

# **School Safeguarding Audit Report 2017**

**Date: March 2018**  
**Kelly Waters – Senior Adviser, Safeguarding**  
**Education, Quality Assurance and Intervention Service**

## Contents

	Page
Methodology	3
Outcomes & Purpose	5
Validation of the Evidence	7
Key Themes	8
Is the evidence supported by data from Ofsted Inspections?	10
Proposed Action Plan	11
Statistical Overview & Analysis:	
1. DSL and named Governor Roles	12
2. School Ethos	14
3. Safeguarding & Child Protection Policy	17
4. Child Protection Procedures	20
5. Record Keeping & Monitoring	23
6. Use of External Providers	26
7. Training & Induction	28
8. Safer Selection & Recruitment	31
9. Safer Working Practices	33
10. Understanding Child Abuse	35

## **Methodology**

Governing Bodies and Headteachers need to ensure that their safeguarding responsibilities in accordance with sections 157 + 175 of the Education Act 2002 are met. *'Keeping Children Safe in Education'* (2016) sets out the responsibilities of schools and further education colleges to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people.

Section 10 of the Children Act 2004 requires a local authority to make arrangements to promote co-operation between itself and its relevant partners and other organisations who are engaged in activities relating to children. Under section 14B of the Children Act 2004 the Norfolk Safeguarding Children Board (NSCB) can require a school or college to supply information in order to perform its functions; this must be complied with. Nationally, this is most commonly done by requesting schools submit a completed safeguarding self-review tool.

The self-review tool was last revised in July 2016 to reflect changes in local and national guidance, the Norfolk Safeguarding Children Board (NSCB) Priorities, learning from serious case reviews and outcomes of school inspections. All new and revised fields are highlighted throughout the tool. The tool forms the evidential basis for the Local Authority audit of school practice. It seeks to ensure that schools are supported in the process of safeguarding and have access to relevant and valid information regarding their statutory safeguarding functions. The tool assists schools to examine the current safeguarding arrangements in place and to identify areas which may require further development. A completed audit tool with evidence of actions undertaken in response to the review is a valuable source of evidence to demonstrate to the Governing Body and for the purpose of Ofsted inspection how the school is meeting statutory requirements for safeguarding children.

Two similar audits of Norfolk schools' safeguarding procedures have been completed. During 2010 and 2011 this work was led by the QA Team with a return rate of 89%. The last audit of school safeguarding procedures was completed in 2015 with a total of 90% of schools that were contacted providing the information. The findings of these audits identified gaps in knowledge across the wider school workforce and training and guidance was tailored to meet these needs accordingly.

## **Methodology**

The findings are based on schools' self-evaluation scores using Ofsted grades 1 – 4. Schools are asked to document the evidence used to inform the conclusions that they have reached and develop an action plan to address any weaknesses identified in the process of completing the self-review.

For the purposes of this review, maintained schools and academies were asked to submit a completed self-review tool for analysis during 2017 in 3 groups as follows:

[Group 1: 23 January – 28 April 2017](#) (MI Sheet 16/17)

[Group 2: 18 April – 7 July 2017](#) (MI Sheet 64/17)

[Group 3: 6 September - 8 December 2017](#) (MI Sheet 120/17)

Independent schools have not been required to submit the self-assessment in previous audits and this was identified as a weakness. In September 2017, all independent schools in Norfolk were asked to submit a safeguarding self-assessment in writing by the Chair of the NSCB and via a presentation at the local Independent Schools Safeguarding Forum.

## **Outcome & Purpose**

The purpose of this review is to enable individual schools in Norfolk and the Local Authority in partnership with the NSCB to scrutinise safeguarding practice to ensure that there are effective safeguarding systems in place. The areas for consideration in the tool are:

1. DSL and Named Governor Roles
2. School Ethos
3. Safeguarding Policy
4. Child Protection Procedures
5. Child Protection Record Keeping and Monitoring
6. Use of External Providers (New 2016)
7. Training & Induction
8. Safer selection and recruitment
9. Safer working practices
10. Understanding of child abuse, signs, symptoms and categories

The findings of this audit will be made available to all schools, shared with relevant teams within Norfolk County Council and reported to the NSCB. Where individual practice issues are identified, contact will be made with the school to offer support and guidance and to ensure any weaknesses have been remedied.

## **In-depth findings**

Where possible, the data has been analysed to identify any trends emerging from the completed self-review tools. The following sections of the report draw together this analysis and the results provide the Local Authority with an overall picture of safeguarding practice in Norfolk schools in line with statutory guidance with an emphasis on the following areas:

- Are schools up to date with current national guidance and local priorities?
- Are schools meeting statutory requirements in relation to safeguarding policy and procedures?
- Do schools implement robust procedures to ensure safer recruitment into the school workforce in Norfolk?
- Are staff at all levels appropriately trained?
- How confident are staff in schools to identify causes for concern about a child's safety and welfare and know what to do when they have a concern?
- How confident are staff and managers in promoting good safeguarding practice and challenging poor practice?
- Do schools in Norfolk have robust procedures for safer working practice and the management of allegations against staff?

## **Validation of the evidence**

In February 2014, Norfolk Audit Services conducted an audit of the safeguarding self-assessment process by visiting and testing the self-assessment information received from a sample schools who had submitted information. Based on the evidence seen, Norfolk Audit Services concluded that that the use of the self-assessment tool provides 'acceptable' assurance that schools are able to demonstrate to the Local Authority how they are meeting statutory requirements for safeguarding children. The report highlighted however that the value of the self-assessment process and assurance is weakened where it is not supported with sufficient evidence. The audit found that evidence to confirm the responses included in the self-assessment tool were not always available within the school and thus concluded that Children's Services may not be able to rely solely on the responses provided by individual schools to satisfy themselves that statutory requirements for safeguarding children have been met within Norfolk Schools. The report recommended that Children's Services should consider carrying out unannounced spot visits to obtain ongoing assurance the self assessments are accurate in their responses.

In addition to audit through the self-review process the Safeguarding Adviser, will commence a series of safeguarding compliance checks with schools during the Summer Term 2018. These checks will be unannounced visits focusing on statutory compliance in line with the [Safeguarding Compliance Checklist](#). The checks will have regard to the information provided by schools via the self-review process and will be used to test and validate audit returns.

## Key Themes

- All Norfolk maintained schools and academies were contacted in 3 groups via MI Sheets to formally request submission of the evidence. The audit requirements were also presented at Educator Leadership events in February & November 2017 and highlighted in DSL training.
- During the Autumn Term 2017, 28 independent schools in Norfolk were asked to submit a safeguarding self-assessment in writing by the Chair of the NSCB and via a presentation at the local Independent Schools Safeguarding Forum in September 2017.
- 349 schools (including Federations) completed an assessment during this period. 116 schools either did not submit a return as requested or provided an incomplete submission.
- This equates to a 75% return rate and represents a 15% decrease in the percentage of schools making a return in comparison with the previous audit undertaken in 2013-15.
- The majority of schools who made a submission provided comprehensive evidence in the commentary section of the self-assessment tool to demonstrate and support the associated grades that they have submitted. The areas of good practice identified by schools are included in the commentary on the subsequent pages of this report.
- A small minority of schools provided limited information to support the self-assessment grades submitted; this is of concern and highlights the importance of strengthening the findings through spot checks of compliance.



## What does the evidence tell us about school practice?

- The final column of each table on the following pages of the report shows an overall percentage shift for areas graded 'good' or 'outstanding' in comparison with the audit completed in 2013-15. Whilst this cannot be seen as a completely accurate comparison, it is positive to note that, based on the evidence provided, **there appears to have been a growth in confidence amongst schools in all areas of the self-assessment.** Schools in this audit have consistently provided more positive assessments of their safeguarding practice in comparison with the 2013-15 audit with an overall 5% increase in schools rating themselves as either 'good' or 'outstanding' across the audit.
- The evidence from the audit at this interim stage demonstrates a positive view of schools' confidence in the safeguarding arrangements that they have in place. **The evidence provided indicates that the vast majority of schools feel that they not only meet but exceed statutory requirements for safeguarding in line with Ofsted expectations and best practice guidance.** 36 % of all responses indicated that the practice was assessed as outstanding and in 54% of cases it was assessed as good. The commentary supplied in the majority of the self-reviews tools demonstrates that schools have taken a robust approach to review of safeguarding procedures and have reached thoughtful conclusions in relation to their assessments. It provides evidence of the variety of ways schools seek to ensure that safeguarding arrangements are robust and understood by all members of the school community. In the best examples, schools provided specific dates for events e.g. training and/or policy review and provided the location of evidence within the school.
- In only 0.6% (15) of all responses did a school identify that existing arrangements were inadequate; in 2 cases this related to the named governor role, in 4 cases this was due to the on-line safety arrangements, 1 related to staff knowledge of the safer working practice guidance, 2 related to gaps in employment history, 2 awareness of forced marriage, 2 private fostering and 2 further in relation to knowledge of fabricated and induced illness.
- 6% of all responses highlighted an area requiring improvement. In the best examples, schools identified specific actions required to get to good or better along with the person(s) responsible and clear time scales. **Staff knowledge and understanding of private fostering had the largest number of responses indicating this was an area for improvement. Other common areas related to tackling child sexual abuse and neglect and on-line safety arrangements, evidence of monitoring and challenge, online safety (14%) and governor training (11%).** Schools are supported with many of the areas for development identified above through training and the guidance available in the 'Safeguarding Section' of the Norfolk Schools' website. These themes have however identified actions that the LA should take to support schools further; these are included within the action plan within this report

## Is the evidence supported by data from Ofsted Inspections?

This audit provides important evidence of how the LA is monitoring schools' compliance with statutory requirements for safeguarding. The methodology for obtaining this evidence via self-assessment is valid, in accordance with other LA practice and understandable given the resources available to carry out the audit. It can be argued however that the evidence from the audit will not, on its own, provide independent evaluation and assurance regarding the quality of day to day practice in accordance with school policy and procedures. The findings of this audit have therefore been compared with the outcomes of Ofsted inspections of Norfolk schools during the Academic Year 2016-2017 and the Academic Year 2017-18 to February 2018. The judgement on the overall effectiveness of a school is likely to be inadequate where safeguarding is ineffective.

- 134 Norfolk Schools were inspected during this period. In the 127 schools that were judged to be 'Outstanding', 'Good' or 'Requires Improvement', safeguarding arrangements were judged to be effective. This equates to 95% of the Schools inspected during this period. This data supports the findings of this audit that indicates the vast majority of schools feel that they not only meet but exceed statutory requirements for safeguarding in line with Ofsted expectations and best practice guidance.
- Of the 134 schools inspected, 7 were judged as 'Inadequate'. The inspection reports for these 7 schools were reviewed in order to identify those instances where the safeguarding arrangements in place had contributed to the inadequate judgement.
- Weaknesses in the safeguarding arrangements contributed to an inadequate judgement in 3 of the 7 schools; this equates to 1.5% of the schools inspected during this period. In one case this related specifically to understanding of radicalisation and extremism and some pupils reporting that they did not feel safe. In the remaining two cases, the failure was symptomatic of broader failures in leadership and management and the ability to keep children safe including failure to evidence safer recruitment checks and a lack of evidence to demonstrate appropriate action had been taken in response to concerns about pupil welfare.
- In the other 4 cases where schools had been judged to be 'Inadequate', the inspections reports clearly stated that the school's safeguarding arrangements were deemed to be "effective".

## **Proposed Action Plan**

1. In order to ensure that the conclusions of this audit are meaningful and accurate, the Safeguarding Adviser will devise a programme of safeguarding spot checks in schools to test and validate the evidence provided through the self-review process. **(Methodology)**
2. In order to increase the return rate of completed self-review tools, all schools that have failed to provide an assessment as requested will receive a further written request to provide the information by the end of June 2018. A process for notifying relevant teams within Education Services and escalation will be developed to respond to schools who continue to fail to provide an assessment,. **(Key Findings)**
3. The Safeguarding Advisers should liaise with colleagues from Educator Solutions in respect of on-line safety and governance so that the findings of this audit can be considered in any future service developments. **(Section 1 & Section 3)**
4. With proposed changes to *Keeping Children Safe in Education* making the expectations regarding the provision of early help even clearer, it is recommended further work is undertaken to promote engagement with the support and advice available via the Early Help Hubs. **(Section 4)**
5. Whilst the findings of the LA annual audit of CME practices, shows an improvement in compliance with the Pupil Registration Regulations and notifications of removal from roll, the evidence does not support the 96% rate of compliance this audit suggests. It is therefore recommended that the findings in this section of the audit are cross-referenced with audit activity undertaken by the LA CME Team. **(Section 4)**
6. The Safeguarding Advisers should review current templates for record keeping and develop overarching guidance to support school practice in this area. **(Section 5)**
7. The use of external providers is a new field within the safeguarding self-review process and as a result, evidence of practice will be a focus of the spot checks undertaken within the Summer Term 2018. **(Section 6)**
8. An audit of school engagement with FSP and NSCB multi-agency training including availability of training should be undertaken to identify schools who are not compliant with the full range of local safeguarding training requirements and to identify any barriers to accessing this. **(Section 4 & 7)**
9. In light of the findings of this audit and the learning from the NSCB Serious Case Review – Case W, the NSCB Education Advisory sub-group will be asked to consider how to further raise awareness of the NSCB priorities for tackling neglect and CSA.**(Section 10)**
10. In order to support schools to address areas commonly identified for development, it is recommended that the Safeguarding Advisers and Safeguarding Training Officer should review the training and guidance available to schools, particularly in relation to private fostering and child sexual abuse. **(Section 10)**

## 1. DSL and Named Governor Roles (revised 2016)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15 Audit
Has a Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL)	62%	38%	1%	0%	+ 1
Has a deputy DSL	62.5%	37%	0.5%	0%	+6.5
Has a named governor for safeguarding	48%	46%	5%	1%	+ 3
The roles are established	49%	50%	1%	0%	+ 11
Time is made available for both roles to work together	21%	61%	18%	0%	- 1
Cover for the DSL role (New 2016).	57%	41%	1%	0%	New field
The school/college has systems in place to monitor and quality assure implementation and compliance with safeguarding requirements and procedures (New 2016).	26%	66%	8%	0%	New field
Any deficiencies or weaknesses in child protection arrangements brought to the attention of the governing body and senior managers are remedied without delay (New 2016).	25%	62%	13%	0%	New field

### Commentary:

All schools that provided a rating in this section indicated that they meet the statutory requirements in respect of the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) role and have multiple staff trained to ensure that this is always cover for the role. This finding is supported by evidence from LA DSL training records. DSLs come from a variety of teaching and non-teaching roles and, dependent on need, in some schools additional staff such as PSAs were employed to ensure support is provided to families the earliest opportunity.

## 1. DSL and Named Governor Roles (revised 2016)

*Keeping Children Safe in Education* makes clear the expectation that during term time the DSL (or a deputy) should always be available for staff in the school or college to discuss any safeguarding concerns. Some schools described how mobile phones were provided to DSLs and contact details were made accessible to all staff via the staff room or school office. Awareness of those holding this role was further reinforced through the use of posters displaying photographs and contact details for DSLs. Many schools also described having agreed contingency plans in place with other schools in the cluster or Trust in the rare event that no trained DSL was available to staff.

In many cases it was clear that the DSLs had established a cycle of regular meetings to discuss vulnerable children, audit case files and review arrangements in line with statutory requirements. In the absence of formal mechanisms for supervision, the establishment of such meetings is strongly recommended to ensure that DSLs receive support and the support for vulnerable children is continuously assessed. For some schools, formally documenting these meetings and agreed actions was identified as an area for further development.

Section 175 Education Act 2002 and the related statutory guidance makes explicit the responsibility of the governing body to ensure that the functions of the schools are carried out with a view to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of pupils and to remedy any weaknesses that are brought to their attention in this respect. In order to achieve this, best practice would indicate that governors and DSLs are given dedicated time to discuss, develop and establish their roles. This was identified as an area for further development in 18% of submissions with the need to document meetings a common action point. **The outcomes of this audit will be shared colleagues from Norfolk Leadership and Governance Service so that they can be considered in any future service developments (Action Point 3).**

In a large number of the submissions received, evidence indicates that the DSLs and named Governor have established a system of regular meetings and work collaboratively to monitor and evaluate school practice through the use of documents such as the safeguarding self-review tool, [compliance checklist](#) and the production of a [safeguarding report](#) for the full governing body. In examples of best practice, these meetings followed a standardised agenda and minutes were produced but for other schools formally documenting and evidencing this activity was a common theme identified as an area for further development. In some cases, all governors routinely check safeguarding as part of any monitoring visit. In some submissions, schools described how their Academy Trust provided a further level of scrutiny and challenge through routine checks and formal audits of safeguarding practice. These systems will help to ensure rigorous oversight and management of the safeguarding function.

## 2. School ethos – providing a safe environment for pupils to learn in

The table and graph below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15 Audit
The school ethos is inclusive of child protection issues.	30%	60%	9%	0%	Revised field
Children feel safe and listened to at school.	38%	59%	3%	0%	Revised field
Helps children through the curriculum	34%	60%	7%	0%	+2
Actively seeks advice on how to develop a child protection ethos	47%	50%	3%	0%	+2

### Commentary:

The evidence provided by schools in this section of the audit recognises the central importance of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of all children. This is vital if schools are to ensure that their safeguarding policies and procedures are implemented in practice and there are opportunities for reflection on issues of safety for all members of the school community. In many submissions there was evidence to demonstrate that pupil safety is integral to the school's vision and ethos and a variety of opportunities are made to talk about safeguarding including through staff meetings, parent newsletters, an active school council and the visibility and accessibility of all staff including DSLs. In examples of best practice, schools not only undertook regular pupil and parental perception work but consulted with them about policies.

## 2. School ethos – providing a safe environment for pupils to learn in

NSCB Serious Case Review – Case Y highlights the key importance of school staff not only being alert to signs that may indicate abuse but also providing children with the space, safety and confidence to talk about what is happening to them. Schools described a number of avenues they have in place to ensure that children are encouraged to talk about what is worrying them on both a collective and individual basis. Examples included:

- school council
- circle time
- online tools to report bullying
- buddy and mentoring systems
- worry boxes that are regularly checked
- the ‘High Five’ or ‘Give Me Five’ initiative

Nurture provision and schools counselling services had also set up to enhance the care and support provided in a number of schools. Schools also described how they utilised the support of other agencies such as Nelson’s Journey, the Benjamin Foundation and the Matthew Project in response to identified needs.

*‘Keeping Children Safe in Education’* places an expectation on governing bodies to consider how children may be taught about safeguarding issues as part of providing a broad and balanced curriculum. Schools identified a number of tools they have adopted to support children to identify and respond appropriately to risk through the curriculum and indicated a broad range of topics covered such as road and fire safety, drug and alcohol awareness, healthy relationships. It was clear in a number of submissions that teaching children to identify and respond to risk is embedded throughout the curriculum and not solely within PHSE or SRE lessons. In addition, a number of schools described how they used annual safety weeks and anti-bullying week to reinforce these messages further.

Pupil learning in this area was commonly supported through the both the THRIVE and PATHS programmes but many schools indicated that they have also utilised the support of external agencies such as the Matthew Project, PCSOs and Crucial Crew. A number of primary schools also provided evidence of engagement with the NSPCC *Speak up. Stay Safe* offer. Submissions from secondary schools during the Autumn Term 2017 demonstrated how they had worked in partnership with Norfolk Constabulary to raise awareness about County Lines through the use of a drama production for pupils.

## 2. School ethos – providing a safe environment for pupils to learn in

The data shows that 96% of schools reported that they actively seek advice on developing a safeguarding ethos. Schools demonstrated that they kept up to date with the local and national safeguarding picture in a variety of different ways. For some schools this was facilitated through an academy trust and in other examples updates, support and advice was obtained through attendance at a local DSL network, Early Help Hub meetings, Educator Leader updates and Local Safeguarding Children Groups. A number of schools identified E-Courier and the Norfolk Schools website as valuable sources of guidance and also sought support directly from the LA Safeguarding Adviser.



### 3) Safeguarding Policy (Revised 2016)

The table and graph below show the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15
The school will have a safeguarding and child protection policy.	56%	44%	0%	0%	+4
The school policy has been devised with consideration to LA model policy and the most up to date guidance.	59%	39%	2%	0%	+5
Other school policies have been revised in line with the safeguarding policy.	32%	57%	11%	0%	+1
The safeguarding and child protection policy is available publicly via the school's website or other means.	44%	54%	2%	0%	+8
Ensure that every member of staff, volunteer, visitor and parent will know the procedures.	34%	60%	6%	0%	+7
The school has online safety policy and procedures that are reviewed annually. (New 2016)	15%	62%	22%	1%	New field

### 3) Safeguarding Policy (Revised 2016)

#### Commentary:

The existence of a safeguarding policy that is updated on at least an annual basis is a statutory requirement. In addition, *'Keeping Children Safe in Education'* makes clear the expectation that this policy is provided to staff at induction and should be available publicly via the school website or by other means. There has been an increase in the number of schools who assessed themselves as good or better in this area. The data indicates that all schools who made a submission are compliant with statutory requirements in this area and 98% indicated that they had made use of the LA model policy in order to ensure that it meets requirements and that this was publicly available.

Schools identified clear systems in place to ensure that every member of staff, volunteer and regular visitor is provided with information to support them to understand the schools procedures. A variety of communication strategies were identified, examples included:

- Use of leaflets and postcards for visitors, parents, volunteers and supply staff that summarise the procedures
- Prominent displays of DSL information posters in the reception area and throughout the school
- Safeguarding information summarised on visitor badges
- Safeguarding display boards in reception areas and staff rooms
- Information included in pupil planners
- Awareness of procedures raised at parent in-take events
- Annual provision of the policy to all staff and at induction
- Quick reference guides/summaries/FAQs about the policy devised to ensure accessibility of the information
- Safeguarding folders and/or flowcharts in each classroom explaining the procedures
- Use of newsletters, parent forums and social media to highlight key issues
- Credit-card sized summaries of the procedures produced and provided to all students attending work experience or alternate provision.

### 3) Safeguarding Policy (Revised 2016)

The evidence provided shows that there is an understanding that safeguarding encompasses many aspects of school functioning. It is positive to note the high level of schools that routinely link and review their safeguarding policy with other related policies such as attendance, behaviour, health and safety and on-line safety policies but this was an area requiring improvement for 12% of schools.

*'Keeping Children Safe in Education'* 2016 placed a clear focus on the importance of online including staff training and filtering as part of safeguarding arrangements that schools are required to have place more generally. The use of information and communication technologies in schools brings great benefits. At the same time, safeguarding risks are attached which schools must proactively address, to promote the safety of all members of the community. This was the third most common area for development across the audit with 22% of submissions identifying this as an area requiring improvement.

A range of Children's Services and ICT professionals have been involved in developing the [Norfolk Online Safety Toolkit](#), which schools can adapt to meet their own circumstances. This guidance will help schools to discuss the issues and review their Online Safety policy. Norfolk Children's Services recommends that Senior Leadership within schools take steps to identify and address Online Safety risks. Guidance and resources for teachers to use when teaching Online Safety as part of the National Curriculum, are referenced within this Toolkit. **The outcomes of this audit will be shared colleagues from Educator Solutions in respect of on-line safety so that they can be considered in any future service developments (Action Point 3).**

## 4) Child Protection Procedures (Revised 2016)

The table and graph show the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 – RI %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15
The School has systems in place to identify children who would benefit from early help or additional services at the earliest opportunity in order to prevent issues escalating. (New 2016)	34%	63%	3%	0%	New field
There are effective and prompt systems for referring safeguarding concerns about children to the DSL and to relevant agencies. (New 2016)	47%	52%	1%	0%	New field
The school plays an active role in multi-agency working to safeguard children. (New 2016)	37%	57%	6%	0%	New field
School staff carry out the actions attributed to them in any Child Protection, Child in Need and /or Family Support Plans.	39%	57%	4%	0%	+ 6
Has appropriate safeguarding responses to children who are persistently absent from school, go missing from education. (Revised 2016)	43%	53%	4%	0%	Revised field
In line with learning from NSCB serious case reviews, DSLs know what action to when there is professional disagreement about how to safeguard a child.	24%	66%	10%	0%	Revised field

## 4) Child Protection Procedures (Revised 2016)

### Commentary:

In line with the requirements of *Working Together to Safeguard Children* and *Keeping Children Safe in Education*, governing bodies and proprietors should ensure that the school or college contributes to inter-agency working and this includes providing a co-ordinated offer of early help when additional needs of children are identified. Schools' commitment to multi-agency working, knowledge of the NSCB Threshold Guidance and contact information for MASH was evidenced positively in this section of the audit. Awareness of Signs of Safety appears to be widespread and many schools described how they had accessed additional training locally or via the NSCB to enhance knowledge. In examples of good practice, schools described how referral information and avenues for support were disseminated widely to all staff, volunteers and parents with relevant information made available via the school's website. Some schools also described how they used case studies in staff meetings to inform and review practice.

In response to the NSCB serious case review Case L, there is a local requirement for at least one DSL from every school to attend training in the Family Support Process (FSP). It is encouraging to note that many schools provided evidence to demonstrate that at least one member of staff had attended this training and the school actively leads on FSPs were appropriate. 97% of responses indicated that schools felt that their systems for identifying circumstances where a child may benefit from early help services were either good or outstanding. Many schools provided evidence to demonstrate that they have strengthened the offer of early help through the use of a Parent Support Adviser and the creation of other pastoral roles. In some cases, the offer of early help provided by a school was extensive including for example the offer of Solihull Programme for parents. In some examples, schools talked about benefitting from engaging with Early Help Hubs and attending early help cluster meetings. **With proposed changes to *Keeping Children Safe in Education* making the expectations regarding the provision of early help even clearer, it is recommended that engagement with training is audited and further work is undertaken to promote engagement with the support and advice available via the Early Help Hubs (Action Points 4 & 8).**

## 4) Child Protection Procedures (Revised 2016)

*Keeping Children Safe in Education* makes it clear that governing bodies and proprietors should put in place appropriate safeguarding responses to children who go missing from education, particularly on repeat occasions, to help identify the risk of abuse and neglect including sexual abuse or exploitation and to help prevent the risks of their going missing in future. The link between safeguarding and poor school attendance was evident at a local level through NSCB serious case reviews Case L and more recently Case P. 96% of respondents felt that systems in place were either good or outstanding in response to children who are absent or missing from education citing robust processes for investigating unexplained absences and notifying the LA of any child who is removed from roll. **Whilst the findings of the LA annual audit of CME practices, shows an improvement in compliance with the Pupil Registration Regulations and notifications of removal from roll, the evidence does not support the 96% rate of compliance this audit suggests. It is therefore recommended that the findings in this section of the audit are cross referenced with audit activity undertaken by the LA CME Team. (Action Point 5)**

In examples of best practice, the DSL and Attendance Lead met on a regular basis (in some cases weekly) to review cases whilst in other examples, a conscious decision had been made to give the DSL oversight of attendance within the school. Further training and a system of networks will be offered to schools from the Summer Term 2018 to provide further support and guidance to schools in the management of pupil attendance.

The majority of evidence provided demonstrated that schools are actively following up and challenging responses from other agencies when there are concerns about a child. This professional curiosity and confidence to challenge are important elements of practice if schools are to ensure that they are proactively addressing concerns about pupil welfare. The NSCB Resolving Professional Disagreements Policy is included in DSL training; the document provides a framework for such challenge and it is encouraging to note that a number of schools have either utilised the policy or identified awareness of the policy as a tool. In some submissions, schools talked about how they had used the Threshold Guide and the Signs of Safety model to ensure that they could be evidence-based and clear about what they thought needed to change for a child. Some schools identified the need to more formally record and evidence challenge within pupil safeguarding files.

## 5) Child Protection Record Keeping and Monitoring

The table and graph below show the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15
Have systems in place for recording concerns about the welfare, safety or behaviour of a child.	55%	44%	1%	0%	+1
Stores records of child protection concerns appropriately.	59%	41%	0%	0%	+1
Child protection concerns are monitored and followed-up in a timely manner.	33%	64%	4%	0%	+5
There is a named child protection file for each child there is a cause for a concern for.	34%	58%	8%	0%	-1
File will have an up to date chronology of significant events and documents included on the file.	44%	50%	6%	0%	+2
Hand written notes are signed and dated to include year, position of author and person the information is being passed to.	37%	59%	4%	0%	+5
All records including reports and referrals will be valid, useful and factual.	39%	59%	2%	0%	+8
Will pass all child protection and safeguarding information on to the subsequent school.	38%	57%	5%	0%	+11

## 5) Child Protection Record Keeping and Monitoring

### Commentary:

The importance of accurate record keeping, monitoring concerns and passing on relevant information are areas consistently identified in serious case reviews and best practice guidance. This is a key theme in both whole-school and DSL training and an area of focus in Ofsted Inspections. It is positive to note that the evidence suggests the majority of schools have utilised the LA templates for recording to support their practice. In examples of best practice:

- the requirements for recording concerns are communicated through induction, regular training and staff meetings;
- feedback is routinely given to staff who report a concern and encouragement to re-report if any further concerns arise;
- protected time is given to DSLs to both audit records and review cases of concern on a regular (in some cases weekly) basis with minutes of meetings taken, audit activity and any resulting actions documented.

It is also evident that some Academy Trusts have quality assurance processes that include spot checks of records. Some schools also described how they have benefitted from adopting the use of electronic systems such as My Concern and CPOMs.

In line with statutory guidance it is the responsibility of a school to pass on safeguarding information to the receiving school when a child moves. Further guidance on this area of practice was developed in response to the findings of the previous audit and was issued to all schools in the Spring Term 2015; it appears that there has been an 11% increase in schools' confidence in the procedures in place to ensure the transfer of these records.

It is essential that any system for recording concerns supports staff and volunteers to make timely referrals to the DSLs. These records should be held centrally to ensure all information is considered when making decisions or providing information to others and provides a facility for building a cumulative picture of risk over time. Some schools described multi-faceted recordings systems in place that sometimes included nagging doubt forms or books that were held within classrooms. Whilst the records held in this way may provide valuable information about a child, the fragmentation of recording systems could lead to a risk that key information is missed, decisions are made without a full picture of concerns or that something urgent does not come to the DSLs attention in an appropriate timescale. **Further advice will be developed and disseminated to schools in response to this finding. (Action Point 6)**



## 5) Child Protection Record Keeping and Monitoring

Whilst there was much positive practice documented, it is evident that some schools are unclear about expected standards for recording and common areas for development in this section of the audit were the need for a process to audit safeguarding records and record this activity, the development of a overview/log of all cases of concern and implementing systems for recording telephone conversations and meetings with parents. The LA provides templates and guidance in training to support schools to review and improve the quality of the record-keeping. **In response to the findings of this audit, the guidance and templates will be reviewed and revised to provide greater clarity. (Action Point 6)**

## 6) Use of External Providers (New 2016)

The graph below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1	2	3	4
The school seeks assurance from all providers of work-based placements, alternative provision placements, after-school services or activities, if they are provided separately by another body, that the body concerned has appropriate policies and procedures in place for safeguarding children and child protection; there are arrangements to liaise with the provider on these matters where appropriate.	24%	63%	13%	0%
When commissioning a service e.g. when contracting out catering, cleaning or maintenance, there are robust mechanisms in place to ensure that these organisations have appropriate policies and procedures in place for safeguarding children and child protection.	29%	61%	10%	0%

### Commentary:

Where pupils are taught offsite or a school commissions any other service, they must have robust quality assurance processes in place to ensure that any adults working with children are suitable and safe to do so and there are systems in place to protect children from harm. In order to achieve this, schools should seek clear and written assurances about the safeguarding and safer recruitment procedures in place at any service being commissioned and should put in place arrangements to monitor the attendance, behaviour, learning and progress of the pupils who are educated off-site. There should be agreed procedures in place for the management of pupil absences and any safeguarding issues that arise that clearly outline the respective roles of the provider and the home school and mitigate against a delay in appropriate action being taken. In most submissions, schools described clearly agreed procedures for the management of pupil absence and safeguarding concerns with daily contact to verify attendance. In examples of best practice these arrangements were written into SLAs and regular checks were completed with staff visiting alternative providers on a regular basis.

## 6) Use of External Providers (New 2016)

Whilst the majority of schools felt that they had robust systems in place, this was an area for development in 10% of submissions. In some circumstances, the self-review process prompted schools to formalise systems whilst in others it was to ask further questions about training and procedures or the development of risk assessments. It is clear that within some Academy Trusts, checks of external providers are completed centrally including scrutiny of risk assessments and policies. An action point for some schools was to obtain evidence of these checks; it is important that evidence of any checks is seen by the Senior Leadership Team and is made readily available at a school for the purposes of inspection.

In examples of good practice, schools described having a meeting with external providers to seek assurances, sign a service level agreement (SLA) and to check documentation such as insurance. For some schools, it was evident that whilst written assurances about safer recruitment checks had been provided, schools had asked further questions about training and this had given rise to concerns about either a lack of training or the quality of training provided by the organisation. As a result, many schools described how they required contracted staff such as catering staff to undertake their own training and induction processes.

**This is a new field within the safeguarding self-review process and as a result, evidence of practice will be a focus of the spot checks undertaken within the Summer Term 2018. (Action Point 7)**

## 7) Training & Induction (Revised 2016)

The table and graph below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15
All staff receive a safeguarding induction (New 2016).	44%	51%	5%	0%	New field
The DSL and deputy DSLs have received suitable training in line with national and local requirements.	40%	54%	6%	0%	+4
In addition to formal training, DSL knowledge and skills are updated at regular intervals, to keep up with any developments relevant to their role (New 2016).	29%	61%	10%	0%	New field
All members of staff receive regular training in line with national and local requirements.	34%	62%	4%	0%	+6
In addition to training, all staff should receive regular safeguarding updates to provide them with relevant skills and knowledge to safeguard children effectively (New 2016).	26%	64%	10%	0%	New field
The Governing Body has received suitable safeguarding training (New 2016).	23%	59%	18%	0%	New field
Inform the Governing Body of updated training.	30%	63%	7%	0%	+6

### Commentary:

High quality training and clear messages at induction about safeguarding including the responsibilities of all members of the school community is essential if schools are to create a culture where pupil safety is of central importance. *Keeping Children Safe in Education* makes explicit the requirement for all staff to receive safeguarding information as part of induction. With 95% of responses indicating arrangements in place are good or better, it appears that schools have implemented robust procedures for delivering a safeguarding induction and ensuring that this is evidenced. Although statutory guidance states that schools should take a risk-based approach to the information provided to volunteers and contract staff, in examples of best practice the same level of information is provided to all adults who regularly come into contact with pupils. In a number of examples key messages about safeguarding were summarised and made accessible through leaflets, posters and displays. In some examples, safeguarding folders including all key policies and pro-forma were available in every classroom and staff room.

It is a statutory requirement that safeguarding training is accessed by the DSL and provided to all staff on a regular basis. The LA provides whole-school training materials and a rolling programme of training for DSLs; the evidence provided and LA training records indicate that schools are making use of the resources provided in this area. Some schools described how they have taken a modular approach to training with regular sessions delivered throughout the academic year to reinforce learning and to ensure that safeguarding remains a priority. Changes made to the structure of the whole school training package provided by the LA will support schools to deliver such an approach. It appears that many schools have also benefitted from accessing the [Home Office on-line Prevent training](#) and have made it a requirement for all staff to complete the module.

It is essential that schools can evidence the safeguarding training received by staff and schools have sought to do so through creating a central body evidence including the use of training logs and of certification for external courses. Training logs and evaluation forms appear to be routinely used. In a small number of cases, schools identified the need to evidence staff training and induction as an area for development; these schools may benefit from accessing the templates available in the whole school training package and the template [Safeguarding training and induction record](#).

## 7) Training & Induction (Revised 2016)

*Keeping Children Safe in Education* states that schools should have appropriate mechanisms in place to assist staff to understand and discharge their roles and responsibilities as set out in Part one of the guidance. In examples of best practice, feedback was analysed and acted upon and the impact of training on staff knowledge was tested at regular intervals through quizzes and questionnaires.

The LA has processes in place to identify where a school does not have a DSL trained or where this training is due for renewal but 6% of responses indicated that DSL training was an area for development. This was because schools had identified a need to access Family Support Process training or NSCB Multi-Agency Training in line with local requirements. **As a result of this finding, an audit of FSP and multi-agency training including availability of training will be undertaken to identify schools who are not compliant with local safeguarding training requirements and any barriers to accessing this training. (Action Point 8)**

In addition to training, *Keeping Children Safe in Education* requires all staff for staff to receive regular safeguarding updates to provide them with relevant skills and knowledge to safeguard children effectively. As highlighted in Section 2 of this report, DSLs accessed updates in variety of ways including through an academy trust, attendance at a local networks and Leadership briefings, MI Sheets and the Norfolk Schools website. In examples of good practice, DSLs cascaded relevant updates including information from training and learning from serious case reviews to all staff. Updates to staff were provided through having safeguarding as a standard agenda item on staff meetings, through provision of a safeguarding information board and for some through a monthly or termly safeguarding newsletter/bulletin. In those circumstances where provision of updates was identified as an area for development, some examples of practice are available via the [shared resource pages](#) of the Norfolk Schools' website.

In 17% of cases, Governor training was identified as an area for development. Governing bodies are responsible for ensuring they receive training that is appropriate to the role and supports them to fulfil their safeguarding functions; relevant training is available from Norfolk Governance & Leadership Service and should be utilised by those schools identifying this an area for development. In light of this finding, further work will be undertaken with the Governance & Leadership Service so that these findings can be considered in any future service developments.

## 8. Safer Selection and Recruitment (revised 2016)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1	2	3	4	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15
The School has a written recruitment and selection policy that comply with local and national guidance.	31%	60%	9%	0%	New field
The Headteacher and at least one governor have completed accredited Safer Recruitment Training.	41%	56%	3%	0%	+3
Will expect a completed application form to be returned for every available position in school.	52%	47%	0%	0%	+1
Shortlists against agreed criteria.	40%	57%	3%	0%	+2
Will always request references and ensure at least one is a current or most recent employer.	46%	53%	1%	0%	+9
Will not accept testimonials brought to interview.	63%	37%	0%	0%	+11
Requests that professional and/or academic qualifications are brought to interview.	37%	56%	6%	0%	+3
Will always question gaps in employment history	45%	53%	1%	1%	+2
All candidates will be made aware prior to short listed that a satisfactory enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service check with Barred List check will be required.	52%	47.5%	0.5%	0%	+2.5
All relevant adults are included on the SCR.	53%	46%	1%	0%	New field
All required checks are evidenced on the SCR.	54%	44%	2%	0%	+10
Supporting evidence has been retained by the school (New 2016).	50%	49%	1%	0%	New field
The school has obtained relevant information from staff working in childcare in line with Disqualification under the Childcare Act 2006.	35%	61%	4%	0%	New field
There are robust procedures in place for monitoring the SCR	51%	47%	2%	0%	New field

## 8. Safer Selection and Recruitment

### Commentary:

Statutory guidance, research and learning from serious case reviews highlight the necessity for schools to establish robust safer recruitment practices that deter, reject and identify people who might pose a risk to children or are unsuitable to work with them. In order to achieve this, safeguarding and promoting the welfare of all children must be an integral part of all recruitment and selection processes in Norfolk Schools. The Local Authority provides training, advice and information to schools to support practice in this area and it is evident from the commentary provided by schools in this audit that they are utilising this guidance and training. In light of some audit and inspection outcomes giving rise to concern about compliance with statutory requirements, there has been a focus on safer recruitment checks in the last two years through a series of MI sheets and input at Education Leadership briefings. The majority of schools considered that the procedures in place were either good or outstanding and there was an increase in confidence in all fields of this area in comparison with data from previous audits. 9 % of submissions identified the recruitment and selection policy as an area for development; they are advised to contact their HR provider for further guidance and support in this area.

The maintenance of a single central record (SCR) of safer recruitment checks is a statutory requirement. The LA provides a [template SCR](#) along with supporting guidance available via the [Norfolk Schools' website](#). There was a 10% increase in the percentage of schools rating practice as good or better in this area. Since academic year 2016-17, the LA has provided training on the maintenance of the SCR and it was clear from a number of submissions that schools had benefitted from accessing this training and improved practice as a result.

Schools need to make arrangements to regularly monitor the SCR and compliance with statutory requirements. 98% of submissions identified that these processes were good to outstanding. Some schools use the LA template [SCR compliance checklist](#) as a basis for undertaking a recording these checks. In some settings, the SCR is checked at regular intervals by the Headteacher, a member of the senior leadership team and/or the named governor for safeguarding and compliance in this area reported to the Governing body. In other settings, the records were routinely monitored by the Academy Trust. Some schools explained that a check of the SCR is evidenced by a copy of the record being signed and dated; this practice is not encouraged as it does not support the school to evidence the outcome of the check and any actions identified. Retention of multiple copies of the SCR can also lead to confusion and there is a risk that the most up to date version is not presented at inspection. **As a result of this finding, a [SCR monitoring form](#) has been developed to support schools to evidence this activity clearly.**



## 9) Safer Working Practice for all Staff for the Protection of Children (Revised 2016)

The table and graph below show the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15
Will have regard to 'Guidance for safer working practice for those working with children and young people in education settings' (Oct 2015)	30%	60%	10%	0%	+ 8
Will have guidance for managing allegations against staff members including the Headteacher in line with national and local requirements.	34%	64%	2%	0%	+ 6
All staff are aware of the school's Whistle Blowing policy and are given a copy upon appointment.	33%	60%	7%	0%	+ 13
All allegations of abuse are reported and responded to appropriately (New 2016).	31%	68%	1%	0%	New field

## 9. Safer working practice for all staff for the protection of children (Revised 2016)

### Commentary:

Beyond the safer recruitment of staff and volunteers, it is essential that schools embed and, where necessary, enforce a culture of safer working practice by clearly communicating expectations about staff behaviour and procedures for reporting concerns through induction and training. This area of practice is a key focus of the LA whole-school and DSL training programmes and it is pleasing to note an increase in confidence in this area in comparison with data from previous audits.

In accordance with *Keeping Children Safe in Education* there is an expectation that governing bodies should ensure that a staff behaviour policy (code of conduct) is in place and provided to all staff at induction. [Guidance for Safer Working Practice for Adults who work with Children and Young People in Educational Settings \(October 2015\)](#) was devised to raise awareness of illegal, unsafe and inappropriate behaviours within education settings and offers practical guidance about which behaviours constitute safe practice. It is recommended that this guidance is either adopted in its entirety or used to inform the content of schools' own procedures. Evidence provided in the audit suggests that while almost all schools were aware of this guidance and provided it to staff in some format, 10% of submissions identified the need to improve practice. In most cases this involved asking staff to sign and acknowledge receipt of the document or to provide the guidance alongside the school's existing policy.

In addition to communicating procedures for whistle-blowing and managing allegations against staff in training, the majority of schools provided evidence to indicate that this advice is easily accessible for staff at all times e.g. on display in staff rooms or staff toilets and/or available electronically. Knowledge and understanding in this area was reinforced in a number of ways. Examples included asking staff to complete a questionnaire about the content of key documents and requesting all staff read Part 4 of *Keeping Children Safe in Education* in the same way as is required for Part 1.

A number of schools submitted evidence to suggest that they have responded to concerns in line with procedures by making a referral to the LADO Team or requesting advice and support from the Education Quality Assurance and Intervention Service; this is supported by the data available from the LA regarding school contacts with these services.

## 10. Understanding child abuse, signs, symptoms and categories (Revised 2016)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	Outstanding %	Good %	R.I %	Inadequate %	% shift of Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2013-15
All staff can describe and explain the categories of abuse.	36%	61%	3%	0%	+2
Staff can identify the signs and symptoms of the abuse.	34%	65%	1%	0%	+3
Are aware that parental misuse of substances and domestic violence are a cause for concern.	37%	58%	5%	0%	+2
Are aware of child on child abuse.	30%	69%	1%	0%	+9
Can describe and explain what Child Sexual Exploitation is and know what to do.	26%	60%	14%	0%	+12
Are aware of female genital mutilation and understand the mandatory reporting requirements for teaching staff.	24%	69%	7%	0%	+17
Staff know that forced marriage is an abuse of human rights and can identify indicators of concern.	25%	65%	9%	1%	+16
Staff are alert to the possibility of fabricated or induced illness	29%	65%	6%	1%	+7
Staff will consider whether children who are young carers have a right to additional support services	24%	63%	13%	0%	-1
Staff can describe and explain what constitutes a private fostering arrangement	11%	52%	36%	1%	No change
Preventing Extremism & Radicalisation	31%	67%	2%	0%	New field
NSCB Priority: Tackling Child Sexual Abuse (New 2016)	14%	57%	29%	0%	New field
NSCB Priority: Tackling Neglect (New 2016)	15%	68%	17%	0%	New field

## 10. Understanding child abuse, signs, symptoms and categories

### Commentary:

All staff and volunteers in education settings play a vital role in helping to identify concerns about child abuse and neglect at an early stage. As highlighted in Section 7 of this report, it is evident that this knowledge is being developed in schools through appropriate and regular staff training and access to LA guidance. In addition to training, it is also clear that schools are using a wide range of tools to provide staff with easy access to supporting guidance and to test knowledge of safeguarding.

It is positive to note that the majority of schools graded themselves good or better for recognising the signs of abuse and understanding the categories of abuse. There was an increase in confidence in fields such as CSE, FGM and forced marriage in comparison with the data from previous audits. This may be a reflection of the work undertaken by the LA in conjunction with the NSCB and other partners such as Norfolk Constabulary to raise awareness of issues such as domestic and honour-based abuse, child sexual exploitation (CSE) and harmful sexual behaviour through the provision of specific guidance in these areas and in some circumstances through workshops. Operation Encompass was referenced in a number of submissions with staff receiving further training as a consequence of the school signing up to receive notifications from the Scheme. In many cases, staff had also been prompted to access external training on domestic abuse and this is evidenced through a significant increase in the number of trained Domestic Abuse Champions in Norfolk schools.

Two fields were added to the review to reflect the NSCB priorities for tackling neglect and child sexual abuse (CSA). 29% of responses identified CSA including the use of the Brooks Traffic Light Tool and NSPCC Pants as an area for development. As a consequence, the LA in partnership with Norfolk Constabulary has ensured that the profile of CSA in Norfolk along with supporting information will be shared with DSLs at all training during the Spring and Summer Term 2018. **In light of the findings of this audit and the learning from the NSCB Serious Case Review – Case W, the NSCB Education Advisory sub-group will be asked to consider how to further raise awareness of the NSCB priorities for tackling neglect and CSA. (Action Point 9)**

It is also evident however that confidence in knowledge across different aspects of safeguarding is variable with some schools feeling less confident about staff recognition of some of the more complex areas of child abuse such as private fostering. Schools are supported with many of the areas for development identified above through training and the guidance available in the '[Safeguarding Section](#)' of the Norfolk Schools' website. **Although there have been some improvements in awareness of some of the specific and complex ways in which children can be harmed in comparison with the data from previous audit, further work will be undertaken by the Safeguarding Advisers and Safeguarding Training Officer to review training and guidance available. (Action Point 10)**