

Schools, Social Services and Safeguarding Children

Past practice and future challenges

Executive Summary

December 2007

Mary Baginsky

Executive Summary

Introduction

This research study deals with the respective roles of, and collaboration between, schools and local authorities in protecting and safeguarding children. It follows on from an earlier report by the same author that explored how schools and local education authorities (LEAs) were approaching the area of child protection, and how well teachers were trained to prepare them for this work. (Baginsky, 2000). In that report some critical issues were highlighted which directly affected the ability of schools to safeguard vulnerable children. Designated child protection teachers interviewed for the study expressed concerns both about the extent to which all school staff understood their responsibilities and about the effectiveness of communication between their schools and social services departments¹. Although policy guidance such as *Working Together under the Children Act 1989* (Home Office et al., 1991) emphasized improved collaboration as the very key to improving outcomes for vulnerable children, schools and other agencies have sometimes struggled to put this into practice. While the Children Act 1989 had been intended to create a sense of collective responsibility in the hope that schools, with other agencies, would increase their assistance to local authorities, it was being implemented at a time when the power of LEAs was being reduced and schools could break free of their relationship with the local authority. Ofsted reports on LEAs carried out in 2000 found that at the strategic level, collaboration between education and social services departments was generally good, but liaison between schools and social services was poor. The distinct role that teachers were expected to play had somewhere been lost in translation.

¹ The term social services department is used throughout this summary, as the study precedes the establishment of children's service departments.

The research presented in this report investigates more closely the role of schools in the child protection process through an examination of the decision making processes that come into play when a child welfare concern prompts the decision to contact social services. It took place between 2000 and 2005, during which time Lord Laming's Inquiry into the death of Victoria Climbié prompted momentous developments and new legislation affecting all agencies, such as section 175 of the Education Act 2002, the governments' emerging Every Child Matters (ECM) programme and the Children Act 2004. This presented significant challenges to schools and social services that are still faced today. This study contributes to an understanding of how schools are positioned to assume their role with the ECM programme and identifies the support they need to carry it out effectively. The themes for policy and practice identified in this research are as relevant in the present context for education and social services as they were at the time the research was conducted.

Research methodology

The specific aims of the study were to identify the factors that encourage effective communication and those which impede it, by examining the decision making processes involved in child referrals; and then to make recommendations for more effective practice in schools, LEAs and social service departments.

The research examined two principal questions, from the school's perspective:

- How are child protection concerns addressed and what judgements lead to a referral?
- What happens when a school makes a child protection referral?

The approach combined qualitative and quantitative elements, using both interview and survey data. The design was inspired by 'tracking' techniques, and included both semi-structured interviews and direct observation. It did not include archival or case analysis.

The fieldwork involved on-going contact with 43 schools (24 mainstream primary; 13 mainstream secondary; two nursery; four special) spread across three randomly selected authorities (one shire; two cities) over a period of one year, as well as a visit each half-

term. This was carried out between 2000 and 2002. In the autumn term of 2004 and spring term of 2005 the fieldwork was repeated, with return visits carried out to the majority of the schools.

The main contact with each of the 43 schools was the teacher with designated responsibility for child protection. Once a school had passed on the name of a child for whom they had made a referral, the researcher would contact the named social worker.

Interviews were also conducted with senior managers, lead officers in the LEA and Social Service Departments, and Education Welfare Officers (EWOs) in order to examine the structures, policies and procedures in place; to explore their views on how well they considered these operated and to invite their wider comments and reflections on how relationships with other agencies were working. Information was also extracted from heads of year meetings, inter-agency fora and training courses.

A survey of all schools in the three authorities was conducted in 2002 and 2005 which allowed similar issues to be explored with a larger number of respondents. This survey data provided a useful backdrop to either corroborate or contradict the qualitative data from the interviews, and provided valuable additional insights.

The three local authorities were given pseudonyms in the study to ensure anonymity: Moleshire is a large county council in the south of England; Riversdale and Valesdown are both cities in the north of England.

Key research findings from interviews

The factors that emerged as the major obstacles to effective communication and to achieving satisfactory outcomes for children can be summarised as follows:

- The distinction between a child in need of support and a child in need of protection was unclear and often applied inconsistently both between schools and between agencies

- The threshold for intervention was more often than not subjectively determined, often driven by personal interpretations and availability of resources.
- There was much uncertainty about the level of evidence required.
- There were no clear guidelines for teachers in dealing with parents of children in need, especially parents who refuse support.
- Schools were unclear about their accountability once other professionals such as a school counsellor were involved.
- Increasing use of call centres by social service departments hampered access to properly qualified social workers in the first instance, and caused a sense of alienation.
- There was a lack of clarity surrounding the role of Education Welfare Officers, who were increasingly encouraged to concentrate on issues around attendance and truancy.
- The level of need identified by schools often exceeded the ability of social service departments to meet the demand for support.

Referring cases to social services: decisions, dilemmas and confusion

There was considerable variation between and within the schools in their willingness to report concerns. This was influenced by several factors including the relationship with parents, uncertainty about the level of evidence required, and the approach of the head teacher, principal or designated teacher. Thresholds were set locally and often driven by available resources. The level of understanding of significant harm by all concerned influenced the handling of referrals and this became a key determinant of the responses made. The increasing use of call centres by the social services departments to whom the schools referred was a significant barrier and, according to the schools, frequently caused delay and frustration.

Even when personal contact was established schools described a poor response to referrals, describing a lack of urgency and sometimes no follow-up or feedback. Teachers described how they needed an opportunity for consultation and to feel listened to; they felt there was a lack of respect for their views. On the other hand, some social workers described how they felt that teachers had a lack of understanding of significant

guidance such as *Working Together* or the *Assessment Framework* and some interpreted this as displaying poor judgement. These social workers then felt that teachers either over or under-reacted to referrals and that their timing and interpretation of information was inadequate. Whilst it is important to stress that only a minority of social workers expressed these views and no child appeared to have been put at risk, the reactions on both sides were negative and in practice would have the potential to influence a critical judgement.

The level of frustration and tension described by both professions was high and there was a sense amongst teachers that referrals from schools were the least likely to receive a response. This is in keeping with similar studies conducted on both sides of the Atlantic. It was evident that thresholds for intervention operated by social workers in the three areas were not clear to other agencies. There was a tension both between defining problems as child protection or as children in need and how local agencies interpreted this information. Within schools there was an interplay between how concerns were defined, the type of abuse and potential effect on the child, the institutional response and the experience of individual teachers. This contributed to a lack of consistency across schools and within the social services departments handling the referrals.

Children in need of support: unmet expectations

Teachers expressed uncertainty about the correct route to take when they had concerns about pupils, especially when they appeared to be about children in need. The line between children in need of support and those in need of protection is not clearly defined in the Children Act (1989) or in guidance; it is more of a continuum, which requires careful assessment and the application of judgement. Teachers expected social workers to carry this expertise, but in practice the responses of social workers within and across the three areas varied considerably.

Neglect and emotional abuse posed particular problems for teachers in identifying the point at which to refer, centred on the question of what level of inadequate parenting should be tolerated. Mental health concerns about children and young people that did not receive a response from educational or health support services were also a problem. Drug misuse and prostitution involving adolescents which the school identified as a

serious problem did not always fit the reporting criteria or local thresholds. Parental drug and alcohol dependency were also difficult for schools in situations where removal of a child or children was not considered appropriate, yet local support was either not available or schools were not aware of what, if anything, was being provided to or accepted by parents. Sexualised behaviour by children was another area that teachers found difficult, particularly if it had been defined by social services as a 'parenting issue' and teachers were unsure where to go next for advice and help. Similarly, guidance defines domestic violence as abuse that should be referred to social services, yet according to schools, there was little support for them when they did so. The result in all these examples was that schools felt they had to wait until problems had escalated to serious levels before a referral was accepted.

Schools were often the first to identify problems and refer to social services in order to prevent situations deteriorating further. But based on their experience of child referral processes, they were inclined to define these concerns as child protection rather than child in need, to get a more effective response. In turn, because of the pressures on social services these may well be the referrals which did not receive a response, which meant that a referral only received attention when it became acute. In one part of one authority however, there was a commonly agreed local definition of children in need that was understood by all agencies involved and as a result more informal family support meetings were held to consider early intervention. This appeared to work well but required a high level of communication, a collaborative approach and shared understanding of thresholds and local services.

Teachers and parents: balancing support and surveillance

The study revealed confusion among teachers with respect to their role and expectations in relation to parents when there are concerns about their children. Their understanding was based in some cases on training received and/or their understanding of *Working Together to Safeguard Children* (Department of Health et al, 1999), but many teachers lacked confidence about whether and when to approach parents, who should do so and how. Even those who had received training on confidentiality and consent had not been trained on how to deal with parents. Many teachers carried a fear of violence or threats to

themselves and possible repercussions for the children, as well as concerns over potentially interfering with the evidence around a child protection enquiry. They were also anxious about how to continue to support children when parents refused any help offered.

Education Welfare Services: remodelled, outmoded or part of the solution?

Despite child protection matters being listed as a duty of EWOs, their main focus became school attendance. Ofsted appeared to be primarily interested in attendance figures. This emphasis was reflected in all the authorities in the study. The level of experience, knowledge and training of EWOs in child protection had fallen considerably in two of the authorities studied, but their new role and focus had not been explained to teaching staff with resulting confusion and informal arrangements.

On the other hand, the observation of some very experienced EWOs who were interviewed was that schools were increasingly reluctant to refer some cases to social services for fear of the consequences. They recognised that the reduction in their previous function of providing advice and consultation had contributed to this lack of confidence amongst teaching staff. The situation in Moleshire, where there were posts of Child Protection Welfare Officers (CPEWOs), was reported to have been better in recent years and it was clear that the support and advice provided by these posts was valued. However these post holders covered a large geographic area and when a post was empty, for whatever reason, schools were left feeling very unsupported.

Communication: sharing information and confidentiality

Central to the Every Child Matters programme is an expectation of information sharing. Even before the first guidance emerged following the Climbié inquiry, agencies were aware that this was a recurring theme in other inquiries and an area that must improve. The primary schools in this study identified few problems in this area, but some secondary schools found it more difficult to coordinate information, particularly if counsellors or pastoral staff were involved with a child. The role of a counsellor could be compromised depending on the assurance of confidentiality that had been given. Most counsellors in the study were clear about procedures relating to child protection concerns but not all had regular contact with the designated teacher. In one school the designated

teacher expressed concern about the school's accountability should the counsellor choose not to refer on, even if it was at the student's request.

Communication between and within schools and agencies revealed difficulties. There was confusion in some schools about the 'need to know' principle. One example was of a student who was a Schedule 1 offender² who had almost been given a work experience placement in an early years setting. Difficulty in communication between schools and social service departments was experienced with families who moved frequently. An example was given where information about a father who 'posed a risk to children' and who regularly collected his child in the playground after school was withheld. Transfer of cases was also identified as a crucial time for passing on such information.

On the whole schools were well represented at conferences across the three authorities. However, the practical difficulties identified included notifications received during holidays, parking, cost of supply cover and uncertainty about who should attend. In most cases the designated teacher – often the head or deputy head teacher – attended, but in one authority learning mentors were encouraged to attend. In another area this was not acceptable to social service staff who felt that only a designated teachers, with the mandate to take and implement decisions, should attend. The experience of many teaching staff in this study who attended CPCs was that they found them daunting and they felt apprehensive, nervous and occasionally intimidated. They were not clear about what was expected of them and found the attendance of parents difficult. There were some accounts by teachers of good conferences, the definition of which seemed to depend upon the experience and skills of the conference chair.

Effective communication is as much a mindset as a response to protocols. Other research studies have found that co-location of services is no guarantee of communication and the early experiences of Moleshire, the one authority that had merged children's social care and education by the start of the study, would echo this, especially when decisions made by social services are dominated by rules, procedures and protocols rather than by judgements, which depend on information sharing and the building and maintaining of good local relationships.

² The term 'risk to children' has now been adopted to describe those individuals who pose a risk to children (Local Authority Social Services Letter LASSL 2005)

Key influences

Several themes emerged in determining the key influences on the way that relationships were conducted and information shared. A recruitment crisis in many social services departments and resulting difficulty in recruiting experienced child protection staff led to a reliance on unsuitably qualified staff who had little knowledge of legislation and guidance. This had led to a breakdown in personal relationships and little consistency in practice. There was a strong message from all interviewed that experienced staff and a relatively stable workforce are vital to good inter-agency communications.

The impression among the schools involved in the study was that inexperienced social services staff were managing unacceptably high levels of risk and limited resources were being stretched too far. In addition it appeared from the social work staff interviewed that less time was being given to supervision, which had become more about case management than about reflective practice. Supervision of teaching staff who became involved in child protection referrals was, however, non-existent and not even under discussion or consideration.

The authorities in the study were undergoing organisational restructuring, either triggered by a poor Social Services Inspection (SSI) or by changes in senior management. The impact on continuity and the relationships built up over time within the child protection network was often overlooked. Where authorities had merged, the emphasis had been on the detail of restructuring rather than any operational considerations. Those who were interviewed in the first survey noted no discernible improvements in the process, though it may have been too soon to tell. However the **second survey** of schools (reported separately) showed that in Riversdale, which had been subject to the highest level of reorganisation and shuffle in social services, there were indications that the latest arrangements were well regarded by schools and seen to be providing a much improved service.

Appointing designated teachers in schools was one of the most significant developments in the child protection process, intended to improve liaison with social services. However, time is a significant factor for staff struggling with competing priorities and the demands of the timetable – hence the latest guidance allows for non-teaching staff, albeit

those holding senior management positions, to be the designated person. The study showed that involving pastoral, learning mentor staff or heads of year tended to confuse the process and was not effective, so it would seem the directive that (at least one of) the designated person(s) should be drawn from senior management was well-founded.

Research findings from a survey of all maintained schools

The results of the surveys, carried out in 2002 and 2005 across the three authorities, should be put in the context of significant developments that occurred during that time: section 175 of the Education Act 2002, the Children Act 2004 and the Every Child Matters programme of change. There was also an important organisational difference between the local authorities. Moleshire, a large county council, had already brought together education and children's social services by 2000, whereas the other two authorities, Riversdale and Valesdown, both cities, had only just done so by the time the survey was repeated in 2005.

The response rate in the three authorities was high for a survey such as this, although the 2005 survey elicited a lower response across all three authorities in 2005. The overlap of schools responding within each authority in both years was significant however, ranging between 81 and 92 per cent, although staff changes meant that the respondent was not necessarily the same person.

Designated teachers, governors and child protection policies

In 2002, the vast majority of schools had child protection policies in place, and by 2005 only a tiny proportion (two per cent in Valesdown) did not have one. However, one main difference between the three authorities was the incidence of head teachers also acting as designated child protection teacher in primary schools: just over half in both Valesdown and Riverdale, compared to 92 per cent in Moleshire. The other main difference was in the proportion of schools that had appointed a second designated teacher: nearly half of both primary and secondary schools in Valesdown; about 20 per cent of primary and nearly half of secondary schools in Moleshire; but only 14 per cent of primary schools and 8 per cent of secondary schools in Riversdale. Fewer than ten per cent of schools in

Moleshire and Valesdown had a third designated teacher; none of the Riversdale schools had. Across the three authorities, secondary schools usually assigned the task to the deputy / assistant head. By 2005 in all three authorities the proportion of schools with more than one designated teacher had increased: in Valesdown three quarters of secondary schools had appointed a second designated teacher.

The time and resources spent on child in need issues were not evenly distributed, but some respondents estimated it took up between 10 and 20 per cent of the designated teacher's time, in addition to their regular teaching and management responsibilities.

Ninety percent of Valesdown's schools had appointed a governor with responsibility for child protection in 2002, rising to 94 percent by 2005. Riversdale saw the number increase from 79 percent to 98 percent and Moleshire from 74 percent to 77 percent.

Child protection conferences

The proportion of schools responding that they were always able to have representation at child protection conferences was over 90 per cent in both 2002 and 2005 across all three authorities, with only a minority of primary schools in Valesdown finding it difficult to attend. Funding for supply cover was often limited however, and finding suitable cover within the tight timescales quite a problem. Nevertheless, all respondents recognised the worth of such conferences in gaining insight into a child's background, although some felt that their contributions were not always valued. A significant proportion (just under half) said they received inadequate notice of the conferences, and that deadlines for reports to be provided were tight, though most did manage to meet them. The single most difficult issue for one quarter of respondents in 2002, rising to over one-third by 2005, was facing the parents at these conferences. Fears of assaults, threats, or the sense that the relationship with parents had been compromised were commonly expressed, as was the wish for training in this area.

Working with social workers

In 2002 around half of all respondents Moleshire and Riversdale felt that the relationship with social workers was generally in need of improvement although the percentage was slightly lower in Valesdown (43 per cent). By 2005 this proportion had risen in all three

authorities (70 per cent in Moleshire; 54 per cent in Riversdale and 55 per cent in Valesdown). The respondents who still felt the relationship was excellent or good in 2005 (24 per cent in Moleshire; 35 per cent in Riversdale; 41 per cent in Valesdown - all lower than in 2002) based their judgement on the contact they had had with individual social workers. The major problems identified in both years focused on the poor communication between the two agencies, slow reaction by social services to concerns raised by schools, the pressures on social workers caused by under-staffing and high caseloads and the failure and reluctance of social workers to share information with schools. However in Moleshire and Riversdale fewer schools reported a failure to share information as a problematic issue.

Respondents were asked what, if anything, had been done by schools, local education authorities and social services to make the interface between them more effective. In Moleshire, in both 2002 and 2005 most responses referred to training together, and participating in conferences or core groups. Although a few referenced team-based, multi-professional groups and multi-agency meetings with other professionals the merger of education and children's social services at authority level did not appear to have made a significant impact on schools' responses. Similar issues were raised in the responses from Riversdale and Valesdown but their tone was more positive and they cited specific actions that had been taken to improve communication, such as offering facilities for meetings and making themselves more available for meetings and / or training.

Access to advice and support

In both 2002 and 2005 the proportion of schools in Valestown and Moleshire saying they had someone to turn to for advice stayed the same at around 90 per cent. A noticeable improvement in Riversdale from 77 to 97 per cent reflected the improvements which had been achieved there between those years.

Across the three authorities two valuable sources of support were rated highly in both years of the study. One was the advice and input from the local education authority in Riversdale and Valesdown and the children's services department in Moleshire. The other was the standard of training received. In Moleshire the role of the CPEWO was particularly valued. Opportunities for local inter-agency meetings or term twilight

meetings were other factors which were perceived to make a big contribution to multi-agency working.

Effectiveness of system to protect

The proportion of respondents agreeing that there was an effective system in place to protect primary children at risk increased between 2002 and 2005 in Riversdale (from 64 to 74 per cent), stayed constant in Valestown (68 per cent) and dropped slightly in Moleshire (58 to 54 per cent). However, there were lower levels of agreement when it concerned secondary children at risk and primary school children 'in need' and the least agreement when considering the effectiveness of the system for supporting secondary school children 'in need'.

Of the two-thirds of respondents who made at least one child protection referral in the preceding year, only a quarter to a third were happy with the outcome, which showed no improvement between 2002 and 2005.

Merging of children's service departments

Moleshire had brought their services together in 2001. In 2002 when questioned, the majority of schools said it was too soon to say if the new arrangement would be beneficial in protecting children. By 2005, although a quarter thought it had, 63 per cent of respondents thought not. It was felt that schools were not considered to be full partners and that an inadequate infrastructure compromised effective inter-agency practice. Some thought that child protection provision had deteriorated to a dangerous level and was undermined by factors such as shortages of social work staff, influx of overseas staff and, again, poor communication. By 2005, when questioned in this survey about prospects for improvement, four-fifths of schools in Riversdale and Valesdown thought it would, but 46 per cent of schools in Moleshire thought not.

Training experiences

Generally there was a perception amongst teachers who had received training that the quality was high but that the quantity and regularity of training had fallen during the period of the research. They also felt that social work trainers lacked an understanding of how schools operated.

Schools' awareness of both *Working Together to Safeguard Children* (Department of Health et al., 1999) and the *Assessment Framework* (Department of Health et al., 2000) was highest in Valesdown, but considerably lower in the other two authorities. The relatively low level of awareness reflects the proportion of schools that had received any training about their contents and implementation. There was a greater level of awareness about Section 175 responsibilities and of *Safeguarding Children in Education* (DfES 2004). This gap in awareness and understanding would pose real problems should teachers be required to contribute to an assessment or gain a thorough understanding of the multi-agency context of child protection. It was also found that there was little understanding amongst teachers of the language and meaning of the Every Child Matters (ECM) vocabulary, such as 'partnership', 'integration', 'collaboration' and co-operation.'

In addition, child protection or other associated courses were often only offered to new staff. It was felt that refresher courses should be available to designated teachers. Training for the whole school was also considered to be important in order to increase confidence and ensure consistency across all staff, not just for the designated teachers³. It was felt that the multi-agency training should address professional values and culture as well as the knowledge and skills base and that the trainers should represent both professions. Social services trainers however, complained that although courses were over-subscribed, invariably teachers did not attend due to timetable demands and staff shortages.

³ This issue has, in part, been addressed in *Safeguarding Children and Safer Recruitment in Education* (DfES, 2006)

Training implications

As a result of this study, the specific training needs identified can be summarised as follows:

- Recognising and responding to concerns, including sexual abuse and grooming in particular.
- Identifying neglect and emotional abuse, together with gaining understanding about thresholds.
- Understanding consent, confidentiality and information sharing.
- Working with parents in child protection.
- Communicating with children and avoiding leading questions in interviews.
- Participating in child protection conferences.
- Conducting safe recruitment.

The methods for delivery preferred by staff included the opportunity to discuss hypothetical - but realistic – situations; involvement in role plays (for example dealing with difficult parents); and working in small groups with plenty of opportunity for discussion and sharing views.

Policy and practice implications

Themes that have implications for both national and local policy and practice emerged as follows:

- Referral thresholds need to be locally defined and understood by all the professional agencies involved in child welfare concerns, especially around neglect, emotional abuse and specific parental problems.
- The difficulties in gaining an effective response to a referral must be addressed.

- The tension between making judgements of referrals as being about either ‘child protection’ or ‘child in need’ must be resolved within the local professional network as a whole, but also addressed by government departments.
- The ECM programme must be properly resourced and staffed. There is an urgent need to address the local work capacity problem of social workers, as well as their level of experience and skill.
- The balance between maintaining families and protecting the welfare of children needs to be clarified and understood locally by all those engaged in these decisions.
- Communication between teachers and social workers must be improved to address common perceptions and misunderstanding of each other’s roles. This can only happen with a willingness and mindset to address it, as well as by adopting practical local strategies. It also needs to be addressed at a senior management level.
- There is a need for inter-agency collaboration in order to share knowledge, experience and skills before making professional judgements.
- There should be greater clarity about schools’ accountability arising from section 175 of the Education Act 2002 regarding information sharing and consent.
- Meeting the costs of supply cover to enable teachers to attend CPCs should be considered as part of the annual planning and resource strategy, especially now that most authorities are merged.
- Greater clarity and dialogue should take place within schools about the changed role of EWOs to ensure that they are involved in child protection matters when appropriate.

Conclusion

The complexity of the task of protecting children and responding to their needs preclude a neat solution. However the imbalance of power and lack of understanding between education and social services that emerged from this research study is a barrier to closer working and ultimately to improved interventions and outcomes for children. Too great a focus on structures and protocols and not enough emphasis on the process of implementation and operational decision-making renders the task more difficult than need be. All parties involved in this research wanted their authority to be more proactive in

working with schools and children's service departments to resolve problems – the ECM rhetoric is not enough.

Recommendations

The fact that the work reported took place before and during a most significant reorganisation of children's services, the philosophy of which focuses on the need to deliver integrated services and address some of the deficits which the report identifies, does not invalidate the need to learn from the findings. Despite some of the negative findings there were encouraging pockets of collaboration and innovation that could be built upon. In addition simple local steps and initiatives could address many of the difficulties.

The key messages were the need for clearer, more consistent definitions, for better understanding, and for facilitating communication and collaboration across supported by agencies working with children, young people and families. Arrangements are being put in place to allow agencies to share information and take vital steps which should allow earlier and more effective intervention. But there are obvious steps which need to go alongside this to safeguard and protect children and young people by making sure that professionals working with them trust each other and understand each other's remit. Each area will need to find the solution which works for the prevailing conditions and challenges but certain steps will support and embed an integrated approach. These should include:

- Opportunities to bring together those working in children's service departments to discuss how to improve practice and understanding, as well as examine challenges and differences which emerge
- Arrangements by which different professionals are able to observe and shadow each other at work
- Provision of mentoring and supervision for all staff working with vulnerable and at risk children and young people

- Accessible information on services to which schools and other agencies are able to refer, alongside information on how this should be done and the action that needs to be taken in an emergency
- Named individuals in all agencies who would act as the first point of contact for other professionals
- Arrangements for continued training and professional development.

References

Baginsky, M. (2000). *Child Protection and Education*. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004) *Safeguarding Children in Education*. DfES-0027-2004. London: DfES.

Department of Health, Department for Education and Employment and Home Office (DoH, DfEE and HO) (2000). *Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and their Families*. London: Stationery Office.

Department of Health (DoH), Home Office and Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1999) *Working together to safeguard children: a guide to interagency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*. London: Stationery Office.

Home Office, Department of Health, Department of Education and Science and Welsh Office (1991). *Working together under the Children Act 1989: a guide to arrangements for interagency co-operation for the protection of children from abuse*. London: HMSO.

Weston House
42 Curtain Road
London EC2A 3NH
Tel: 020 7825 2500
www.nspcc.org.uk/inform

The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) has a vision – a society where all children are loved, valued and able to fulfil their potential.

Our mission is to end cruelty to children.

The NSPCC is the UK's leading charity specialising in child protection and the prevention of cruelty to children. For over 100 years it has been protecting children from cruelty and is the only children's charity with statutory powers, enabling it to act to safeguard children at risk.

© NSPCC 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

First published 2007 by the NSPCC.

Registered charity numbers 216401 and SC037717