



devon **audit** partnership

Internal Audit Report

Director of Children's
Services Local Assurance
Test Review

People Directorate
Plymouth City Council

August 2015

OFFICIAL



Auditing for achievement

Devon Audit Partnership

The Devon Audit Partnership has been formed under a joint committee arrangement comprising of Plymouth, Torbay and Devon councils. We aim to be recognised as a high quality internal audit service in the public sector. We work with our partners by providing a professional internal audit service that will assist them in meeting their challenges, managing their risks and achieving their goals. In carrying out our work we are required to comply with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards along with other best practice and professional standards.

The Partnership is committed to providing high quality, professional customer services to all; if you have any comments or suggestions on our service, processes or standards, the Head of Partnership would be pleased to receive them at robert.hutchins@devonaudit.gov.uk.

Confidentiality and Disclosure Clause

This report is protectively marked in accordance with the National Protective Marking Scheme. Its contents are confidential and, whilst it is accepted that issues raised may well need to be discussed with other officers within the organisation, the report itself should only be copied/circulated/disclosed to anyone outside of the organisation in line with the organisation's disclosure policies.

This report is prepared for the organisation's use. We can take no responsibility to any third party for any reliance they might place upon it.

1 Introduction

The Plymouth City Council (PCC) Senior Management structure is such that the single role of Strategic Director for People encompasses the duties of Directors of Children's and Adult's Services.

The Department for Education guidance "Statutory guidance on the roles and responsibilities of the Director of Children's Services and Lead Member for Children's Services" (April 2013), Section 6 entitled *Additional functions not related to Local authority children's services*, states that "*local authorities should undertake a local assurance test so that the focus on outcomes for children and young people will not be weakened or diluted as a result of adding such other responsibilities*".

A template for the local assurance test has been obtained from another Local Authority and completed by the Assistant Director for Children, Young People and Families. The *Local Assurance Test* document is split into six sections which contain a total of 13 questions. These are designed to confirm that the role of Director of Children's Services and its key responsibilities are being sufficiently resourced and addressed.

2 Executive Summary

Overall the responses address the majority of points outlined in the questions and the supporting evidence confirmed the information given. The supporting evidence was defined and then obtained in order to verify the detail within the answers. Sources of evidence, including the recent Ofsted report, PCC structure information and interviews/discussions with a cross section of around six staff, supported a number of the management responses.

In some cases it is felt that the response could be enhanced as the supporting evidence shows more compliance than had been recorded. There are also a number of questions that would benefit from inclusion of additional information such as information on data sharing (Question 4), recognition of capacity issues (Question 7), delegation outlined within formal role profiles (Question 8) and recognition of how family views are incorporated into policy and practices (Question 9).

Whilst there may be potential to expand the answers provided or provide additional information, this review can confirm that the responses provided are suitably evidenced. Appendix A of this report includes a summary Internal Audit comment for each of the 13 questions. The questions are shown in Appendix B which is the full Local Assurance Test document including PCC management responses.

3 Scope and Objectives

The key objective of this piece of work was to verify the document drafted to support the Director of People in evidencing the ability to carry out the Dual Hat Role of Director of Children's Services (DCS) and Director of Adult Services (DAS).

In order to achieve this we reviewed relevant supporting evidence for the '*DCS Local Assurance Test*' document' to ensure it corroborates the statements made and conclusions drawn. As well as documentary evidence we discussed aspects of the return with operational staff and management.

4 Inherent Limitations

The opinions and recommendations contained within this report are based on our examination of restricted samples of transactions / records and our discussions with officers responsible for the processes reviewed.

5 Acknowledgements

We would like to express our thanks and appreciation to all those who provided support and assistance during the course of this audit.

Robert Hutchins
Head of Partnership

DRAFT

Appendix A

Detailed Observations

Question (Local Assurance Test Document)	Comments on Management Responses
1.	The evidence reviewed, which included (Plymouth City Council) PCC staffing structure information and the January 2015 Ofsted report, supported by discussions with staff, confirmed there is a clear structure in place to provide line management and accountability at all levels and promote improved outcomes for children. The Management response references the Ofsted report as this is a key independent source of confirmation on how the service is working. The response makes specific reference to " <i>Leaders and Managers knowing the strengths and weaknesses which need to be addressed as a priority</i> ". In light of this it may have been prudent to include (very brief) key information on either those actions completed or still outstanding, or reference to the Improvement Plan. This would have provided further support to the acknowledgement of issues and the work to address them, in turn increasing the transparency of the response and the perceptions of how well it was working.
2.	The discussions held with a cross section of staff found them able to articulate their understanding of the management structure and resulting line managers. Those with whom this was discussed also commented on the accessibility of management and were happy that they could raise issues and concerns if needed through both formal and informal processes.
3.	The Ofsted report did not include any concerns and previous Internal Audit work had not highlighted any issues relating to the integrity and coherence of the service structure. When discussed with staff there was a clear response that the structure did not impact on their ability to perform their duties, however, some concerns over capacity were raised.
4.	The evidence reviewed, which included the Members area of the PCC Intranet and safeguarding presentations and also the discussions with staff, confirmed the response provided in relation to structures, referral systems and key relationships & processes. Commissioning was covered in question 2 but the response omits to answer the bullet point regarding information sharing agreements, so whilst the majority of areas have been covered and supporting evidence confirmed, the management response is considered incomplete. The presence of the Plymouth Safeguarding Board (PSCB) implies that actions have been taken in respect of data sharing but this needs to be evidenced, or addressed if not in place.
5.	Performance information was obtained from the Policy, Performance & Partnerships Team and then reviewed which confirmed there is a clear level of data available for review, and this is presented to a number of audiences in order to enable the service to be held to account, this included operational management and Councillors.

Question (Local Assurance Test Document)	Comments on Management Responses
6.	The Local Authority has taken a number of steps to make all linked services aware of safeguarding standards and practices. The safeguarding website contains a number of publications and information and the Authority has gone out to visit other organisations as identified in the management response. The PSCB is a multi-agency board so the varied membership allows consistency of messages to be sought and also provides a wide-ranging reach through one forum.
7.	There is a clearly evidenced and experienced management structure in place within the PCC People Directorate. The Management response to this question highlights some of the key responsibilities of the DCS and accountability for these, raising no capacity concerns at present. However, it must be recognised that there will always be pressure on capacity due to the nature of the combined role and at all levels due to budgetary constraints.
8.	Delegation to the Assistant Directors ensures suitable seniority and the management response to this question identifies that this does occur. The response could be strengthened by referencing the receipt of delegation of activities/functions which should be outlined in the role profiles for the Assistant Director posts.
9.	The management response identifies a number of avenues for the capture and integration of Children, Young People and Family (CYP&F) views into policy formation and whilst not all were reviewed, those that were, including Independent Reviewing Officers (IRO) reports, showed a wealth of information with which policy can be informed. The discussions with staff further cemented the view that there is ample opportunity for children to input into the service. Whilst overall there was nothing to contradict the management response, the input of parents and families into the policy making process and setting of priorities was highlighted as not being as strong as it could be. The question specifically makes reference to families as well as Children and Young People, the response provided does not clearly address how the views of the "wider" family are given suitable opportunities to be presented and incorporated into the service where relevant and possible.
10.	A comprehensive response has been provided to this question and the discussions with staff confirmed the sound basis of Supervision, Review and Learning & Development. Some concerns were raised over the capacity to carry out all of these so whilst in place there is a risk to the effectiveness of each. This links into previous responses and also the comments in the Ofsted report relating to staff caseloads being too high. Capacity has been recognised and the comments signpost the CSC Improvement Plan. When discussed with staff there was clarity about the role of the LADO and what happens when the main appointed person is not present, again supporting the response provided. In respect of the ability to protect vulnerable children from being drawn into terrorism, the review found a mixed response and the management response has not specifically addressed this point. Whilst training has been provided to some staff on this issue there is potential for further work to be done and the Local Assurance Test (LAT) document would benefit from recognising and including this.

Question (Local Assurance Test Document)	Comments on Management Responses
11.	The response identified the work being undertaken in relation to Early Help and this was clearly evidenced though the Integrated Health and Wellbeing Programme. The discussions with staff highlighted a high level of positivity towards the effectiveness of the CAF overall, again supporting the response given including Planning in Isolation.
12.	There is clear evidence in place as outlined in the management response that the PSCB is effective and authoritative. The management response was fully evidenced through the review of the Safeguarding Business Plan, PSCB minutes, the Post Review Improvement Plan, most recent Ofsted report and previous Internal Audit Reviews.
13.	The management response is clear on the links to Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) and the integration of the Youth Offending Team. There is a clear strength in respect of partnerships obtained through the work on integrated commissioning. The Ofsted report, as highlighted in the management response, is clear on there being a well-developed Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Therefore through the review of IHWB information, the Ofsted Report and discussions with staff the response has been verified.

Appendix B

Completed Local Assurance Test

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
Clarity about how senior management arrangements ensure that the safety and the educational, social and emotional needs of children and young people are given due priority and how they enable staff to help the local authority discharge its statutory duties in an integrated and coherent way.	1. Are line management and accountability arrangements for safeguarding and the promotion of improved outcomes for children and young people clear and transparent and perceived to be working well?	The Assistant Director (AD) for the newly formed CYP&FS reports directly to the Director for People (DCS). AD CYPF has accountability for operational children in need, children in care and child protection services, care leavers and those offending or at risk of offending, as well as troubled families. These services focus on safety and improving outcomes for children. AD for Learning and Communities is a direct report to the Director of People, and provides the key link through school improvement to supporting the effective deployment of safeguarding responsibilities in school settings, including operational responsibility for the virtual head, in addition the children with disabilities social work service and other SEND services report to the AD for Learning and Communities. These services report to one Head of Service and appropriate social care supervision arrangements are in place for the HOS. This part of the service evidenced good practice when the Ofsted SIF was undertaken in Oct/Nov 2014. In addition the SIF specifically commented that senior managers, leaders and elected members discharge their individual and statutory responsibilities. 'Leaders and managers know the strengths and weaknesses which need to be addressed as a priority.....The DCS and senior managers are visible to staff, are respected and take an active role in quality assurance.' The Chief Executive appraises the independent chair of PSCB. All priorities are informed by the four Integrated Commissioning Strategies that are now in place, with the Best Start in Life Strategy for children and young people.	Good	Appraisal review meeting to take place in November 2015 (i.e. after 6 months of objective/target setting) to review progress.
	2. Are staff able to understand and articulate the line of accountability and know where in the management structure to go with a concern about safeguarding, unsafe practice and 'whistleblowing'.	Accountabilities within the new service areas in the people directorate are clear, and staff do understand their line management accountabilities. NQSW's and other new staff (who attend some of the NQSW learning sessions) receive training from the LADO as part of their induction. The	Good	

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
		<p>allegations management process is discussed and staff are made aware of who to report concerns to, how to access the SWCPP and PSCB websites for reference. LADO presentation at joint service training sessions between CSC and Early Years providers in 2014.</p> <p>Commissioning arrangements are robust in monitoring the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements by providers. ' Whistleblowing', child protection procedures and HR policies to support this are required as part of the terms and conditions of contract and tested at tender. As part of the selection process providers have to undertake a pre-qualification process, which tests their policies and processes, including safeguarding, and safer recruitment. Non-compliant bids will not progress within a tender and providers who fail this area are not selected. As part of contract monitoring processes there is an ongoing focus on Safeguarding and swift action is taken to ensure robust improvement plans as soon as concerns are raised.</p> <p>Procedures are up dated, and PSCB procedures, and responsibilities are up to date, and audited through the S11 audits on a regular basis. The PSCB also runs effective training, and has established a new framework for evaluating the impact across all agencies. The most recent staff survey highlighted an issue that a high proportion of staff, outside the people directorate, do not understand their safeguarding responsibilities. The corporate Safeguarding Improvement Plan has a specific section on ensuring all council staff, and members are aware of their safeguarding responsibilities. This section has been up dated specifically in light of the staff survey findings. The SIP is updated annually and monitored through quarterly Safeguarding assurance meetings.</p>		
	<p>3. Has the integrity and coherence of the structure been 'tested' to ensure fitness for purpose? Can staff confirm that the structure does not impact negatively on them performing their functions or duties?</p>	<p>As set out above the recent Ofsted SIF does suggest that we are aware of the areas where we need to improve, and they did not set out any issues in relation to the structure of services that suggest they are not fit for purpose. As well as managing individual cases safely and appropriately, there have been a number of operations involving multiple children, and</p>	<p>Good</p>	

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
		challenging situations including trafficking that have demonstrated robust responses, planning and arrangements are in place. For example operation Triage, as well as joint work with adults safeguarding that was commended in court.		
Clarity about how the local authority intends to discharge its children's services functions and be held accountable for them from political, professional, legal and corporate perspectives (including where, for example, services are commissioned from external providers or mutualised in an arm's length body)	<p>4. Are the means by which the LA intends to deliver its children's services functions clear and understood by (i) staff (ii) partners (iii) councillors? i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Are delivery structures clear and coherent? * Are critical factors e.g. referral systems, equalities, threshold criteria shared and understood by staff and partners? * Are key relationships and processes around safeguarding, child protection and children in need shared; understood and effectively implemented? * Are staff in Commissioning clear about relationships and processes within CSC? * Are information sharing agreements in place and supported as necessary by multi-agency training? 	<p>Staff, partners and councillors are clear about the structures, and how services deliver their functions and responsibilities. Effective induction is provided for all new starters - see above. Specific induction and training is provided for councillors. This includes specific sessions in relation to safeguarding responsibilities, and their role as corporate parents. The Ofsted SIF commented and recognised that corporate parenting responsibilities are well understood and embedded in Plymouth.</p> <p>It is clear that referral arrangements and the work of the AAS team are well understood across the partnership, however there are concerns about how well thresholds are understood by partners, and the through the PSCB and piece of joint work is being undertaken to address this. A report on this work will be provided to the board. The appropriate and necessary relationships and processes are in place, and the PSCB is supporting work to improve the contributions of key partners including the police and GPs in attendance at CPCs and effective contributions to other processes such as strategy meetings and discussions. Regular reports are being provided to the PSCB, and targets have been set for key agencies.</p>	Requires improvement	Progress re work with partner agencies will be monitored by the children's improvement board and the PSCB
	<p>5. How are children's services functions reported and accountable to (i) the corporate organisation and (ii) the democratic structure? How effective is the scrutiny process and how involved are Members?</p>	The established performance framework ensures that there is regular consideration and analysis in service, and reporting to the DCS, DMT, CMT, and the cabinet member. There is a Corporate Safeguarding Improvement Plan which contains actions for CYPFS, ASC and the council as a whole. In 2015-16 this also contains the Children's Services Improvement Plan from the OFSTED inspection required actions. The CSIP is led by the ADs and subject to scrutiny and challenge at a quarterly Safeguarding Assurance Meeting, attended by the DCS, Chief Exec, PSCB Chair, Portfolio Holders, and Leader of the Council.	Good	The effective running of the Safeguarding Assurance meetings in terms of evidencing improvements in outcomes, and safeguards will continue to be reviewed and adjusted as appropriate.

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
	<p>6. How is the LA requirement in relation to safeguarding standards and practices articulated, evidenced and implemented in commissioned and 'arm's length' services? What early warning indicators can trigger a review?</p>	<p>PCC has met the PSCB Safer Employment Quality Standard. PSCB Business Manager has developed safer recruitment guidance for PCC, commissioned services and other organisations. The document is available to the public on both the PCC and PSCB websites. The LADO has delivered allegations management training to prospective peninsula providers (i.e. Children's Homes, 16+ providers, foster carers etc.) The LADO has recently met with commissioners and one particular children's home provider to deliver bespoke training and learning around the allegations management process in direct response to contract concerns.</p> <p>Providers of regulated services such as residential providers, fostering providers and special schools are required to notify the commissioning team and the relevant social worker of any incidents under regulation 4 and 5 of the minimum standards. Local Authorities share information about provider performance and work closely with Ofsted Inspectors, who attend quarterly Peninsula Meetings to share intelligence on provider performance. When there are performance or safeguarding concerns, local authority officers visit sites and meet with managers to ensure robust improvement plans that are monitored by the Peninsula Board Members. If a provision fails its Ofsted Inspection, they are automatically suspended from the provider list.</p>	Good	
The seniority of and breadth of responsibilities allocated to individual post holders and how this impacts on their ability to undertake those responsibilities (especially where a local authority is considering	7. Does the management structure recognise and allocate capacity to the key functions of the DCS to ensure that these can be effectively discharged and are relationships working well?	The Strategic Director for People carries a range of responsibilities that include: Integrated Commissioning and the joint responsibility with the CCG for a fully pooled budget; ADASS role, commissioning of Adult Social Care provision; all statutory housing responsibilities; neighbourhoods and community safety. The senior management structure is agreed at full council. The management structure ensures capacity is in place, and specific working arrangements to ensure these functions are fulfilled. These include performance monitoring arrangements and regular reports to the DCS. DCS is a full member of the PSCB, and ensures effective links within the Health and Wellbeing Board, and Children's Partnership. In addition the DCS has a programme of meetings, observations	Good	

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
allocating any additional functions to the DCS and LMCS posts)		and visits, that ensure they are sighted and in touch with front line practice and practitioners. The chief executive, cabinet member and DCS meet with frontline staff twice a year. The oversight and understanding of how the DCS undertakes all other responsibilities, and maintains capacity to fulfil these statutory responsibilities is overseen by the chief executive through regular 1-1s, and the appraisal arrangements that ensure review twice a year.		
	8. Where key functions are delegated, is the scope of delegation clear and does the relevant post holder hold the appropriate level of seniority both departmentally and corporately?	As sited above the DCS is a full and active member of the PSCB, however the AD also sits on the PSCB exec, and has the corporate lead for children's safeguarding. Appropriate and considered decisions are made in relation to operational responsibilities, for example when there have been silver or gold operations with the police a case by case decision will be made between the AD and DCS about when it is appropriate to delegate to the AD. When appropriate and necessary there will be daily briefings, discussions, and joint agreement between the DCS and AD, communication is responsive, and swift as necessary.	Good	
The involvement and experiences of children and young people in relation to local services	9. How do the voices of children, young people and families inform and influence policy making and priorities for CYP and families.	<p>All children and young people over 4 years old involved in the CP process or in care have access to advocacy services. Feedback from the Advocacy and Independent Visiting services is considered at the quarterly contract monitoring meeting and informs service development. From April 2015, the Independent Chairs have provided quarterly reporting to the AD on themes and issues, with the expectation that this influences service planning, and this feedback reflects a strong focus on their IRO role in promoting the views and wishes of children and young people.</p> <p>Alongside this children and young people's voice influence planning and commissioning is regularly sought through the Listening and Care Council, the young carers participation and through the commissioning of bespoke participation projects, such reports produced on alcohol and substance misuse, domestic abuse and key worker role for children with special educational needs. Information provided by these groups and</p>	Good	The Chair of the PSCB and the Shadow C&YP Board will develop formal working links and meeting schedules during 2015/16 to ensure the 'voice of the child' is fully embedded in the day to day work of the Board. Further work around the 10 Wishes will be undertaken during 2015/16 to seek the views of C&YP on whether in their view, agency

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
		<p>projects has been utilised to influence the Children and Young People’s Commissioning Strategy and the future commissioning intentions.</p> <p>Young Inspectors have worked with other young people who have experienced child protection services, and at the end of 2014 undertook an inspection of our child protection, and conference arrangements. Results of this are being directly fed back to senior managers and actions agreed in response. The PSCB has established a Shadow Children & Young People’s Board facilitated by the PCC Youth Service. This group will become a formal sub group of the Full Board and the Chair of the PSCB will determine with young people the best mechanism for input and dialogue between the parties. Children & young people have been asked to identify their ‘10 Wishes’ for working more positively in partnership with professionals in order to better support their needs and help ensure they are safeguarded and protected from potential harm. Agencies members to the PSCB have responded to the ‘10 Wishes’ by identifying a joint commitment to each wish and identifying how they are currently meeting the wishes or intend to do so during the next 12 months. The ‘10 Wishes’ and agency commitments are published on the PSCB website. In addition to the identification and support around the ‘10 Wishes’, the Shadow Children & Young People’s Board have developed a DVD to support the PSCB multi-agency training programme. The DVD, produced and performed by young people, contains the thoughts, views, ideas and experiences of C&YP around the ‘10 Wishes’, child sexual exploitation, sexual abuse, on line safety etc. These experiences will help practitioners to improve safeguarding practice and ensure safer outcomes for C&YP. The Shadow C&YP Board has produced a leaflet for C&YP around the serious case review process to explain how such a review will work, the input required from C&YP and how the learning will impact on their future safety and wellbeing. A similar exercise will be undertaken during 2015/16 to develop a LADO leaflet to explain the allegations management process to those C&YP who raise concerns.</p>		<p>commitments to the said wishes are being met.</p>

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
<p>Clarity about child protection systems, ensuring that professional leadership and practice is robust and can be challenged on a regular basis, including an appropriate focus on offering early help and working with other agencies in doing so.</p>	<p>10. Are the operational management and practice systems clear, understood and implemented? i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Are timescales managed/adhered to? * Is there a culture of effective supervision? * Is there a culture of continuous learning & development? * Is there a system of routine line management QA of practice and decisions? * Are there effective offline assurance and audit systems in place? * What arrangements are in place to ensure that any allegations about those who work with children are passed to the designated officer(s)? * What arrangements are in place to protect vulnerable children from being drawn into terrorism? 	<p>Operational management arrangements and practice systems are clear and actions identified by the Ofsted SIF have been undertaken in relation to the recording of some management oversight in the Advice and Assessment Service. Work to improve the quality of practice and supervision is ongoing, and is set out in the post Ofsted service improvement plan.</p> <p>QA of children’s cases is well supported via the Independent Chairs and individual team managers. There is a quality assurance framework in place, which includes participation in multi-agency systems audits (MASAs) and the s11 audit undertaken by the PSCB. There is a well embedded system of monthly case audits undertaken by senior managers with partner agencies, which has been reviewed and refreshed in 2015. The frame work also includes regular audit of supervision records by service managers, audits of quality of assessments in line with a bespoke audit tool, and themed audits commissioned via CSCMT in response to emerging issues. The framework includes a focus on ensuring learning is disseminated, and practice and service improvements are monitored via CSCMT.</p> <p>Prevent training has been offered across the staff team and messages relating to the Prevent agenda are contained within the PSCB safeguarding training. The Safeguarding Service Manager attends the quarterly Channel Meeting and ensures that key staff, including foster carers, contribute to planning for any vulnerable children/young people identified. The IROs are vigilant in this area and ensure they seek young people’s views, using interpreters as appropriate, and referring up any concerns.</p> <p>Operational management and practice systems are provided via Tri-x online procedures and the Plymouth Children’s Safeguarding Board online procedures. These are supplemented by a comprehensive programme of single and multi-agency training.</p>	<p>Requires improvement</p>	<p>See the CSC improvement plan</p>

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
		<p>Effective supervision is being driven by the newly developed framework “Quality Assuring Supervision in Children’s Social Care” with key milestones as detailed in the Service Improvement Plan (area 2).</p> <p>There is a culture of continuous Learning and Development and this is evidenced by the joint quality assurance of supervision files by the author of the supervision notes and their direct line manager which feeds into a conversation around learning and development needs of the author’s own supervision session. The collation of overall judgements by the Professional Development Service will ensure the service stays alert to any need for ongoing supervision training requirements.</p> <p>There is a named Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) who is based in the Children, Young People and Families Service. The LADO works closely with the Advice & Assessment Team (based with them for three days per week) and the Independent Reviewing Officers who chair allegations management strategy meetings (AMSTRATS). Allegations Management Procedures are explained clearly in the South West Child Protection Procedures and the LADO has developed a series of leaflets to explain the process to organisations and individuals subject to concerns. The leaflets are published on the PSCB website and can be downloaded for distribution. The PSCB website contains a detailed flowchart explaining the allegations management process in easy to follow steps. The LADO has developed a model allegations management policy for schools within the city. The LADO provides advice, guidance, challenge and direction to agencies at AMSTRAT meetings, via a telephone helpline and face to face meetings. The LADO has delivered training to agencies and individuals around the allegations management process and general safeguarding practice - this includes schools (including governing bodies) nurseries, foster carers, sports groups, church groups, care providers etc.</p>		

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
	<p>11. Is there a clear model for and offer of 'early help'? i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Is the CAF effectively implemented? * How do other services contribute to early help and do they understand the relevant systems and operate those? 	<p>The Plymouth Assessment Framework for Safeguarding Young People and their Families sets clear thresholds and expectations. The EIP Strategy supported the development of expectations of services to deliver the CAF and improve the tightening of quality assurance to reflecting good planning processes. However there have been some difficulties with the existing system, including services continuing to plan in isolation without sharing information and difficulties in ensuring the right service at the right time due to the myriad of service referral processes and thresholds. Consequently, reporting data continues to be a challenge and is limited to the information that is reported into the CAF Team by agencies. We know that this is not representative of the multi-agency work being undertaken across the system. A full review of existing processes has therefore been undertaken through the council’s transformation programme. This has resulted in a new Early Help Operating Model with the ambition to create better join up of the system through an Early Help Gateway for information and advice and support to assess need and coordinate support - to be fully implemented by September 2016. The Commissioning Strategy sets an ambition for integrating a graduated service offer to enable improved support planning, meeting need at the differing thresholds through a clear assessment of risk and protective facts influencing decisions for intervention. While the need for better co-ordination is being addressed there is much good and impactful provision in place this includes: Children Centres; the Family Group Conference provision through Family and Community solutions; the Family Intervention Project; the Intensive Support team in the youth service; and the Multi-Agency Support Team.</p>	<p>Requires improvement</p>	<p>See the CSC improvement plan.</p>
<p>The adequacy and effectiveness of local partnership arrangements (e.g. the local authority’s relationship with schools, the</p>	<p>12. Is the PSCB effective and authoritative?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Is its structures and processes 'fit for purpose'? (i.e. does it have effective sub-committees to undertake detailed work. Are there effective Performance Management and Audit/Assurance systems?) * Do statutory and relevant voluntary agencies 	<p>Ofsted undertook a review of the effectiveness of the PSCB during October/November 2014. The PSCB was judged to be meeting the requirements of 'Working Together 2013' but requires improvement to be a good functioning board.</p> <p>The PSCB has drawn up a 'Safeguarding Improvement Plan' for 2015/16 in response to the Ofsted review. The PSCB has</p>	<p>Requires improvement</p>	<p>PSCB Safeguarding Improvement Plan to be monitored by the Executive Group and a report on progress to be reported to the Full Board. PSCB to</p>

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
<p>Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board (PSCB), the courts, children’s trust co-operation arrangements, Community Safety Partnerships, health and wellbeing boards, Young Offending Team partnerships, police, probation, Multi-Agency Public Protection arrangements and Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences) and their respective accountabilities</p>	<p>contribute sufficient professional time and resource to the PSCB and its sub-committees. * How does the PSCB report on its work and findings to the LA and other statutory agencies? * Are there other multi-agency partnerships, if yes, how does the PSCB formally link into these and to what effect? * What arrangements are in place to ensure schools and colleges fulfil their duties? * What opportunities are being sought to streamline processes and identify shared areas of concern to influence joint policy development and joint commissioning?</p>	<p>reviewed its working structure for 2015/16 and beyond with strategic work around CSE and the Shadow C&YP Board now integrated into formal sub groups of the Full Board. The PSCB has an agreed working protocol with the Children’s Partnership and the H&WBB with representatives of both these bodies attending PSCB Full Board meetings.</p> <p>Performance monitoring and quality assurance are managed through the Learning & Professional Practice Sub Group (LPP) of the PSCB. A full data set of performance indicators around multi agency practice are analysed and the subject of intense scrutiny at regular dedicated meetings of the LPP Sub Group with formal reporting to the Full Board. A quality assurance framework is currently being developed by the LPP Sub Group and will dovetail with the PSCB Learning & Improvement Framework.</p> <p>Attendance at Full Board and Executive Group meetings are analysed at the end of each year and data included within the PSCB Annual Safeguarding Report. Agency attendance at these meetings are good but some sub group meetings are not always quorate leading to difficulties in making decisions and allocating work streams to meet deadlines within the work programme. The new Chair of the PSCB is meeting with all agency lead members as part of his induction and is re-enforcing the importance of regular participation in all PSCB meetings.</p> <p>Meeting minutes of the PSCB Full Board are published on the PSCB website and a 'highlights' document is produced and distributed to agencies within one week of each Full Board meeting. This document is cascaded to staff in all agencies.</p> <p>The Chair of the PSCB attends each Children’s Partnership Board meeting and presents a brief report on national/local safeguarding issues/developments together with a range of challenges for the Partnership to consider. The Chair of the PSCB will provide in future a regular report to the Council Scrutiny Committee for information and each agency member</p>		<p>analyse results of the Schools Section 175/157 self-assurance audit during July/August 2015 and report findings to the Full Board in September 2015. PSCB Business Manager to identify and review future format, mechanism and timing for PSCB reporting to the Children’s Partnership and Council Scrutiny Committee. Analyse attendance at Full Board and Executive group meetings for 2014/15 and consider how a similar exercise could be undertaken for all sub group meetings.</p>

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
		<p>to the PSCB should provide similar information through their own governance arrangements. Schools are represented on the PSCB Full Board by Headteacher representatives from PAPH, PLT and SHAP. Schools, Colleges and Academies have a duty under Section 175/157 of the Education Act 2002 to ensure they undertake their statutory role with regard to the safeguarding and welfare of children. A Section 175/157 self-assurance audit was last undertaken by schools etc. in 2011.</p> <p>Schools, Colleges and Academies have been asked to complete a self-assurance Section 175/157 audit in 2015 and to provide the PSCB with an electronic return. The audit will identify areas of best practice and also enable the PSCB to identify areas to focus support and resources in order to improve safer outcomes for children.</p>		
	<p>13. What other multi-agency partnerships are in place that are relevant to the wellbeing of Children and Young People?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How are Children's Services involved in MAPPAs and MARAC structures? * How is the YOT Management Board integrated into the broader work of the Children's Service and PSCB? * How are partnership arrangements led and developed to ensure effective focus and coherence? * Are the health priorities for looked after children reflected in the CYPP and monitored by the Children's Trust Board? * Are the needs of vulnerable children a key part of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment? 	<p>CYPFS are represented at management level at the MAPPAs meetings, and there is a well-developed process in place to ensure CSC information is gathered in advance to inform the MAPPAs, and that outcomes are followed up. MARAC arrangements were reviewed and changes implemented last year, to ensure effective involvement of all partners including children's services.</p> <p>The YOT management board is now chaired by the AD for CYP&F's and the HOS is part of the services Senior Leadership Team therefore there is good integration with broader children's services. The HOS is also an active member of the PSCB.</p> <p>The Ofsted SIF confirmed that 'Strategic commissioning is informed by a well-developed joint strategic needs assessment, which includes key information on safeguarding issues and vulnerability.' There are effective arrangements to ensure that the Health and Well Being Board, the Children's Partnership and Safer Plymouth provide good governance. The Children and Young People's Plan has agreed the four priorities across the partnership, and these are: Raise Aspiration, Ensure that all children and young people are</p>	Good	

Assurance Parameters	Key Questions	Evidence provided in 2015	Risk Assessment	Remarks / Action Plan
		<p>provided with opportunities that inspire them to learn and develop skills for future employment; Keep our Children and Young People Safe, Ensure effective safeguarding and provide excellent services for children in care; Deliver Prevention and Early Help, Intervene early to meet the needs of children, young people and their families who vulnerable to poor outcomes; Integrated Education, Health and Care Offer, ensure the delivery of integrated assessment and care planning for our children with additional needs.</p> <p>From April 2014 Plymouth City Council and NEW Devon CCG formed an integrated commissioning function. Integrated commissioning will be achieved through the delivery of four commissioning strategies. The Children and Young People's Strategy has a clear ambition to co-commission early help with schools, and a post has been recruited to support the delivery of this agenda.</p>		

Confidentiality under the National Protective Marking Scheme

Marking	Definitions
Not Protectively Marked or Unclassified	Documents, information, data or artefacts that have been prepared for the general public or are for the public web pages or can be given to any member of the public without any exemptions or exceptions to release applying, have the classification NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED. Some organisations will also use the word UNCLASSIFIED for publicly available information.
Official	The majority of information that is created or processed by the public sector. This includes routine business operations and services, some of which could have damaging consequences if lost, stolen or published in the media, but are not subject to a heightened threat profile.
Secret	Very sensitive information that justifies heightened protective measures to defend against determined and highly capable threat actors. For example, where compromise could seriously damage military capabilities, international relations or the investigation of serious organised crime.
Top Secret	The most sensitive information requiring the highest levels of protection from the most serious threats. For example, where compromise could cause widespread loss of life or else threaten the security or economic wellbeing of the country or friendly nations.