

NSPCC inform

The online child protection resource

www.nspcc.org.uk/inform

Responding to change

**A survey of local education authorities'
responses to the changing policy context
of child protection**

Mary Baginsky

June 2006

About the author

Until recently Mary Baginsky was Senior Research Officer in NSPCC's Research Department where, amongst other areas of work, she developed a programme of work on the role of education in safeguarding and protecting children. During that time she was seconded to the Department of Education and Skills to conduct the national evaluation of the Investigation and Referral Support Network and seconded to the Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London. She is now Senior Consultant with GHK Consulting.

Acknowledgements

Along the way I have been fortunate to have the support of a number of people. Phillip Noyes, Director of Public Policy at NSPCC did not hesitate to give the work his support when I first suggested it. There were those in local authorities who helped at the early stage. These were Carol Taylor (Hertfordshire), Christine Gould (Sheffield), Mary Palazzo (Cambridge) and Paul Saunders (Derbyshire) who looked at the draft questionnaire and were kind enough to take time to make it a better research instrument. I am also grateful for the comments which former NSPCC colleagues have made on earlier drafts of this report, particularly David Coulter, Lorraine Radford and Diana Sutton.

Three people outside NSPCC read the report and shared their wisdom, experience and wit in helping to move the document from a string of findings to a report that I hope will prove to be of use. These were Jo Green, now an Allegations Management Adviser (AMA); Amy Weir, a Children's Services Consultant and John Guest, Head of Education Welfare and Safeguarding, Southwark Education. But there would have been no report without the exceptional co-operation from those who work in education in local authorities and have responsibility for safeguarding and protecting children. So many responded to a request to complete yet another questionnaire. I am, as always, so very grateful to all of them. I hope that in analysing and writing this report I have done justice to the time and energy that they put into their responses.

Executive Summary

This study was designed to examine how education services within local authorities were responding to the significant changes that were transforming children's services and those that were proposed for the future. Recent changes included Sections 157 and 175 of *Education Act 2002* which placed statutory responsibilities on these authorities, along with schools and colleges, to safeguard and protect children. It was translated into practice in the document *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004), which was issued in September 2004, two months after these sections were enacted. At the same time the Children Act (2004) placed a duty on local authorities to make arrangements to promote co-operation between agencies and integrate the front line delivery of services with the introduction of Director of Children's Services and Children's Trusts. In addition, while the Children's Agenda, *Every Child Matters* was guiding a more unified approach to the development of provision in every service and agency, the White Paper, *Higher standards, better schools for all - more choice for parents and pupils* (DfES, 2005a) appeared to introduce further uncertainty over the relationship between schools and local authorities. The survey was directed to the officer in each authority who had sole or shared responsibility for child protection within education. Responses were received from 104 of the 150 local authorities in England.

The study found:

- About half of the authorities from which a response was received had created Children's Service Departments, with the majority of the rest planning to do so sometime in 2006. However about one in every 13 authorities did not have plans in place.
- Half of the authorities had a Trust or similar body in operation, though not all were assuming a strategic role in relation to the provision and integration of services across the authority. Most of the rest said a trust was either planned or under discussion. This meant that about one in five respondents did not know if a trust was planned or said that there were no plans to introduce one.
- It was also evident from some responses that further attention needed to be given to the relationship between children's services and trusts particularly where operational and strategic responsibilities overlapped.
- Local authority education services are required to have a named officer for child protection. *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) makes it clear that this should be a senior officer for child protection to undertake and manage strategic, support and operational responsibilities. In just under half of authorities responding to the survey the responsibility was held by the Head of the Education Welfare or similar. In nearly a third of authorities an Assistant Director of Education or another senior manager held the post, although operational responsibilities were then usually delegated to another officer. Whatever the arrangement, under half (46 per cent) of responding authorities had someone taking full time responsibility for child protection.
- Respondents were asked to identify up to three factors that had assisted the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda in their authorities and three factors that had challenged the implementation. The factors most commonly identified as supporting its introduction were strong strategic partnerships **and** consultations with staff at all levels to ensure their engagement in the process. The main factors which were identified as militating against successful implementation were the scale of need among children and young people in many areas, failure to match demands being

made with appropriate level of funding, initiative overload and the pace of change, the difficulties involved in creating capacity to develop preventative work and in fully engaging schools in the process.

- In the majority of authorities the person carrying the operational lead for child protection had represented the authority on Area Child Protection Committees (ACPCs). About a third were not then sure if they would be continuing to represent education on Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCBs). The remaining respondents divided between those who said there would not be any change in the representation and those who reported that a more senior officer would represent education.
- *Safeguarding children in education* was published in September 2004 and defined specific strategic, support and operational responsibilities for LEAs. Just over one third of respondents said these were the responsibilities of the operational lead officer in education. However nearly half said it was now part of either the local strategic planning process through the LSCB or cross-departmental work at Chief Officer level. The remainder replied that it was under review or that it was too early to be sure where these responsibilities would lie. There were comments from all these groupings that the process had not been as well co-ordinated as it should have been as a result of the many other changes that were also happening.
- Respondents were asked if *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) was appropriate to the arrangements being introduced as a result of *Every Child Matters*, the Children Act 2004 and Bichard recommendations (Bichard, 2004) / DfES Guidance on dealing with allegations against those working in educational settings (DfES, 2005b). Just under half of respondents thought the document was still relevant. Although very few thought it needed a complete rewrite, just under half considered that it needed to be updated and revised. There was also the suggestion that document should be simplified, specifically to make a clear distinction between child protection and safeguarding.
- The White Paper *Higher standards, better schools for all* (DfES, 2005a) proposes schools will have greater independence and be able to run their own affairs through bodies such as a self-governing trust. Respondents were asked what they thought the implications were for Children's Service Departments **and** Local Safeguarding Children's Boards. The overwhelming majority believed that it represented a potential challenge to the *Every Child Matters* agenda, particularly in relation to accountability and compliance.
- Only a small number agreed that it was right not to place schools under a duty to co-operate to improve the well-being of children in the area within Section 10 of the Children Act 2004. The majority of respondents agreed that the duty was already imposed implicitly by the 1989 Children Act and / or sections 157 and 175 of the 2002 Education Act, but wanted an explicit duty to secure compliance and to make it clear that schools were a vital partner in the *Every Child Matters* agenda.
- Respondents were asked if they considered that the current changes meant that there was now a more effective system for protecting children than the one in place in 2002, the last time a similar survey was conducted. Over half of those responding to the survey believed that the system which was being put into place would be *more* effective in providing services for primary school aged children but the proportion fell in relation to secondary school pupils, with only around two-fifths having no reservations about improved effectiveness.

Responding to Change

A survey of local education authorities' responses to the changing policy context of child protection

Mary Baginsky

Introduction

There are 150 local education authorities (LEAs) in England responsible for the strategic management of local authority education services.¹ Earlier surveys had explored how LEAs were responding to their responsibilities in relation to child protection (Baginsky, 2000 and 2003), but since then significant changes had occurred which impacted on LEAs and on their responsibilities. In July 2004, Sections 157 and 175 of the *Education Act 2002* were enacted. These require LEAs to make arrangements for ensuring that the functions conferred on them are exercised with a view to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children. These sections also place a responsibility on the governing bodies of maintained schools to make arrangements for ensuring that their schools operate in such a way as to safeguard and promote the welfare of their pupils. *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) was issued in September 2004. It replaced previous guidance contained in Circular 10/95 (Department for Education and Employment, 1995) and explains the roles and responsibilities of LEAs, schools, and FE institutions in the light of the legislation. At the same time the Children Act (2004) placed a duty on local authorities to make arrangements to promote co-operation between agencies and other appropriate agencies. This includes adopting a common assessment framework for all children, establishing effective information sharing arrangements with other agencies and the integration of the front line delivery of services. Local Authorities are also required to appoint an officer as Director of Children's Services to have responsibility for LEA functions, social services functions that relate to children, arrangements to ensure effective co-operation and NHS functions (S 31 of the Health Act 1999) that relate to children.

In addition to these demands the Children's Agenda, *Every Child Matters* (see <http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/>), was developing (with the intention that it will be implemented in full by 2008) and the new inspection process was being introduced. The White Paper, *Higher Standards, Better Schools for All - More Choice for Parents and Pupils* (DfES, 2005a), appeared and introduced further uncertainty over the relationship between schools and LEAs. At a macro level the debate over the future of local administration continued. In addition, under the Children Act 2004, from April 2006 Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs) have been introduced in all local authority areas and education will be a key member.

It seemed appropriate to collect data from LEAs on how they were responding to some of these initiatives. Particular emphasis was placed on *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) and the

¹ The Department for Education and Skills (DfES is now discouraging the use of the term 'LEA' in favour of 'local authority education services', which encapsulates the diverse arrangements across England. However the term LEA is used in this document.

possible changes implied by the contents of the White Paper, *Higher standards, better schools for all - more choice for parents and pupils* (DfES, 2005a), as well as on the factors which supported and challenged the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda. It is, however, important to recognise that the survey took place at a time of almost unprecedented uncertainty and change.

Conducting the survey

The report discusses findings of a survey sent to LEAs between November 2005 and January 2006. The name of an officer in each LEA who had sole or shared responsibility for child protection had been obtained for a study which had been conducted in 2004-5 (see Baginsky, 2005). The questionnaire (Appendix A) was addressed to that person and sent as an email attachment in November 2005, with a request that they should complete it or pass it to an appropriate colleague. The original deadline of 5 December was extended to 9 January 2006 by which time 104 of the 150 were returned. This represents a response rate of 69 per cent. [Twenty of the 104 responses were received from London authorities.] Although this is below the response rate obtained in previous surveys of LEAs (Baginsky, 2000; Baginsky, 2003; and Baginsky, 2005) a number of LEA officers contacted the researcher to apologise for not returning the questionnaire. In the course of conversation with these officers, and in emails with other officers, two reasons for this emerged. It was clear that not only did pressure of work at a time of structural change make it impossible for some to complete the task, others were uncertain about too many issues to feel they could provide useful information.

As noted above the questionnaire had been addressed to the lead officer for child protection and, in most cases, had been completed by them. Where a member of an authority's senior management team held the post the questionnaire was usually delegated to the person with operational responsibility for child protection. An exception was where it had been given to an investigation and referral support co-ordinator serving the cluster where the authority was based.

Respondents were asked about the following areas relevant to their work:

- The progress towards introducing Children's Service Department (CSD) and Children's Trusts in their authorities.
- Details of the posts which carried the lead role in their LEAs / education services for child protection and safeguarding (if these responsibilities had changed since September 2004).
- What, if anything, they considered had assisted or hindered the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda in their authorities.
- The representation of education on Area Child Protection Committees (ACPCs) and planned representation on LSCBs.
- How LEAs / CSDs were responding to the strategic, support and operational responsibilities defined in *Safeguarding children in education* [DfES, September 2004].
- Whether they considered *Safeguarding children in education* [DfES, 2004] continued to be appropriate in light of the arrangements which had been introduced since its publication.

- What, if any, did they consider to be the implications of White Paper *Higher standards, better schools for all* [DfES, October 2005] for:
 - a) Children's Service Departments
 - b) Local Safeguarding Children's Boards.
- If they considered schools should have been placed under 'a duty to co-operate' within the Children Act, 2004.
- If they considered that the current changes would produce a more effective system to protect and safeguard children than that in place 2002.

The report details their responses on each of these areas and concludes with the author's reflections on the implications of the findings.

Children's Service Departments

As part of the *Every Child's Matters* agenda, Directors of Children's Services must be appointed by 2008 and will be accountable for the delivery of education, social services and delegated health services for children. This is the minimum requirement although the expectation was that most authorities would integrate education and children's social services to some degree, including those who would merge the two functions completely. Respondents were asked if education (LEA) services had been brought into a wider Children's Service Department and if so when this had happened. If this had not happened respondents were asked to state if this was planned and, again, if so when. Fifty-four of the 104 authorities had already done so. A few of these authorities had moved towards a similar arrangement before the announcement of the proposal to introduce Children's Service Departments, but most had done so during 2005. It is due to happen in 33 of the 50 remaining authorities sometime in 2006, although 13 of the 17 remaining respondents did not have any idea when one would be created. There was a considerable degree of variation between authorities in how they approached this development. But in addition some authorities had appointed senior posts, including the Director of Children's Services prior to any major structural changes, and the rate at which this was then followed by actual change also varied considerably. In a few cases a pilot department had been established in part of the authority before it was extended across the whole area.

Children's Trusts

Children's Trusts are key to the achievement of the five main outcomes for children identified in *Every Child Matters*. They are commissioning bodies intended to ensure integrated service delivery and better outcomes for children. Trusts will decide how best to spend pooled budgets to secure the most effective integrated delivery of services and monitor and review performance. Although Children's Trusts are not statutory, the Children Act 2004 states that these are the preferred model for delivery and that most councils should have a Trust by 2006 and all should have one by 2008. In reality they will vary from the creation of new organisations, some of which will focus on specific client groups, to *virtual* Trusts that will not require structural reform. When asked if a Children's Trust operated in their area 39 of the 104 respondents replied that it did, with one more having a Trust operating in just part of the authority. In

some cases the Trust focused on one particular group, such as disabled children and young people, but in most cases Trusts were assuming a wider strategic role in order to oversee the provision and integration of services. Of the remaining 64 respondents over half (35) said a Trust was either planned or under discussion, while 11 referred to working relationships which equated with trust arrangements in all but name. This left 18 respondents (17 per cent), nine of whom who did not know if a Trust was planned or not and nine who said one did not exist and that there were no plans to introduce one. The intention was not to collect data on the form and nature of these Trusts. Even within a devolved approach to implementation, the responses raise questions both about the extent of variation across the country and, within some authorities, as well as about the involvement of education or of all sections of the education function.

Trusts were intended to have a strategic rather than an operational role. Respondents were asked if, in any circumstances, Trusts were taking on operational responsibilities in relation to services for schools. In most instances they were said to be exclusively strategic, although in a small number of cases respondents said Trusts had begun to assume some operational responsibilities and others said that they could see how this may happen in the future. An additional observation was made by a significant minority that although their Trusts were essentially strategic, conflicts were beginning to emerge because the agencies were represented by those who had operational responsibilities and who were trying to marry the strategic and the operational. In the view of one respondent these *operational constrictions dilute the vision*. These views reflect the importance of clarifying the exact relationships between CSDs and Trusts during the transitional process.

Child protection and safeguarding posts

Previous guidance for LEAs and Schools (Department for Education and Science, 1988 and Department for Education and Employment, 1995) had required LEAs to have a named officer for child protection. *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) reinforces this requirement. The guidance states that all LEAs will have an identified senior officer for child protection to undertake and manage strategic, support and operational responsibilities.

Respondents were asked to identify the post which carried the lead role in their LEA for child protection in their authority. Just under half of respondents (n = 50) said that the post holder was the Head of the Education Welfare or similar; in eight of these cases the responsibilities were delegated to an officer who held either a dedicated post or combined it with other responsibilities. However, in nearly a third of responding authorities (n =32) the post was held by an Assistant Director of Education or by another senior management post, although in most cases operational responsibilities had been delegated to another officer. Whatever the arrangement, only 46 per cent (48 of the 104) of responding authorities had someone taking full time responsibility for child protection.

Respondents were also asked if a separate post for safeguarding had been established in their authority and 42 authorities had done so, although it was not always clear how many of these were based exclusively in the education service and how many carried a wider brief.

Respondents, who it should be remembered, were the lead officers for child protection or the officers with delegated responsibility for that work were asked to say if their job title had changed since the introduction of *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004). In a third of cases this had occurred, although in most cases this was where the respondent was a member of the senior management team of an authority and had been given responsibility for child protection and safeguarding. However, over three-quarters of respondents (n = 82) said their responsibilities and workload had expanded; 16 replied that there had been no change and the remaining six said they had contracted or contracted and expanded. There had been significant increased responsibilities in a number of areas, particularly in relation to child protection training for teachers and other staff in schools, advising on and dealing with allegations against staff and monitoring schools' compliance with their responsibilities. Some respondents raised concerns about their expanded workloads and their ability to fulfil the required duties. Others referred to a patchwork response that meant some areas were not covered:

Assistant Director, Specialist Services is nominally the lead officer. The lead officer role as defined by the *Safeguarding Children in Education* is split between various staff or not undertaken. For instance the Assistant Director, Specialist Services does not take initial calls regarding allegations made against education professionals or currently arrange designated person training etc., which is done by the Principal Attendance officer. Other work specified in the guidance is not undertaken by any one. It was planned to have a Safeguarding Officer role combining the lead officer role and other tasks such as representing education on the LSCB, licensing applications etc., but financial constraints have led to the role not being filled.

Implementation of *Every Child Matters* agenda

Respondents were asked to identify up to three factors which had:

- a) assisted the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda in their authorities.
- b) challenged the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda in their authorities.

The factors identified by respondents are summarised in Table 1 and Table 2. In addition there were a number of comments from respondents who expressed their belief that the process was easier where an authority was small and /or there were co-terminus boundaries with other agencies. Both factors were judged to ease negotiations and relationships.

Some respondents in large authorities thought that the size of their authorities was proving to be a major difficulty.

Table 1: Factors assisting the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda

40-50 respondents	30-39 respondents	20-29 respondents	10-20 respondents
Strong strategic partnerships	Consultations with staff at all levels and their engagement in the process	Well managed ACPCs / LSCBs	Joint Area Reviews Process
Strong leadership from senior managers across education and social care		Development of posts to deal with specific aspects such as training and support.	The force of legislation and guidance
Commitment from, and good working relationships between, agencies at all levels			

Table 2: Factors challenging the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda

50 - 60 respondents	40 – 50 respondents	30 – 39 respondents	20 - 29 respondents	10 – 20 respondents
The scale of need among children and young people in many areas.	Initiative overload and the pace of change	Operational difficulties of professionals working together and the sharing of information across professional boundaries	Government ambivalence in respect of the role of LEAs	Contradictory statements in documents
Failure to match demands being made with appropriate level of funding.	Creating capacity to develop preventative work.	Bringing together departments with differing performance management and service planning systems	Moving beyond structural change to develop genuine multi-disciplinary working.	Tendency of agencies to compartmentalise the five outcomes
	Fully engaging schools in the process	Governance arrangements for secondary schools	Lack of understanding by other agencies of the relationship between schools and LEAs.	
		Competing agendas of attainment and inclusion.	Developing trust / shared culture / shared values / common language / respect for different skills and knowledge.	

How LEAs had been represented on Area Child Protection Committees (ACPCs) and future arrangements on Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCBs)

In the majority of authorities (88 per cent / 92 of the 104 respondents) the person carrying the operational lead for child protection had represented the authority on ACPCs. Where a senior officer was the designated officer s/he would also attend. In most cases (90 per cent / 94 of the 104) schools were also represented and in just under a third of the authorities (30 per cent / 31 of the 104 respondents) others also attended such as principal educational psychologists and the DfES Investigation and Referral Support Co-ordinators² working with the cluster where the authorities were located.

Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs) have replaced ACPCs and had to be operational by April 2006. Unlike ACPCs they have statutory powers to ensure agencies work together. Although about a third (37) of respondents did not then have details of the composition of their LSCBs the rest were able to provide some information. These were split between those who said there had not been or would not be any change in the representation (n = 32) and those who indicated that education would be represented by a senior officer post (35). Most of those who would be standing down as a result said they would still have some operational responsibilities for LSCBs.

Responding to *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004)

The DfES guidance for schools, *Safeguarding children in education*, was published in September 2004 and in Part 2 defined specific strategic, support and operational responsibilities for LEAs. The questionnaire provided an opportunity to find out how LEAs were interpreting and responding to the document.

Strategic responsibilities to plan, co-ordinate, delivery and allocate resources in partnership with other agencies

Just over one third of respondents (n = 36) said these were the responsibilities of the operational lead officer in education. However nearly half (n = 50) said it was now part of either the local strategic planning process through the LSCB or cross departmental work at Chief Officer level. The rest (n = 18) either replied that it was under review or that it was too early to know where these responsibilities would lie. But about a third of those who had identified the individual or group assuming responsibility commented that the process had not been as well co-ordinated as it should have been as a result of the many other changes which were occurring at the same time. It indicates the need for LSCBs to ensure that all parties are clear as to how this responsibility is being discharged.

² These posts disappeared in March 2006.

Support responsibilities

a) *To ensure the awareness of maintained schools in relation to their responsibilities 'for child protection'*

All respondents mentioned at least one action that had been taken to meet these responsibilities. Most (n = 83) mentioned more than one and had provided various combinations of briefings, training and written materials. There were also those who had been able to put considerable resources into this work which allowed them to develop:

- resources which they made available through an intranet
- additional training sessions
- training materials for designated teachers to use with all those working in schools
- various self-evaluation tools for schools.

However, nearly half of respondents (n = 49) commented on the difficulties which they faced as a result of the number of schools in their authorities and the limited financial and personnel resources available for the work.

b) *To monitor performance of schools **

A third of respondents (n = 35) only provided information on who was monitoring rather than how it was being done, including one reference to a specific post that had been created to do this. Perhaps surprisingly, there were authorities (n = 11) that had not put any system in place, although there were comments that this would be part of Children and Young People's Plans (which have to be in place – except in 3 star authorities – by April 2006) or be part of LSCBs' work. The responses from the remaining 58 respondents showed that there was considerable variation between authorities in how they were implementing the requirement to monitor schools. A minority of respondents (n = 14) claimed that this aspect, alongside the provision of training, was their main focus. They referred to integrated systems that monitored a range of activities, usually alongside self-evaluation tools that they had developed for schools. These included:

- the existence and appropriateness of school child protection policies
- the names of and training received by designated persons in schools
- child protection referrals made by schools
- schools' attendance at child protection case conferences
- governing bodies' annual reports on how they had discharged their duties (as required by *Safeguarding children in education*, 31.9).

This left the majority of those who provided details of the process referring to one or more of these aspects. In some cases more robust systems were being developed, but the impression was that in too many cases the process was either restricted or ad hoc, even though a small number of respondents detailed the way in which the monitoring process was integrated into the wider ACPC or LSCB systems or how additional information was culled through other means such as Children's Services Reviewing Unit.

* *Monitoring the performance of maintained schools is also listed as a strategic responsibility.*

c) To make available appropriate training for designated persons

Safeguarding children in education (DfES, 2004) requires all designated persons to have basic child protection training, supplemented by inter-agency training and bi-annual updates provided by, or of a standard, agreed with the ACPC (LSCB). All responding authorities were providing training for the child protection designated persons in schools. In most cases this was organised and delivered by the lead officer, either alone or in consultation with others, either from education, social services or the ACPC / LSCB. However the extent of the programmes which have been developed clearly reflected the human and financial resources which had been available. Some concern was expressed about how it would be possible to sustain the rolling programme of basic training and the initial multi-agency training for designated persons, alongside the two-yearly updates. A small number of authorities (n = 8) did not have anything which could be described as a significant training programme in place and their provision was described in terms of it being 'ad hoc' or even 'skeletal'.

d) To make available appropriate training for all staff in maintained schools

Safeguarding children in education (DfES, 2004) requires the head teacher and all staff working with children to attend appropriate child protection training and subsequent three-yearly intervals. One-fifth of responding authorities had put in place a rolling programme of training for all their schools on a three-year cycle and another two-fifths offered training but were aware that they may not be able to cover all their schools in a three-year period. Some authorities had clustered schools and an education welfare officer, training officer or other post-holder would work their way around that cluster. Again, the training provision depended on the resources which were available. The remaining authorities adopted different strategies. In some cases they combined taking training into schools with an option for designated persons to cascade training to all school staff, in other cases the only training which was available to all staff was through the designated teacher, sometimes using materials developed for this purpose by the authority. A small number of authorities were about to appoint a dedicated trainer for schools and others were hoping that LSCBs would be able to extend their training to schools. Once again capacity was a significant determinant of provision. In three instances authorities had identified criteria by which schools would be judged for individual training. The criteria included recommendations and requirements following Ofsted inspections of schools, serious incidents, and concerns expressed by other agencies.

e) To make available model policies and procedures

Again, *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) requires LEAs to make these available to schools. The majority of respondents (89 of the 104) said these had been made available to all schools, with a quarter stating that they were available on a website. Three of the remaining 15 said they were available on request and the rest that they were being developed.

f) Facilitating links and co-operation with other agencies

LEAs are required by *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) to facilitate these links. Although others may well offer similar services only a fifth of respondents (n = 21) gave details of how they worked directly with schools and other agencies over difficult cases or to resolve misunderstandings. However, nearly every respondent gave details of how they or their colleagues represented education on inter-agency and multi-agency groups.

Operational responsibilities

Safeguarding children in education (DfES, 2004) specifies the operational responsibilities of LEAs which are in relation to:

- *safe recruitment procedures*: Two-thirds of respondents had some involvement in this, usually working with the human resource / personnel sections of the LEA. In the remaining authorities HR / personnel were said to carry exclusive responsibility for this area of work.
- *arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and Young People not offered a school place*: The majority of respondents either had a peripheral or more central role in working with specific teams or individuals responsible for these children and young people. A very small number (n = 8) had not linked with those who held this responsibility.
- *dealing with allegations of abuse against members of staff and volunteers*: In the majority of cases those with responsibility for child protection and safeguarding in education were working with HR / personnel sections, and usually with their legal departments, police and unions, over this issue. This response illustrates the process described by many of the respondents:

The Child Protection procedures in use in schools define how such allegations are to be dealt with and a termly meeting, which includes teacher unions, monitors the outcomes. The Lead Officer is the first recipient of information about allegations from schools. There is a process in place with the local Police and Children's Services Referral and Assessment unit to refer allegations received by their officers back to the LEA lead officer. A strategy discussion is then held with the head teacher in line with procedures to take responsibility for ensuring processes are followed.

A small number (n = 10) replied that HR / personnel took full responsibility, although the dangers of failing to co-operate were illustrated in this response:

Traditionally, the Personnel Team has dealt with allegations against staff. However, following a situation where I delivered training in a primary school and ended up with extremely distressed participants (I was totally unaware that the head teacher had just been dismissed for child protection related concerns) I have put everyone involved under pressure to include me wherever possible. It seemed clear to me that personnel officers knew about disciplinary processes but had little concept of child protection or the procedures that schools should have in place. Personnel did not normally ask me for the school's (or the member of staff's) training record. We are just at the point where personnel now notify me of all allegations, am invited to the strategy meeting if one is called (and try to attend!). This means that we can quickly identify any gaps in the school procedures, make judgements about how the school followed the procedures, whether the ethos of the school safeguards pupils

from professional abuse and then make training needs recommendations to the school once the allegation is resolved.

Safeguarding children in education (DfES, 2004) also requires ensuring any of the authority's staff working with children receive child protection training. Details of how this is implemented in relation to those working in schools are provided above. Most respondents (n = 87) had collected or were collecting information on the groups this would involve and most of them (n = 73) were providing training, usually in conjunction with their ACPCs / LSCBs. Both amongst those who had taken this forward and those who still had to initiate any work referred to the strain which this placed (or would place) on available resources.

Safeguarding children in education (DfES, 2004) makes it clear that authorities may choose to provide these services for independent schools and Further Education (FE) institutions and may make a charge for doing so. Respondents were asked if they did extend their support services to these sectors, as well as to any new academies. Their responses are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Engagement with independent schools, FE institutions and academies

	Independent schools	FE Institutions	Academies
Yes	79	72	17
No	18	27	2
Under consideration	3	4	0
No institution	4	1	85

Those respondents saying that they had contact with independent schools included them in their mailings and made their training available to them, although in most cases there was a charge for this. One authority had created a post to deal with schools in the independent sector, while two others expressed concern about their ability to maintain the work without additional support. The extent to which schools in the independent sector responded varied between and within authorities and was described as having been 'enthusiastically and widely received' to 'not one school has responded'. Most of the 18 respondents not engaging with schools in the independent sector would provide support if they were approached to do so, but they did not intend to approach them.

Only a minority of authorities had an academy by the end of 2005. Those that did have an academy would be willing to provide support and training in the same way as they did for independent schools. Two respondents expressed concern about the difficulties that they had experienced in working with academies. While most respondents were supporting FE institutions many said they were giving this more attention with the increasing number of under 16 year olds attending colleges. It was evident that this was placing additional strains on some authorities and others claimed they did not have the capacity to undertake this work.

Relevance of *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004)

The questionnaire asked respondents to say if they considered the document *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) was appropriate to the arrangements which are now in place, and those which are still being introduced, as a result of *Every Child Matters*, the Children Act 2004 and Bichard recommendations (Bichard, 2004) / DfES Guidance on dealing with allegations against those working in educational settings (DfES, 2005b). Just under half (n = 48) of the respondents thought the document was still relevant in its current form. Although very few (n = 5) thought it needed a complete rewrite, the remaining respondents (n = 51) thought it needed an early update, especially in relation to procedures around allegations and terminology now that terms such as 'LEA' would no longer be appropriate. There were also those who suggested that the opportunity could be taken to simplify the document, making a clear distinction between child protection and safeguarding, as well as those who proposed disposing of the appendices, or incorporating them into the text.

White Paper *Higher standards, better schools for all*

The White Paper *Higher standards, better schools for all* (DfES, 2005a) was published in the month before the questionnaire was distributed. The White Paper proposes schools will have greater independence and be able to run their own affairs through bodies such as a self-governing trust. Respondents were asked what they thought the implications were for Children's Service Departments and Local Safeguarding Children Boards.

Implications for Children's Service Departments

Although, some respondents thought it was too early to say what the implications for Children's Service Departments would be, the overwhelming majority (96 of the 104) believed that greater school autonomy was a potential challenge to the *Every Child Matters* agenda. Some concerns focused on the original intention to give schools greater control over their admissions policies. There was far more apprehension about accountability and compliance. While all maintained schools are under the obligations imposed by Section 175 of the Education Act 2002, *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) gives local authorities a defined strategic and monitoring role. Although the White Paper does not explicitly change this, the majority thought that the proposals weakened the relationship between schools and local authorities, and undermined their ability to take a strategic role. The view of most respondents was that it had introduced conflicting messages and jeopardised local shared accountability in that it would be difficult to operate strategically with autonomous and semi-autonomous institutions and would depend on the willingness of individuals to co-operate.

Implications for local safeguarding children boards

The Children Act 2004 requires every local authority to establish a LSBC by April 2006, so at the time of the questionnaire Boards had either been recently formed or were being introduced in the near future.

Although, LSCBs have responsibility for monitoring compliance with all safeguarding arrangements against the majority of respondents (89 of the 104) believed the proposals contained in the White Paper would make this more difficult, unless there was a clear statement on how this should be implemented.

Duty to co-operate

Section 10 of the Children Act 2004 creates 'a statutory framework for local co-operation between local authorities, key partner agencies ('relevant partners') and other relevant bodies ('other bodies or persons'), including the voluntary and community sector, in order to improve the well-being of children in the area. The duty to make these arrangements is placed on the local authority and a duty to co-operate with the local authority is placed on the relevant partners'. Schools were not placed under a duty to co-operate with other local agencies as the Government's view was that such a duty should apply only at the strategic level with the LEA. Respondents were asked if they thought schools have been placed under 'a duty to co-operate' within the Children Act, 2004. The majority of respondents (88 of the 104) believed that this should have been the case. A small number (n = 5) made the point that it had not been necessary, citing either the duty to co-operate imposed by the 1989 Children Act and / or that introduced by sections 157 and 175 of the 2002 Education Act. Even though many of those who thought schools should have been put under a duty to co-operate, agreed that a duty already existed. However, they would have liked to have seen it restated in the Children Act 2004 for two reasons. In the first place they were unsure how compliance would otherwise be secured, as illustrated by these comments:

The expectation is that the local authority can ensure that schools co-operate with other partners to promote the well being of children and young people. With increasing autonomy and freedom being given to schools and the local authority being the commissioner of services rather than the provider, there is little the local authority can do if the school refuses to co-operate.

The reason given that the duty exists under the Education Act 2002 is confusing. It would have been better to include this duty specifically in this piece of legislation rather than cross refer – especially if the White Paper is implemented re the proposed greater autonomy of schools.

The need for this might be said to be negated by duties under CA1989 and Ed Act 2002 (175/157), though the danger is that people may think that there isn't a duty and that schools are either exempt or different in some way.

But it was also felt that it would have emphasised that the *Every Child Matters* agenda applied to everyone and that it was imperative that schools worked with other agencies to achieve the intended outcomes.

Effectiveness of the system

In 2002, 114 of the 150 LEA officers with responsibility for child protection responded to a questionnaire (see Baginsky, 2003). Amongst other issues respondents were asked if, in their opinion, the present system for involving key agencies was working. Just over half thought it was, with the rest divided equally

between those who thought it partly worked, those who were not sure and those who believed it was not working. However when respondents were asked to express their opinion on whether, as a society, there was a system for protecting specific groups their responses were more cautious.

Their responses are reported in Table 4.

Table 4: Views on the system's ability to protect children (2002)

	Children of primary school age who are at risk of suffering significant harm	Children of primary school age who are in need	Children of secondary school age who are at risk of suffering significant harm	Children of secondary school age who are in need
Yes	88 (77%)	54 (47%)	78 (68%)	48 (42%)
No	16 (14%)	23 (21%)	18 (16%)	25 (22%)
Other	10 (9%)	37 (32%)	18 (16%)	41 (36%)
Total	114 (100%)	114 (100%)	114 (100%)	114 (100%)

* Includes those who expressed uncertainty, referred to there being too much variation and those who failed to respond to this question (10 per cent of respondents).

In this survey, conducted at the end of 2005, respondents were asked if they considered that the current changes meant that there was now a more effective system than in 2002 in relation to the same groups. The respondents were obviously not identical but the responses are still useful in indicating the strength of feeling in LEAs.

Table 5: Views on whether the ability of the reshaped system to protect children is more effective than the one that was in place in 2002

	Children of primary school age who are at risk of suffering significant harm	Children of primary school age who are in need	Children of secondary school age who are at risk of suffering significant harm	Children of secondary school age who are in need
Yes	56 (54%)	56 (54%)	41 (39%)	46 (44%)
No	22 (21%)	24 (23%)	26 (25%)	29 (28%)
Not sure	21 (20%)	18 (17%)	27 (26%)	22 (21%)
Yes with reservations	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	4 (4%)	4 (4%)
No with reservations	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)
No response	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Total	104 (100%)	104 (100%)	104 (100%)	104 (100%)

Over half of those responding to the survey believed that the system which was being put into place would be *more* effective in providing services for primary school aged children than the one in place in 2002.

The proportions fell in relation to secondary school pupils, with only around two-fifths having no reservations about improved effectiveness. Respondents not considering that the changes would establish a more effective system varied from 21 per cent in relation to primary children at risk through to 28 percent for secondary pupils in need; between a fifth and a quarter of respondents were not sure if the changes would improve effectiveness.

A fifth of respondents expanded on their response to this question. Whatever box they had ticked they believed that the legislation and guidance represented a positive development, by moving from a system which was based on recommendations to one that was more prescriptive. However there were concerns expressed that effectiveness would be threatened by three factors which were:

- a failure to provide an adequate level of resources
- staffing problems in key agencies
- the growing autonomy / diversity of schools.

Conclusions

The philosophy underpinning *Every Child Matters* is about outcomes for all children within an inclusive context. In theory a combination of raising the awareness of schools to their duties under Section 175, the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda and the Common Assessment Framework, the establishment of dedicated post(s) for child protection and safeguarding, combined with a closer working relationship at national and local level between key agencies should ensure the more effective protection of children. But this implementation has had to be achieved within a short time scale and clearly some authorities were still determining how their institutions and partnerships would be structured and many more were still finalising how they will plan and deliver the *Every Child Matters* agenda. The survey evidences the differential progress, as well as the diversity of approach, occurring across the country. Previous surveys of LEAs (Baginsky, 2000 and 2003) have highlighted the degree of variation in practice across the country. However the scale of the work involved in implementing and steering these changes, as well as in responding to the requirements of *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004), raises serious questions for those authorities without dedicated child protection and safeguarding posts.

As Ofsted inspections began to monitor LEA and school practice in relation to child protection LEAs had assumed a greater role in monitoring schools' practice, but even in 2002 the hallmark of the relationship between most LEAs and the majority of schools was support rather than inspection (Baginsky, 2003). This now seems to have changed in some authorities. Although *Safeguarding children in education* refers to LEAs' responsibilities to support schools it also imposes a monitoring role. Given the importance placed on inspections and accountability there is the possibility that an audit to identify gaps which need to be addressed could become a process in itself, especially where resources are not available to improve practice.

The debate about the role of LEAs has been going on since the 1988 *Education Reform Act* allowed some schools to 'opt out' of LEA 'control'. Although this particular initiative was reversed when New Labour came to power in 1997 the uncertainties around the role and responsibilities of LEAs continued. The White Paper, *Excellence in schools* (Department for Education and Employment, 1997) determined the role of LEAs as:

...not to control schools, but to challenge all schools to improve and support those which need help to raise standards'. (p.67)

The ever-increasing emphasis on school-led improvement gave LEAs a far narrower role and some even contemplated their demise (see Smithers, 2001). According to Tomlinson (2003) they survived because they became 'agents of central government policy' (p. 200). Where they were seen to fail private consortia replaced them. In October 2000, in *The Role of the local education authority in school education* (DfEE, 2000), the Government identified five areas, including strategic management and the welfare of pupils, where LEAs should have a key role. Nevertheless these contradictions continued, particularly in relation to how schools should be managed and the degree of autonomy that they should be granted, alongside a firm political commitment to raising educational standards. West and Ainscow (2003) refer to:

The apparent contradictions here between the notions of 'challenge', 'support' and 'need' are suggestive of a fundamental tension 'between autonomy and external intervention' [Audit Commission 1998, p.9]. (West and Ainscow, 2003, p1)

Commentators such as Chitty (2004) and Haydn (2004) both interpreted the increasing independence of schools as a portent of the demise of the notion of a comprehensive system and of accountability channelled through LEAs. Although services have been outsourced since the early 1990s this had now been taken to a new level with the spectre of a range of new education providers. These first appeared through City Academies and contracted services until the point now where privatised education provision is an accepted alternative within the public sector. Details on accountability remain unanswered despite statements that LEAs, and their successors, have a strategic role. The responsibilities defined in *Safeguarding children in education* (DfES, 2004) go beyond the strategic and involve operational support which many schools need and value (see Baginsky, forthcoming).

This lack of clarity around the future role of local authorities in relation to maintained schools has continued to confound the educational scene. The uncertainty that this has generated clearly underpinned many of the responses to the survey, as did the perceived conflict between the inclusion approach and the school standards agenda with the implied greater independence for individual schools.

The Education White Paper, *Higher standards, better schools for all* (DfES, 2005a), was clearly judged to have compounded this confusion. There are obvious tensions between its aims and those of the *Every Child Matters* agenda. The proposals for increased school autonomy raised questions for respondents about how they would be able both to commission the services needed to fulfil commitments to the *Every Child Matters* agenda and to challenge schools. Although the White Paper recognised that local

authorities play a key strategic role, respondents believed it glossed over too many issues around their capacity to secure schools' engagement, which, unless addressed, would threaten *ECM*. These included:

- the failure to emphasise the pivotal role which they play in *ECM* in securing services to meet local need
- paying insufficient attention to inclusivity
- the difficulty in reconciling the increasing autonomy given to schools with the need for schools to assume a full role in multi-agency work alongside other services and within the frameworks devised by the new Local Safeguarding Children Boards.

The DfES must address these apparently divergent approaches. Child protection and safeguarding are demanding activities. Bringing professional and agencies together is fraught with difficulties, not least what Parton (2001, p. 62) defines as their 'competing policy objectives'. The tensions that exist will be exacerbated if market forces gain increasing influence in education.

Respondents' views on whether the re-shaped system would be more effective at protecting children than the one that was in place in 2002 were divided. In addition to concerns about resources, many of their reservations arose out of the co-existence of conflicting policies, uncertainty about their own powers, and professional cultures and imperatives that did not always pull in the same direction. A *Community Care* poll of children's service staff (*Community Care*, 27 November 2005, p. 6) conducted a few months before this survey found that only two-fifths of respondents believed the reforms would make children safer. Potentially the *Every Child Matters* programme and the plans contained in the white paper, *Higher standards, better schools for all*, conflict. Despite the Government's vision of the strategic role which local authority education services will play, clarification is needed on how the operational role in relation to child protection and safeguarding will be implemented. This means making explicit the leverage which local authorities have to ensure the compliance of all schools, especially in view of the fact that the new framework for school inspection (Office for Standards in Education, 2005) does not examine how a school is co-operating with other agencies. Given the uncertainties expressed by respondents about the extent of their powers, as well as their concerns about the implications of schools not having been included in the duty to co-operate (Children Act, 2004), action is required. The DfES should consider issuing all schools, including Academies, foundation and independent schools, as well as Further Education institutions, with a specific directive to co-operate with local partners. It is not enough to rely on the vaguely worded statutory duty that is imposed by Sections 157 and 175. Clarification is required on the need for all maintained and independent schools and FE institutions to work in collaborative partnerships with other agencies and the mechanisms by which they are supported to do this.

Social services have long complained that schools have made inappropriate referrals to them, particularly involving cases of children *in need* (Baginsky, forthcoming). The system that is being put into place provides a framework that should ensure earlier intervention. This will only work if the services exist to respond to these needs. Children's Trusts will play a key role in planning and co-ordinating these arrangements and role of Local Safeguarding Children Boards will be to ensure the effectiveness of all

partners in safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in each local authority area. Those who responded to this survey identified the extent to which strong strategic partnerships and leadership across agencies had been in taking the *Every Child Matters* forward. But they also identified the challenges which they are facing. The most significant of these challenges were the level of need not then being matched by adequate funding, the pace of change and the difficulties involved in developing capacity to establish a preventative response.

Some commentators have feared that bringing education and children's social care together would not be the panacea which it claimed to be because of the political pressures on local education services:

Although education services are rapidly expanding into new and diverse areas which embrace children's welfare and the social exclusion agenda, educational attainment remains the overriding priority. An emphasis on the goal is not always compatible with the needs or protection of the individual child. (Stanley, 2003, p. 275)

Therein lies the heart of the problem. The strategic framework will not lead to any improvement unless agencies are clear about their remit and adequately resourced to deliver preventative services rather than forced to respond to crises.

References

- Department of Education and Employment (DfEE). (1995). *Protecting children from abuse: The role of the educational service (Circular 10/95)*. London: Department of Education and Employment.
- Baginsky, M. (2000). *Child protection and education*. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children
- Baginsky, M. (2003). *Responsibility without power? LEAs and child protection*. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.
- Baginsky, M. (2005). *Evaluation of the network of investigation and referral support co-ordinators*. London: DfES.
- Baginsky, M. (forthcoming). *Schools, social services and safeguarding children: past practice and future challenges*. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.
- Bichard, M. (2004) *The Bichard inquiry report*. London: The Stationery Office (TSO).
- Chitty, C. (2004). *Education policy in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE). (1997). *Excellence in schools (Cm 3681)*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE). 2000. *The role of the local education authority in school education*. London: Department for Education and Employment.
- Department of Education and Science (DES) (1988). *Working together for the protection of children from abuse: procedures within the education service (Circular 4/88)*. London: Department of Education and Science.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004). *Safeguarding children in education*. London: Department for Education and Skills.
www.teachernet.gov.uk/childprotection/guidance.htm

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2005a). *Higher standards, better schools for all - more choice for parents and pupils*. London: Department for Education and Skills.
<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/schoolswhitepaper/>

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2005b). *Guidance on dealing with allegations of abuse against teachers and other education staff*. Issued on 21 November 2005.
www.teachernet.gov.uk/childprotection

Halsey, K., Judkins, M., Atkinson, M. and Rudd, P. (2005). *New relationship with schools: evaluation of trial local authorities and schools* (DfES Research Report 689). London: DfES.

Haydn, T. (2004). The strange death of the comprehensive school in England and Wales, 1965-2002. *Research Papers in Education*, 19, 4, 415 - 432.

Office for Standards in Education [Ofsted]. (2005). *Every child matters: framework for the inspection of schools in England from September 2005*. London : Ofsted

Parton, N. (2001). Risk and professional judgement. In L-A. Cull and J. Roche *The law and social work: contemporary issues for practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Smithers, A. (2001). Education policy. In A. Seldon (ed.) *The Blair effect*. London: Little Brown.

Stanley, N. (2003) Initial responses to the Green Paper. *Child Abuse Review*, 12, 5, 274-278.

Tomlinson, S. (2003). New Labour and education. *Children and Society*, 17, 195-204.

West, M. and Ainscow, M. (2003). An evaluation of the early stages of a mentoring scheme for Chief Education Officers in England. *Paper presented at the International Congress on School Effectiveness and School Improvement, Sydney, Australia, January 2003*.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

1) Name of Authority

.....

2a) Have education (LEA) services been brought into a wider Children's Service Department in your authority?

YES / NO

If YES please provide date this happened and any further details. (If you wish to attach a structure chart please do so.)

.....
.....
.....
.....

If NO please provide any date when this will happen or details of other arrangement

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2b) Does a Children's Trust operate in your area?

YES / NO

If **YES** please provide:

i) Brief details of the arrangement

.....
.....

ii) Is the Children's Trust taking an operational role in relation to services to schools?

.....
.....

If **NO** is this planned?

.....
.....

3a) What post carries the lead role in your 'LEA' / education services for child protection* in your authority?

* as defined in *Safeguarding Children in Education*, DfES 2004

.....

3b) Do you have a separate post for 'safeguarding' in your authority?

YES / NO

If **YES** please give details

.....

3c) Are these full time, dedicated posts?

Child protection

YES / NO

Safeguarding

YES / NO

3d) Has your job title changed since September 2004*?

YES / NO

If YES please give the original job title:

.....

(* If you came into post after September 2004 please respond re. the 'post' rather than individual circumstances)

3e) Have your responsibilities changed since September 2004?

YES / NO

If YES Have the responsibilities expanded or contracted since September 2004?

Expanded Contracted

If they have expanded please indicate what is now included that was not previously:

.....

.....

.....

If they have contracted please indicate:

i) What is not now included that was previously:

.....

.....

.....

ii) Who is now responsible for these duties:

.....

4a) What, if anything, do you consider has assisted the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda in your authority?

1.

2.

3.

4b) What, if anything, do you consider to be the major challenges to the implementation of the *Every Child Matters* agenda in your authority?

1.

2.

3.

5a) How is the LEA /local education services represented on the ACPC?

.....
.....

5b) Will this change when the Local Safeguarding Children Board is launched?

.....
.....

6) How is the LEA / CSD responding to the responsibilities defined in *Safeguarding children in education* [DfES, September 2004] in relation to:

a) **Strategic responsibilities** to:

i) Plan, co-ordinate delivery and allocate resources in partnership with other agencies?

.....

.....

b) **Support responsibilities** to:

i) Ensure the awareness of maintained schools in relation to their responsibilities 'for child protection'?

.....

.....

ii) Monitor performance of schools?

.....

.....

iii) To make available:

⇒ appropriate training for designated persons?

⇒ appropriate training for all staff in maintained schools?

⇒ model policies and procedures?

⇒ facilitating links and co-operation with other agencies?

Do you extend any of the services above to:

- Independent schools?

YES / NO

Comment

.....
.....

- Academies?

YES / NO / Not applicable

Comment

.....
.....

- Further Education colleges

YES / NO

Comment

.....
.....

c) **Operational responsibilities** in relation to:

⇒ safe recruitment procedures?

.....

⇒ arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children:

.....

i) not allocated a school place?

.....

ii) excluded from school?

.....

iii) dealing with allegations of abuse against members of staff and volunteers?

.....

iv) ensuring any of the authority's staff working with children receive child protection training?

.....

Do you extend any of the services to:

- Independent schools?

YES / NO

Comment

.....
.....

- Academies?

YES / NO / Not applicable

Comment

.....
.....

- Further Education colleges?

YES / NO

Comment

.....
.....

7) Do you think the document *Safeguarding children in education* [DfES, 2004] is appropriate to the arrangements which are now in place and those being introduced?

YES / NO

Please explain your answer if you wish to do so.....

.....

.....

8) If the proposals for greater school autonomy outlined in the White Paper *Higher standards, better schools for all* [DfES, October 2005] are accepted what, if any, do you think the implications will be for:

a) Children's Service Departments?

.....

.....

b) Local Safeguarding Children's Boards?

.....

.....

9. In your opinion, should schools have been placed under 'a duty to co-operate' within the Children Act, 2004?

YES / NO

Please explain your answer if you wish to do so.....

.....

.....

10. In your opinion, will the current changes mean we have a more effective system than in 2002 in relation to:

- a) children of primary school age who are 'at risk'? **YES / NO**
- b) children of primary school age who are 'in need'? **YES / NO**
- c) children of secondary school age who are 'at risk'? **YES / NO**
- d) children of secondary school age who are 'in need'? **YES / NO**

Please provide any additional comments you may wish to add on the authority's ability to safeguard children.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

PLEASE RETURN BY 9 JANUARY 2006 TO baginsky@gmail.com or:

**Mary Baginsky
Senior Research Officer
NSPCC – Research
Weston House
42 Curtain Road
LONDON EC2A 3NH**

(Please mark as CONFIDENTIAL)