</p>		