

Primary School Head Teachers

WSCB Schools Safeguarding Audit 2016

Adrian Over - Education Safeguarding Manager

Response

- Thank you!
- 251 respondents to date
- 244 included in analysis by Business Intelligence
- 122 responses by 1/7/16
- 191 by 14/7/16
- 238 by 5/9/16
- Fewer than 10 schools have not submitted a response

Status of schools that responded

- 4 nursery schools
- 194 primary schools (8 independent)
- 46 secondary schools (7 independent)
- 2 FE colleges (re: provision for under 18's)
- 5 alternative providers of education

Confusion about WSCB and WCC

- General lack of understanding about distinction between WSCB and WCC and what each provides:

“Sorry, don't know the difference between WCSB and the LA!”

“Confused over the difference between LA and WSCB.”

- When asked what is helpful about WSCB, many responses related to support from WCC including Education Safeguarding Service and were repeated in response to later question about WCC support

Confusion about WSCB and WCC

- WSCB – **inter-agency body** responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of arrangements to safeguard and promote the well-being of children across range of partner agencies, of which **WCC is only one**. Key tasks: **ensure effective inter-agency safeguarding procedures** in place, **ensure effectiveness of single agency safeguarding training**, undertake **serious case reviews**. Provides some multi-agency training. Includes **Education Sub-Committee**
- WCC – responsible for enquiring into circumstances in which children are experiencing significant harm and are in need. **Education Safeguarding Service is part of WCC**, providing dedicated safeguarding advice, guidance, information, support and traded training service for education sector

Findings

- 10 schools reported only one DSL, 2 of which are secondary schools
- 29 secondary schools have 4 or more trained DSLs; 17 have three or less. 5 secondary schools have 10+ DSLs
- 78 schools (72 primary, 3 secondary, 3 AP) have 2 DSLs – significant number of those are smaller primary schools
- 79 schools (66p /12s) have 3 DSLs

Findings

'It is a matter for individual schools and colleges as to whether they choose to have one or more deputy designated safeguarding leads. Any deputies should be trained to the same standard as the designated safeguarding lead.'

'During term time the designated safeguarding lead (or a deputy) should always be available (during school or college hours) for staff in the school or college to discuss any safeguarding concerns. Whilst generally speaking the designated safeguarding lead (or deputy) would be expected to be available in person, it is a matter for individual schools and colleges, working with the designated safeguarding lead, to define what "available" means and whether in exceptional circumstances availability via phone and or Skype or other such media is acceptable.'

'It is a matter for individual schools and colleges and the designated safeguarding lead to arrange adequate and appropriate cover arrangements for any out of hours/out of term activities.'

(KCSiE 2016)

Support and supervision for undertaking safeguarding activity

Working Together to Safeguard Children and Young People (DfE 2016):

‘Organisations should have in place arrangements that reflect the importance of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children, including:

- a designated professional lead for safeguarding. Their role is to support other professionals in their agencies to recognise the needs of children, including rescue from possible abuse or neglect. Designated professional roles should always be explicitly defined in job descriptions. Professionals should be given sufficient time, funding, **supervision and support** to fulfil their child welfare and safeguarding responsibilities effectively;*
- appropriate **supervision and support for staff**, including undertaking safeguarding training: employers are responsible for ensuring that their staff are competent to carry out their responsibilities for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children and creating an environment where staff feel able to raise concerns and feel supported in their safeguarding role.’*

Support and supervision for undertaking safeguarding activity

- Wide range of arrangements including a lot of informal discussions between DSLs in schools (*NB are they recorded?*)
- Some surprising responses in respect of 1:1 supervision from external providers – 22 schools (18 primary, 2 secondary, 1 nursery, 1 AP) reported such arrangements - *worthy of further exploration*
- 63 schools identified that support is provided at least in part by DSLs attending cluster/consortium meetings with DSLs in other schools - *also worthy of further consideration and development*
- Other responses included: weekly planned meetings of DSL and pastoral teams; *DSLs regularly reviewing each other's responses to green forms*; regular meetings with other intervention (e.g. CAF trained) staff; regular meetings with school counsellor

Do schools' Child Protection and Safeguarding policies take into account the procedures and practice of WCC as part of inter-agency safeguarding procedures set up by WSCB?

- 5 schools said no
- 2 schools made reference to having academy trust policies in place
- *'The child protection policy should describe procedures which are in accordance with government guidance and refer to locally agreed inter-agency procedures put in place by the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB)' (KCSiE DfE 2016)*

Providing all staff and volunteers with copies of policies and Part 1 of KCSiE as part of induction

- 200+ schools reported robust arrangements including keeping a record. Most others indicated intention to tighten process up
- Common issues included need to include volunteers and temporary staff; ensure staff and volunteers sign to confirm they have read policies and KCSiE; need to pursue some staff that have not signed; intention to introduce new process in September 2016; need to add this to induction process; plan to include this process for all new starters from 9/2016;
- 42 schools stated they do not provide all staff and volunteers with access to policies – plans included introducing leaflets summarising key policies for all temporary staff and visitors; plans to send policies to new staff before start date; need to include policies in updated induction programmes

Providing all staff and volunteers with copies of policies and Part 1 of KCSiE as part of induction

Concerns:

- One reference made to volunteers working under the supervision of staff and therefore not requiring access to policies
- *“We do not give copies of the policies to volunteers or those on work experience and have no intention of doing so unless it is statutory.”*
- Comment: **Safeguarding is everybody's responsibility.** Children do not make distinction between adults based on whether or not they are paid. **Any adult** working with children may **notice something**, may **need to use the whistleblowing policy** and may be the **adult a child feels comfortable to speak to** and **possibly disclose abuse/neglect to**

Induction

- 22 schools stated that not all new staff including temporary staff and volunteers receive a safeguarding induction before they have contact with pupils/students
- Issues: need to improve induction arrangements for volunteers & temporary staff; need to formalise induction processes; and need to ensure staff receive a safeguarding induction before they have contact with children
- 73 schools stated they do not retain a record of induction
- Some responses focused on provision of documents/policies. Others included 1:1 meetings with DSL/HT. However, what is of primary importance is the **need for SLT to emphasise the importance of safeguarding and to promote the safeguarding ethos/culture of the school**

Induction - responses

- *“In response to this audit the Headteacher has agreed that the DSL should induct all new appointees on the school’s safeguarding expectations and arrangements as they join the school.”*
- *“All new staff are given a safeguarding induction but this has not applied so much to volunteers. I can see there is a gap here which we will need to address.”*
- *“All new teaching staff currently receive face to face induction training with the DSL/Safeguarding lead. This model will be extended to include new associate staff and volunteers from September 2016.”*

Safer Recruitment

- All respondents reported at least one school leader had undertaken SR training since 30/06/13
- All respondents confirmed that recruitment to all posts includes a face to face interview with a minimum of 2 panel members and questions about candidates' attitudes to and commitment to safeguarding
- Only 3 schools reported that there had been a recruitment campaign for any post that had not had at least one panel member who was trained in Safer Recruitment – all three identified the need to access SR training as matter of priority

Staff training

- All but 22 schools delivered two or more training sessions; only 12 reported that they do not maintain a record of staff training - all intend to address during 2016/17
- Content: **definitions** of abuse; responding to **disclosures**; **recording** safeguarding concerns and **reporting** to DSLs; and **identifying & preventing extremism** are all **widely covered**
- 6 secondary schools (4 mainstream, 1 special, 1 independent), 1 alternative provider and 1 FE College reported that CSE was **not** included in staff training. **This is a significant concern for WSCB**
- 47 primary schools (only 4 infant schools & 1 nursery school) reported that CSE and issues of consent were not covered. **Children need to be educated about consent from Reception onwards – Protective Behaviours and Spring Fever will help**

Staff training

- Impact of abuse – 156 primary, 41 secondary
This is important both in motivating staff to notice and report safeguarding concerns and also as an inhibitor to potential abusers who may minimise the impact of abuse on children
- Shared responsibility for online safety – 168 primary, 43 secondary
- Safer working practice – 172 primary, 44 secondary
- Female Genital Mutilation – 136 primary, 35 secondary
- Forced Marriage – 95 primary, 26 secondary

Staff training – which groups of staff are trained?

- Teachers, TAs, office staff are widely trained
- 34 schools (21 primary, 13 secondary) **did not include lunchtime supervisors** in training sessions.
- 180 schools (140 primary, 33 secondary) **did not include volunteers** in training sessions.
- All staff, paid and unpaid, require training – **safeguarding is everybody's responsibility**. Children spend a lot of time with LS's at a time when their day is less structured and there is more opportunity for conversation – children may disclose to Lunchtime Supervisors & volunteers; LS's & volunteers may notice that something is wrong. LS's & volunteers may also need to whistle blow.

Managing children's behaviour safely

- 147 schools (only 4 mainstream secondary) stated they are Team-Teach accredited
- 28 (including 2 mainstream secondary) confirmed that their training is in date
- Of the 104 that are not TT accredited, 24 stated that they **do not have a strategic approach to managing pupils' behaviour** that is compliant with WSCB policy and DfE advice
- This leaves staff in those schools and schools whose TT accreditation is out of date vulnerable when allegations are made against them following physical interventions; as well as leaving children vulnerable to unsafe and inappropriate responses to their behaviour

Inspecting safeguarding in early years, education and skills settings - guidance for inspectors undertaking inspection under the common inspection framework (Ofsted 2016)

‘13. In settings that have effective safeguarding arrangements, there will be evidence of the following:

*Positive behaviour is promoted consistently. Staff use **effective de-escalation techniques and creative alternative strategies** that are specific to the individual needs of children and learners.*

Reasonable force, including restraint, is only used in strict accordance with the legislative framework to protect the child and learner and those around them. All incidents are reviewed, recorded and monitored and the views of the child or learner are sought and understood. Monitoring of the management of behaviour is effective and the use of any restraint significantly reduces or ceases over time.’

Curriculum – nursery and primary

- The promotion of fundamental British Values – 194
- Issues of consent and healthy relationships – 151
(includes 3 nursery + 12 Infants)
- Online safety – 192
- Protective Behaviours – 174 schools stated they subscribe. Most others stated they have booked dates or have plans to book training during 2016/17

Curriculum – secondary, FE colleges and alternative providers

- How children can keep themselves safe from bullying including online bullying – 49
- How children can identify and report different types of abuse and any concerns about their own or others' welfare and to whom they can report it – 46
- Healthy relationships including sex education – 49
- CSE including informed consent – 49
- The promotion of fundamental British values - 48

Early help

- 92 schools reported fewer CAF trained staff than DSLs
- Many reported intention to train more staff. Several stated that current numbers are adequate
- 46 schools (2 nursery, 35 primary, 8 secondary, 1 AP) did not initiate a CAF during the year
- Total CAFs initiated: 1,012 (average 4.03 per school)
- Nursery/Primary: 629 (average 3.18) – 10 schools 10+ each
- Secondary: 368 (average 8) – 5 schools initiated 25+ each
- FE College/AP: 15 (average 2.14)

CSE

- 21 schools indicated that their staff do **not** understand the signs indicating that children may be subject to sexual exploitation – all planning to address this in staff training
- 95 schools stated that they are **not aware** of Warwickshire's child sexual exploitation campaign "Something's Not Right"?
- including **10 secondary schools** and **1 FE College**
- 63 schools did not answer 'Yes' to the question '*Does your PSHE / RSE curriculum address the issue of consent?*' – several considering implementing Spring Fever

Some infant & primary schools suggested this is developmentally inappropriate –requires more discussion to ensure consent as a broad concept is introduced as early as possible, e.g. through protective behaviours

Staff vigilance – identification and reporting of safeguarding concerns to DSLs

- 247 schools reported that they use green forms or a slightly modified version of them. Of the remaining four, 3 schools declared they intend to review their systems
- 129 schools (N - 1, P – 112, S – 10, FE/AP – 6) reported 40 or fewer concerns raised by staff during the academic year (total 2,510)
- 118 other schools reported 40+ concerns (total 14,088)
- 4 schools were unable to report how many concerns had been raised. 1 school reported it does not maintain a log

Staff vigilance – identification and reporting of safeguarding concerns to DSLs

- Overall total concerns – 16,598 (average 66.13 per school)
- N/P – 11,777 (average 59.48 per school)
- S/FE/AP – 4,821 (average 90.96 per school)
- Total number pupils on roll – 79, 314
- 1 concern identified per 4.78 pupils
- 0.21 concerns per pupil
- Total pupils eligible for free school meals - 6, 682
- 2.48 concerns per pupil eligible for FSM
- 1 concern per 0.40 pupils eligible for FSM

Identification and reporting of safeguarding concerns to DSLs

Primary sector

- Overall total concerns – 11,777 (average 59.48 per school)
- Total number pupils on roll – 44,366
- 1 concern identified per 3.77 pupils on roll
- 0.27 concerns per pupil
- Total pupils eligible for FSM – 3,928
- 3 concerns per pupil eligible for FSM
- 1 concern per 0.33 pupils eligible for FSM

Identification and reporting of safeguarding concerns to DSLs

Secondary sector

- Overall total concerns – 4,821 (average 90.96 per school)
- Total number pupils on roll – 32,377
- 1 concern identified per 6.72 pupils on roll
- 0.15 concerns per pupil
- Total pupils eligible for FSM – 2,315
- 2.08 concerns per pupil eligible for FSM
- 1 concern per 0.48 pupils eligible for FSM

Child protection referrals

- 62 schools (2 n, 54 p, 6 s) did not make a CP referral throughout the academic year
- 181 schools made total of 878 referrals. 491 (56%) were accepted by Children's Social Care
- 20 schools (8%) made 342 referrals (39% of total).
184 (54%) of those were accepted by CSC
(6 primary – 74 referrals; 12 secondary – 243 referrals; 1 FE – 14; 1 AP - 11)
- 156 schools did not make a child in need referral.
95 schools made total of 222 child in need referrals.
27 schools made 139 (63%) CiN referrals
- Several schools indicated that they submit all referrals as child protection and leave it to CSC to determine threshold

What is helpful about WSCB and WCC?

- Training
- Advice/support/guidance
- Information updates/e mails
- Taking Care scheme
- Availability/approachability
- Model policies

What is unhelpful about WSCB and WCC?

- 169 responses indicated no dissatisfaction
- MASH/thresholds/referrals/response times ... although:
'Situation has improved through launch of MASH'
'MASH is a great improvement'
- WiLMA
- The audit itself ... although:
'This Audit has been extremely useful'
'Annual review form to complete - ensures compliance with current best practice and prevents risk of complacency.'
'This survey has been helpful in making us think about the way we approach and record safeguarding.'
- Distinction between what is mandatory/statutory and what is best practice

What is unhelpful about WSCB and WCC?

Some dissatisfaction with Education Safeguarding Service:

- Difficulties accessing/lack of information about/need for more variety/cost of **training**
- Overload of /accessing **information**; information not provided at most helpful time; **lack of clarity** of what is and is not required
- **Speed** of response; occasionally it can be **difficult to speak** to somebody about possible referrals / advice on a situation or concern
- **Not very 'visible'** in terms of communicating with schools etc.