Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Safeguarding Children Learning

Quality Assurance Process for Single-Agency Safeguarding Children Learning

April 2014

Contents:	Page Number
Appendix	

Details of Professionals / Groups involved in the Quality Assurance Process

'Commissioning Group': Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Safeguarding Multi agency Training, Learning and Development Commissioning & Delivery Group.

LSCB Project Development Officer: Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Training Project Development Officer.

Multi Agency Project Coordinator: Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Multi Agency Project Coordinator.

SEG: LSCB Safeguarding Effectiveness Group: responsibility for the scrutiny and evaluation of the effectiveness of safeguarding learning.

LSCB Policy Officer: LSCB Policy officer with responsibility for SEG activity.

Provider: the provider / organiser of the of the safeguarding learning event

Delegate: member of children's workforce attending the learning event.

'The Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Learning, Development & Training Strategy and associated documents are the intellectual property of Leicestershire & Rutland and Leicester City Safeguarding Boards, and cannot be used without expressed permission of those LSCB's and must not be reproduced or used for commercial or financial gain.'

Context:

This paper outlines the process of Quality Assurance for single agency safeguarding learning.

Responsibility to quality assure multi agency training is a requirement of Regulation 5 (1) (c) of the Local Children Safeguarding Boards Regulations 2006.[1]

To fulfill this statutory function the LSCB as a minimum should;
'Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of training, including multi agency training, to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.' (Working Together 2013)[2]

There are a varied range of training activities across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. Much of this learning is single agency and organised by individual organisations.

The LSCB SEG officer will liaise with the provider of these other events to organise the gathering of information to support the quality assurance work.

Quality assurance activity will be undertaken by the LSCB, and report to LSCB Safeguarding Effectiveness Group (SEG) **This work will be the responsibility of the SEG policy officers.**

This work will also be supported by the LSCB Training Project Development Officer.

Central to Quality Assurance activity is effectiveness of safeguarding learning, and how this in turn impacts on outcomes for children and young people.
The Quality Assurance process will support and provide evidence for a range of inspection frameworks (i.e Ofsted inspection framework, CQC etc).

---

[1] http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/90/regulation/5/made
[2] http://www.workingtogetheronline.co.uk/index.html

Principles for Quality Assurance Work:

- The work of the Training Project Development Officer will support the SEG activity; however Quality Assurance is primarily the responsibility of LSCB SEG officer and SEG.

- The SEG activity of 'Quality Assurance' and assessing the effectiveness of safeguarding learning will be undertaken in partnership between Leicester City and Leicestershire & Rutland Safeguarding Boards. The SEG policy officers for both Boards will liaise with respective SEG's in order to seek agreement and agree roles and responsibility for undertaking the Quality Assurance work.

- The Quality Assurance work will be underpinned by a locally adapted 4 stage evaluation model – base on the Kirkpatrick model.[3] (Appendix 1)

- There are a range of locally endorsed documents that support 'Best Practice' in safeguarding learning that provide guidance on the minimum standards for best practice in safeguarding training; (Best Practice Guidance, Competency Framework, Training Strategy, LLR Golden Threads) These documents and standards will be considered in the quality assurance activity.

- It is acknowledged that SEG quality assurance activity may mean that a small number of courses and delegates will be subject to 2 evaluation processes; where possible, the methods and approaches used, will strive to minimise duplication and be as efficient as possible to try and maximise efficiency, and minimise the impact on the delegate involved in the process.

- The selection of the courses to be audited will reflect themes and priorities to be determined by SEG.

- A pragmatic approach will be taken, which will allow flexibility for SEG to adapt the process to look at a variety of different methods to gather evidence for the quality assurance work.

- There is potential for using systems such as online surveys (i.e. SNAP / Survey Monkey) to gather information in a way which is timely, engaging and has an infrastructure to support the processing and administration of this task.

- Other methods will be used in the process to gain evidence for quality assurance, (in particular to gain more qualitative data): for example: surveys, bespoke evaluation forms, telephone interviews, direct interviews, group work, meeting with delegates, interviews with peers / managers, service users, evidence from case files etc, to assess the effectiveness of the training event and impact on practice.

- The LSCB SEG officers will report to SEG on the effectiveness of safeguarding learning on a quarterly basis. The SEG officers will contribute a regular update on effectiveness of all safeguarding training to be included in the LLR Multi agency quarterly report that is prepared by the MA training co-ordinator.

---

[3] Donald Kirkpatrick: 4 Level model for training course evaluation

LSCB LLR SEG QA Single Agency Training VERSION 5 FINAL – Updated 14.02.14

Appendix 1: LLR SEG 4 Steps Evaluation Model

Step 1
- **Objective questions that are closely related to the course objectives**
- **Conduct pre-test on identified area / theme for assurance.**

Step 2
- **Conduct post-test on identified area and compare the results**
- **Objective questions that are closely related to the course objectives**
- **Test the reaction of the delegate after the learning / immediate feedback (however feedback may be subjective)**
- **Advantage: allows us to determine if the training actually 'delivered' knowledge and that it was understood and remembered by the delegate.**

"Four steps" model: (adapted for Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland) based on Donald L. Kirkpatrick's 4 stage model of evaluation

Reaction | **Learning**

Effectiveness of Safeguarding Training

Results | **Behaviour**

Step 4
- <u>**Focus on effectiveness and outcomes for C&YP**</u>
- **Measures the tangible benefits to the organisation, worker and service user**
- **How much has practice, performance, effectiveness and competence improved as a result?**
- **"Results" are expressed in terms of the benefit for the organisation, the delegate and the <u>service user.</u>**

Step 3
- **To measure change in an individual and their practice as a result of their attendance on the training course**

Appendix 2: LLR Quality Assurance Process for Single Agency Learning

The Children's Trust (Leicester City & Rutland) & Leicestershire CYP Commssioning Board

- Create the Children and Young People's Plan which contains the local priorities for action.

The Safeguarding Effectiveness Group

- Identifies the Priorities, themes and courses for Quality Assurance

The Safeguarding Effectiveness Group

- Commissions the Workforce Leads from the statutory Partner Agencies to produce an annual report on the safeguarding learning that they are responsible for.

The Workforce Leads

- Write an annual report (containing both quantative and qualitative evidence) using the template issued by SEG
- Submit the report to SEG and attend SEG to present the report.

The Safeguarding Effectiveness Group

- Receive and consider the report
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the training with a focus on outcomes for the child and young people
- Commssion the collection of additional evidence and activity where the evidence in the report is insufficient, or to support QA activity on priority areas.
- Make a judgement on the effectiveness
- Considers any remedial action required by the partner agencies where necessary and makes reccomendations as required
- Reports it's assurance (or not) on effectiveness to the Board.

Report on Safeguarding learning delivered by (insert name of organisation) in the financial year from April 2013 to March 2014

Workforce Lead (as author) to insert name here
Workforce Lead (as author) to insert job title here

Purpose of Report

To inform the Safeguarding Effectiveness Group (a sub group of the Local Safeguarding Children Board Leicester city & Leicestershire & Rutland) of (insert agency/organisation's name) safeguarding training provision and report on effectiveness and outcomes for children and young people.

1.	Introduction

1.1   Organisational context

1.2   Workforce numbers and levels

2.	How is the content of the agency/organisation's safeguarding and learning decided?

2.2

3.	How is the agency/organisation's safeguarding learning delivery commissioned?

3.1

4.	How are the agency/organisation's safeguarding learning events delivered, and who by?

4.1

5. What types of safeguarding learning events are available to staff?

5.1

6. How many of the agency/organisation's staff received safeguarding training and learning events in the year from April 2013 to March 2014? What Level were these staff? Did these staff meet the required outcomes / competencies for this level?

6.1

7. Are there any timescales/frequencies that apply for the safeguarding training provided by the agency/organisation?

7.1

8. Does the agency/organisation's safeguarding training conform to the LSCB standards?

8.1

9. Has the agency/organisation's safeguarding training been inspected? If so, what was the outcome?

9.1

10. How does the agency/organisation measure and evaluate the quality (not the effect) of its' safeguarding training?

10.1

11. How effective is the agency/organisation's safeguarding learning?

11.1

12. Is the agency's safeguarding learning is making a positive difference? What evidence do you have to show that it is making a difference?

12.1

Signed: **Name:**

Dated: