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**Performance Management,**

**Quality Assurance**

**and Scrutiny Framework**

**Introduction**

In September 2019, Surrey adopted new safeguarding children partnership arrangements in response to legislative change (Children and Social Work Act 2017) and updated statutory guidance (Working Together 2018). The new arrangements are based on a clear vision:

**‘The new safeguarding arrangements will make a difference to the lives of children and young people in Surrey. They will ensure that agencies work better together, learn from local and national practice and continuously improve services to enable children and young people to be safe and feel safe in their families and communities.’**

This ambition for impact is matched by a shared commitment to the principle of a safeguarding children partnership:

**‘which has a stronger focus on outcomes for children; knows and understands the performance and quality of its services; holds itself accountable for improving services where needed and develops a learning culture which promotes reflection and continuous improvement.’**

This document outlines how the partnership will manage the performance of safeguarding children services in Surrey, assure itself of the quality and impact of those services and enable their continuous improvement. It also describes how independent scrutiny, a new requirement, will challenge us as a ‘critical friend’ and provide an objective overview of the effectiveness of our arrangements to safeguard and protect children.

This framework should be read in conjunction with the New Surrey Safeguarding Children Arrangements found at (insert link).

**Principles**

The performance management, quality assurance and scrutiny framework is informed by the following principles:

* To be **clear** about what we are seeking to achieve as a Partnership and **plan** accordingly.
* To share common ownership and work **collaboratively** in both delivering our services and judging their progress.
* To deliver our plans with **rigour**, against goals, targets and standards.
* To use a **wide range of tools** to help us measure our progress – including interrogating data; learning from audit and listening to service users and practitioners.
* To use information and intelligence actively and to prompt **curiosity,** **questioning** and **analysis**.
* To use information and intelligence to **challenge** ourselves and each other when needed.
* To be focused on **continuous improvement** of services and outcomes for children.
* To be **open** and **responsive** to external scrutiny, making use of challenge and advice to support our improvement ambitions.

**Framework**

Our performance management, quality assurance and scrutiny framework must help us gain a clear understanding of:

* The functioning of our operational safeguarding services
* The overall effectiveness of the local safeguarding system
* The ability of the safeguarding arrangements to meet statutory and regulatory expectations

This agenda, and the questions it poses, requires activity in three distinct domains – operational; strategic and independent – to enable us to have a comprehensive view of the functioning of the Partnership and our services and the right information on which to base our decisions and actions:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Operational | Strategic | Independent |
| Performance in individual agencies is managed according to policies and procedures; management information is analysed and used to highlight and address practice issues and risks; single agency auditing/service review is undertaken and agencies contribute to multi-agency audit.  User voice and practitioner views are routinely canvassed and complaints and other feedback are analysed.  There is a ‘feedback loop’ from assurance of practice, user and practitioner engagement which informs single and multi-agency learning.  Individual agencies contribute data and information to a Partnership performance dataset (appendix one).  Individual agencies routinely report on performance and issues to the Partnership’s Executive. | The Executive sets the direction and priorities with the Partnership, commissions a strategic safeguarding plan and is accountable for its delivery. It maintains purposeful relations with other key strategic boards.  The Learning from Practice Group monitors the Partnership performance dashboard and commissions multi-agency audits and service reviews. It takes the learning from local and national practice reviews inc CSPRs; CDOP findings; s11, s157 s175 audits; user and staff feedback and a range of annual reports.  The LfP group provides a regular balanced scorecard assurance report to the Executive (appendix two).  The Executive acts on these reports in order to resolve problems and ensure the effective delivery of services. It provides regular reports to the Partnership Group and produces an annual report outlining actions it has taken and evaluating the effectiveness of the arrangements in practice. | Independent scrutiny provides an objective view of the effectiveness of the arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children locally.  Surrey’s appointed Independent Scrutineer makes use of all the performance management and quality assurance tools in use to inform judgements and has direct access to Partnership representatives, users and practitioners.  Observations and challenges are logged and recommendations from the Independent Scrutineer are made to the Executive routinely and continuously during the course of a year.  The Independent Scrutineer provides a summary of issues and impact of scrutiny in the annual report.  The Executive may elect to join peer review activity as a further means of obtaining independent views on the functioning of the arrangements and to enable benchmarking.  Surrey’s arrangements will be subject of further external scrutiny via Ofsted/ joint inspectorates inspection activity. |

**The Role of the Learning from Practice Group**

The Learning from Practice Group is at the ‘hub’ of the Partnership’s performance management and quality assurance system. In addition to its own commissioning role for multi-agency audits and thematic ‘deep dives’, it reviews and analyses the products of the whole range of assurance tools used and advises and makes recommendations to the Executive on practice and service issues.

The group is also key to the embedding of a learning culture within the safeguarding partnership through responsibility for disseminating regular ‘highlight reports’ on safeguarding practice issues for practitioners and for commissioning an annual safeguarding learning and development programme from the Children’s Workforce Academy.

By its nature, the group needs to maintain close links with other parts of the safeguarding partnership ‘architecture’, in particular with the Case Review Panel and the Engagement and Communications Group, as well as with the Independent Scrutineer.

The group will meet bi-monthly and will review performance and quality issues arising at each meeting. Through its senior membership, the group will be able to resolve at least some of these issues, minimising escalation to the Executive, but will also be able to make informed recommendations on matters on which it considers the Executive should be sighted.

The group is responsible for providing the Executive with regular/quarterly balanced scorecard assurance reports based on its analysis of all assurance activity in a period. Although the primary focus of this report is always to alert the Executive to declining or poor performance requiring immediate decisions, it will also include highlighting emerging risks and issues, unresolved or recurring concerns, areas for improvement as well as examples of good practice and particular strengths.

**The Role of Independent Scrutiny**

The fundamental rationale for independent scrutiny of safeguarding arrangements is to provide assurance of their effectiveness both to the Safeguarding Partners and to the public. This involves judgements being made in three key areas – the leadership and governance of the arrangements; the extent to which the arrangements protect and safeguard children and the capacity of the arrangements to improve and develop services.

Surrey’s Independent Scrutineer has a far-reaching mandate to objectively examine the Partnership arrangements in depth and provide ongoing/’real time’ challenge and advice to the Executive and Partnership Group. In order to perform this role, the Scrutineer will have access a wide range of quantitative and qualitative information about the functioning of the local safeguarding system and, importantly, will engage closely with senior leaders, managers and practitioners responsible for delivering services and with young people and their carers receiving those services.

As Independent Chair for key Partnership groups, the Scrutineer will be able to make direct observation of both the senior leadership of the Partnership and the functioning of its key governance structures. The Scrutineer will also convene and attend practitioner forums, including multi-agency, and service user groups and attend specific meetings in the three safeguarding partner organisations concerned with the scrutiny of safeguarding services including the County Council’s Select Committees and board level meetings in the NHS/Police. The Scrutineer will also engage with leads of other key multi-agency governance bodies including for Community Safety and Health and Wellbeing.

To support the independent scrutiny process, lead officers from the three statutory partners will be identified with overall support for the programme provided by the Partnership Support Team. This group will join the Independent Scrutineer in planning and delivering the annual scrutiny programme.

Access to the whole range of data and information available to the safeguarding partnership itself and routine engagement with key stakeholders enables the Independent Scrutineer to obtain a comprehensive overview of the effectiveness of the safeguarding system locally, and to advise both informally and formally of improvements.

**The Role of the Partnership Support Team**

Although the Partnership Support Team has a broader remit overall, it has a central role in the Partnership’s performance management, quality assurance and scrutiny functions.

The Partnership Development Manager will be a member of the Learning from Practice group, will contribute to the collation and analysis of information and will take lead responsibility for the authoring of regular balanced scorecard and annual reports. This role will involve close collaboration with the Chair of the Learning from Practice group and close liaison with performance and quality colleagues across the Partnership organisations, and with professional leads.

The Partnership Support Team will also play an important part in supporting the triangulation of data, intelligence and information including through collation of user voice and practitioner views. Additionally, it will perform a ‘horizon scanning’ function, bringing into the Partnership intelligence from national case reviews, innovations and public policy developments. This will enable the Partnership’s approach to performance management, quality assurance and scrutiny to be both inward and outward looking, proactive and reflective.

The Partnership Support Team will co-ordinate the ‘feedback loop’ from performance management and quality assurance activity, working closely with the Learning from Practice group and ensuring regular publication and wide distribution across the Partnership of practice based ‘highlight’ reports. The team will also work with the Children’s Workforce Academy on the commissioning and delivery of the Partnership’s annual safeguarding learning and development programme.

The Partnership Support Team will assist the Independent Scrutineer to plan and deliver an annual programme of scrutiny including through the supply of information, convening and supporting consultative forums and production of reports.

**Annual Assurance Conversation**

In addition to the regular/quarterly (tbc) reporting cycle into the Executive, an annual meeting will take place between the Executive, Learning from Practice Group and the Independent Scrutineer which reviews performance and quality over the previous year and reflects on viewpoints arising from independent scrutiny. This meeting will support both the backward looking evaluation of the Safeguarding Partnership required for the annual report (meeting the needs of both the Safeguarding Partners and also the Independent Scrutineer in the process) and also the prioritisation of activity for the year ahead.

**Appendix One – Partnership Performance Dataset**

Note: This is an extensive selection of possible data drawn from a number of different local areas which focusses on the multi-agency components of safeguarding services and the Partnership’s current priorities. Some of these measures may not be currently available and would need decisions of the Executive and new business processes to be reportable. The specific reporting format needs discussion - The LfP Group and Partnership Support Team could routinely monitor the whole dataset, reporting by exception to the Executive, with the entire dataset reviewed in the annual assurance conversation proposed. Alternatively, a smaller core dataset could be agreed but the wider set of metrics used to inform commentary against the strategic priorities section in the balanced scorecard (see appendix two).

|  |
| --- |
| **Core Data:**   * Population level – numbers; gender; ethnicity; rates per 10,000 of children receiving early help; children in need; children with cp plan; children looked after; young offenders; young carers * Cohort level – numbers receiving early help services; children in need; children with cp plan; children looked after; young offenders; young carers * Cohort level – numbers of children with cp plan by type of cp concern; children with cp plan previously receiving early help or CiN services; LAC as a result of cp concerns; children taken into Police Protection * Referrals – numbers; repeat; referrals leading to assessment/s47 * Assessments – numbers; in time * S47 Investigations – numbers; in time; * Strategy discussions – numbers; in time; quoracy * CP medicals – numbers * Initial CP Conferences – numbers; in time; quoracy * Review CP Conferences – numbers; in time; quoracy * Duration CP Plans * Outcomes of CP Plans - remaining at home; step down to CiN; LAC * CP Plans for second or subsequent times * LAC incidents of missing/return home interviews * LAC three or more placement moves; placed outside county * EY Settings and Schools rated inadequate for safeguarding * Children missing education * Residential homes rated inadequate for safeguarding; missing incidents * Hospitals/ community health providers rated inadequate for safeguarding   **Priorities - Thresholds**   * Conversion rates contact – referral – assessment/s47 * Conversion rates s47 – ICPC * Conversion rates ICPC – CP Plan * Outcomes Police Protection   **Priorities – Neglect**   * Numbers children on CP Plan for neglect * Numbers with previous EH/CiN intervention * Duration on CP Plan * Outcomes of CP Plan   **Priorities – Domestic Abuse**   * Referrals of children in families affected by domestic abuse * Numbers children receiving EH services; CiN services; on CP Plan as a result of domestic abuse * Outcomes of interventions with families affected by domestic abuse   **Priorities – Contextual Safeguarding**   * Numbers of incidents of violent youth crime; young people perpetrating and victims * Numbers of young people requiring A+E/inpatient treatment as a result of serious violence * Numbers young people with known gang affiliation * Number offences against children * Children at risk of/experiencing child sexual abuse; receiving interventions; inc LAC * MAPPA cases affecting children; re-offending against children * MARAC cases affecting children; outcomes of intervention * Numbers young people in custody; overnight; remand; post sentence * FTEs for serious offences * Re-offending serious crime   **Priorities – Emotional Wellbeing and CAMHs**   * Referrals; waiting times tier 3 CAMHs * CYP presenting to A+E through self-harm * CYP in tier 4 in-patient hospitals; locations * Hospital admissions for drug or alcohol related conditions   **Priorities – Children with SEN and Disabilities**   * Numbers children with SEND; EHCP; LAC with SEND; SEND children on CP Plans * Children with SEND missing education * Children with SEND in residential placements; incidents of missing * Children with SEND vulnerable to sexual and criminal exploitation   **Priorities – Historical Abuse**   * Total cases of young people/adults claiming historical abuse while in the care of/receiving services from Surrey County Council; new cases * Total cases reaching resolution/outstanding |

**Appendix Two – Balanced Scorecard Assurance Report**

Note: This is the proposed quarterly (tbc) report to the Executive; template format to be agreed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Period:** | |
| **Partnership Dataset**   * Provides data and commentary by exception * Commentary to include actions taken to address performance issues   -----------------------------------------------------------  **Partnership QA Activity**   * Commentary on audit; user voice; practitioner engagementactivity * Commentary to include actions taken to address findings/issues   **Independent Scrutiny Activity**   * Commentary on scrutiny activity and feedback * Commentary to include recommendations | **Partnership Strategic Priorities**   * Data and commentary by exception * Commentary to include actions taken   --------------------------------------------------------------**Key Issues for Executive**   * Commentary to include emerging risks   --------------------------------------------------------------**Recommendations**   * Specific recommended actions for the Executive to consider |