SESLIP Quality Assurance Leads Minutes

|  |
| --- |
| Date: Monday 16th September 2024, 10:00 – 12:00 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTENDEES** |  | **APOLOGIES** |
| **Kent,** Kevin Kasaven – Chair  **Achieving for Children,** Shungu Chigocha  **Bracknell Forest,** Kogie Perumall  **Brighter Futures,** Fiona Betts  **Brighter Futures**, Otilia Broadhurst  **Brighton & Hove,** Tina James  **East Sussex,** Douglas Sinclaire  **Hampshire,** Amanda Meadows  **Kent**, Hillary Musarurwa,  **Kent,** Sam Birkin  **Kent,** Sian Fearn – Minute Taker  **Medway,** Teresa Devito  **Oxfordshire,** Senay Nidai  **Portsmouth**, Kate Soutter  **Surrey,** Linde Webber  **West Berkshire,** Nicola Robertson  **West Sussex,** Laura Mallison  **Wokingham.** Sara James |  | **Bracknell Forest,** Joanne Beaton  **Brighton & Hove,** Sharon Martin  **Brighton & Hove,** Justin Grantham  **Buckinghamshire,** Aman Sekhon-Gill  **East Sussex,** Helena Wickens  **East Sussex,** Louise Carter  **Hampshire,** Sophie Butt  **Isle of White,** Anna Clarke  **Isle of White,** Simon Dear  **Kent,** Leemya McKeown  **Kent,** Gavin Swann  **Milton Keynes,** Sophie Marshall  **Milton Keynes,** Martin Clement  **Slough,** Sandra Davies  **Southampton,** Stuart Webb  **Surrey,** Tom Stevenson  **Surrey,** Patricia Denny  **West Sussex,** Beverly Berry  **Wokingham,** Danielle McKenzie |

|  |
| --- |
| Next Meeting: Monday 16th December 2024 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA – 16.09.24** | | | | |
| **Item No.** | **Time** | **Item Description** | **Lead** | **Papers** |
|  | 10:00–10:10 | **Introduction and Apologies** | Chair |  |
|  | 10:10–10:15 | **National Ofsted Issues** | Chair |  |
| **3.** | 10:15-10:30 | **CP Chair feedback from CP Chairs Subgroup** | Sharon Martin |  |
| **4.** | 10:30-10:45 | **Quality assurance and performance**   * **Area of challenge – all LAs investigate and report back on the area identified. Questions to consider could include:**   + **Process**   + **Performance**   + **What do you understand from this?**   + **How do you quality assure** * **Good practice as identified by QA Framework. Questions to be considered could include:**   + **What is it?**   + **How do they know?**   + **What makes this an area of good practice for this LA, what did they add to make it good practice.** | Chair |  |
| **5.** | 10:45-11:00 | **Topic for discussion – presented by participating LA or guest speaker.** | Sam Birkin  Hillary Musarurwa |  |
| **6.** | 11:00-11:15 | How do you track actions to make sure they make a difference? | ALL |  |
| **7.** | 11:15-11:30 | How to improve feedback, any examples of good effective measures of acquiring feedback from family? | ALL |  |
| **8.** | 11:30-11:40 | Number of Moderations vs Number of Audits | ALL |  |
| **9.** | 11:40-11:55 | Kent COA process | Leemya McKeown |  |
| **10.** | 11:55-12:00 | AOB |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS** | | |
| **Action No.** | **Action Description** | **Lead** |
| **1a** | “CP Chair feedback from CP Chairs Subgroup” and “Kent COA processes” to be added to the agenda for the next meeting | Sian Fearn |
| **2a** | Amanda to liaise with Sophie in sending information to Kevin regarding the model of the lead practitioner role. | Amanda Meadows |
| **2b** | Sian to contact Tracy Smith from Kent TPS to do a 20 minute slot at the next meeting to talk about Kent’s quality assurance oversight of unregulated placements. | Sian Fearn/Tracy Smith |
| **2c** | Sian to add an agenda item to the next meeting to discuss “Missing children” (20 minutes). | Sian Fearn |
| **2d** | Tina to circulate some bullet points from her Missing Children Repeat Episodes report to help inform the discussion for the “Missing Children” agenda item. | Tina James |
| **2e** | Fiona to share feedback from the Youth Justice Inspection at the next meeting. | Fiona Betts |
| **4a** | Leemya to present the new Practice Framework at the next meeting. | Leemya McKeown |
| **8a** | Sian to add “Improving Audit Culture” (20 mins) as an item for the next meeting. The group are to prepare for this item with information on how their local authority does this. | Sian Fearn/All |
| **10a** | “ToR Discussion” to be added as an item for the next meeting. | Sian Fearn |
| **10b** | Tina to remind Sharon to provide feedback to help inform the “CP Chair feedback from CP Chairs Subgroup” item for the next meeting. | Tina James |

|  |
| --- |
| **MINUTES** |
| Introduction and Apologies |
| Kevin welcomed all to the meeting, with apologies acknowledged, and introductions were made.  Kevin highlighted agenda item 3 and 9 will need to be carried over to the next meeting due to apologies.  **Action 1a – “CP Chair feedback from CP Chairs Subgroup” and “Kent COA processes” to be added to the agenda for the next meeting** |
| National Ofsted Issues |
| Amanda shared her experience of a recent inspection with the outcome being positive overall.  Kevin queried what the model of the lead practitioner role looks like as this was found to be strong within the inspection. Amanda advised she is unable to answer this, however, will ask Sophie to send to Kevin.  **Action 2a – Amanda to liaise with Sophie in sending information to Kevin regarding the model of the lead practitioner role.**  Kogie questioned if the inspectors were exploring any key themes and if they focused on the new cohort of care leavers. Amanda responded they did not do anything specifically in relation to the care leavers . Amanda suggested Ofsted have not yet figured out what they are looking for, and are pushing elements that are not yet in regulation but are perceived to be normal practice such as council tax exemptions. Amanda explained in terms of themes, there was less focus on unregistered placements, however, they are more interested in the oversight of these. Highlighted a key theme was education and non-attendance in education. Another key theme was strategies in the districts and partner’s involvement in these.  Kevin suggested having a regular item on this meeting’s agenda to focus on the oversight and quality assurance activity of unregulated placements  **Action 2b – Sian Fearn to contact Tracy Smith from Kent TPS to do a 20 minute slot at the next meeting to talk about Kent’s quality assurance oversight of unregulated placements.**  Douglas referred to the Hampshire report and highlighted one of the areas of improvement was around the return conversations and supported the language changing from “return home interviews”. Douglas shared East Sussex are changing this language too, to try and engage their young people, however, are struggling with the number of these being completed within timescale. Douglas queried if there was appetite for an agenda item to share data or strategies for improving this.  Linde shared Surrey recently linked in with Missing Persons as this is also an area they identified as needing improvement. Tina shared she coordinates the Safeguarding Partnership Multiagency Audits and has recently completed a report on missing children repeat episodes. Tina offered to feedback the findings from the report at the next meeting.  Amanda shared Ofsted were fixated on the quality of the conversations and the evidence of professional curiosity, even if it did not take the form of a return conversation. Amanda agreed with Douglas’ suggestion of having a conversation regarding this as it would be helpful for all.  Tina agreed to sharing the findings of the report at the next meeting and will talk to work the AVRM (multiagency group) completed, the work between the Missing Team, Social Work and Social Work pods, and the good practice from the prevent interviews conducted by Police.  Kevin agreed for Tina to share some bullet points around this topic, which can then be discussed by the group. Kevin explained Kent has found Police reported children as missing who weren’t missing for a long time, around 15mins missing, with this sometimes being repeated. Kevin noted Police’s performance figures increase due to this and suggested the group review their local policing arrangements to determine if they have the same definition of “Missing”. Kevin shared another finding was Foster Carers were less likely to ring to report a missing young person due to the waiting times on 101, therefore, Kent worked with Police to allow Foster Carers to complete this online.  Tina mentioned the Philomena Protocol which a lot of the local authorities are using with residential placements.  Teresa highlighted this topic of discussion is similar to the ones being had in Medway and suggested the overarching element is vulnerable adolescents.  **Action 2c – Agenda item for December meeting to discuss Missing children (20 minutes).**  **Action 2d – Tina to circulate some the bullet points from her Missing Children Repeat Episodes report to help inform a discussion for the Missing Children agenda item.**  Kevin shared the Ofsted report card mechanism for Education has changed. Kevin highlighted this has not applied to Social Care at this moment in time. Highlighted the number of authorities graded as “Good” and “Outstanding” are increasing with the number of those graded “Inadequate” and “Requires Improvement” decreasing. Kevin suggested with various activities such as regional DFE Partners and SESLIP, there is an improving picture for Social Care inspections across England.  Fiona highlighted their report might not have been published due to the issues with the timescales of the election, even though their inspection was in March. Fiona shared they have had 3 inspections since March, a full ILACs, IFA and recently a Youth Justice Inspection. Explained the ILACS inspection noted improvements for Children Looked After and Care Leavers and highlighted this echoes Amanda’s findings of the areas of focus.  Fiona noted their care and protection is impacted by workload issues and with the model still embedding in practice. Shared they are struggling with elements such as supervision and first tier management oversight. Highlighted they discussions with staff took place in preparation for the inspection, however Social Workers did not mention their workloads significantly even though it was highlighted as an issue by the inspectors.  Fiona shared they have maintained their grading for the Fostering inspection. Explained there may be more learning from the Youth Justice inspection due to the issues around oversight and the strategic coordination between partners beyond the initial identification of risks. Fiona suggested sharing feedback at the next meeting.  Kevin agreed to Fiona sharing the Youth Justice inspection feedback at the next meeting.  **Action 2e – Fiona to share feedback from the Youth Justice inspection at the next meeting.**  Laura shared they recently had a focus visit on Care Leavers and noted they focused on talking to young people and the involvement on PAs. Noted there was focus on areas such as PAs going above and beyond to try and maintain contact with Care Leavers, over 21 Care Leavers and how contact has been maintained with them, agreement for Care Leavers to become a protected characteristic, council tax exemptions and voice of the young people. |
| CP Chair feedback from CP Chairs Subgroup |
|  |
| Quality assurance and performance |
| Kevin asked the group if they would like to share feedback for areas of challenge. Kevin highlighted the JTAI around Domestic Abuse and referred to the national panel publication for analysis of Rapid Reviews and the recommendations for a change in processes for Domestic Homicide Reviews. Kevin highlighted a number of local authorities are not having as many Domestic Homicide Reviews as others are and suggested there may be some potential gaps in understanding thresholds. Kevin questioned the group if anyone suspects they could be a potential local authority to be selected for a JTAI.  Amanda shared Hampshire had a previous JTAI on Domestic Abuse and Hampshire volunteered to pilot the new round of JTAIs, therefore, are not expecting to receive another one soon. Highlighted Hampshire complete a dry run JTAI annually with their partnership to remind them of the tight timelines for the multiagency audits and Amanda suggested all local authorities should do this to help educate partners what is required from them. Amanda shared they experienced issues in identifying Domestic Abuse and highlighted to the group it is important to be able to pull this data from the systems.  Kevin shared while completing audits for Domestic Abuse, it was found when a family is first referred it is categorised as Domestic Abuse, however, if they are re-referred it is categorised as Family Dysfunction. Highlighted the code the Police have placed on the referral seems to stay with the families as the Social Workers do not change this whilst the referral is open. Kevin explained there was learning for Kent to be challenging codes they do not agree with, or recoding these to Domestic Abuse.  Kevin explained Kent Police volunteered to partake in a new inspection and the report published to leaders showed positives in Kent Police activities in relation to Domestic Abuse and how they are working with Kent Social Care to understand the risks.  Kevin shared he met with the SESLIP AD leads and one of the local authorities raised the matter in relation to gender medication, as some medication has been banned from being prescribed for gender alignment and this has meant an increase in referral numbers.  Tina explained a challenge they have is in relation to intervention needed at an early stage for neglect. Tina shared the Ofsted reported stated “recurring patterns such as neglect are not always evaluated thoroughly enough to inform next steps and this means that some children wait longer than they should to get the help that they need”. Tina questioned if other local authorities are experiencing similar concerns or challenges regarding the relationship between neglect and experience.  Kevin responded Kent’s virtual school is part of the Nurture Programme nationally. It has been found 80% of children that had a Social Worker in the last 6 years were showing a lot of the factors for Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) ACEs with links to neglect and poverty, highlighting there is a strong link between having previously had a Social Worker or Early Help intervention and school absence. Kevin explained this is why Kent is driving their Virtual School to have strategic relationships with all schools in Kent with respect to children who previously experienced a Social Worker/Early Help intervention. The Virtual School Head is finding the schools need a trauma informed relationship with the families to help support the understanding of previous experiences having an impact on a child.  Kevin shared Kent has around 20,000 EHCPs and nearly 70% of these have had a Social Worker or Early Help worker in the past, with 500 of these who are currently open to Kent Social Care.  Kevin referred to the Working Together 2023 Guidance and highlighted bringing Education in as a 4th partner and the need for a practice framework across all multiagency. Leemya is currently working on a Practice Framework which is not only for Kent Social Care but for the multiagency and it is going live in November.  **Action 4a – Leemya to present the new Practice Framework at the next meeting.**  Senay shared Oxfordshire are currently working with the DfE around introducing the new safeguarding framework and implementing their recommendations from the Working Together 2023 guidance.  Kevin suggested for the December meeting that the group send completed thematic audits or new emerging activities to Sian in advance, so it can be listed on the agenda. |
| Topic for discussion |
| Kevin explained in March, Kent took over the process for the leads meeting and explored the opportunity for research to be completed by the Kent Analytics team. A business case was made to the SESLIP executive for Sam and Hillary to complete 2 projects by developing key lines of enquiries, conducting focus groups and interviews and collating the learning into a report. Kevin suggested then holding a conference next year to celebrate QA activity, review the learning and develop next steps. SESLIP has confirmed funding for 2025/26, which means Kevin can request funding again for Sam and Hillary to complete the research again in 2025/26 and then measure between both reports produced.  Sam highlighted they are currently recruiting a dedicated resource for this work with Devika Menon as a Research and Evaluation Officer.  Hillary shared the below presentation:     1. **Black and Global Majority Workforce Research Project**   Hillary explained the first project is regarding Black and Global Majority Workforce to explore the challenges and barriers BMG Social Workers experience, with a focus on recruitment and retention. The aim is to develop a self-assessment tool for SESLIP to use.  Hillary shared they will conduct a survey with the BGM Social Workers which will then need to be followed up with a focus group discussions and interviews, The data will then be analysed to identify trends and patterns, and the quantitative data will be used to provide the context and explanations of the recruitment and retention statistics.  Hillary highlighted they would need the project leads to provide access to study the participants and for them to share the survey, encouraging staff to complete it. Hillary also requested the local authorities provide recruitment and retention statistics, data on the progression opportunities and experiences for BGM Social Workers and the data on the actual progressions for those who have capitalised on the opportunities presented to them. In addition to this, feedback will be required from the local authorities and Social Workers on how the self-assessment tool might have improved their experiences and address some of the barriers.   1. **Quality Assurance Research Project:**   Hillary explained the aim of this project is to understand the blockers in developing consistent, high quality management oversight for children’s social work across the local authorities and to also co-produce a supervision template.  This project will also involve a survey and interviews for social work managers and staff. Hillary explained they will complete the data analysis to understand the context and explanations from the management practices. One key part of this research will be conducting co-production workshops to produce the template based on the data but also with the input from Social Workers and staff members in the local authorities.  Hillary requested the local authorities support by giving access to study the participants, by encouraging colleagues to participate and allowing access to QA data and management and oversight records. Feedback will then also be required from the project leaders and staff members involved.  Kevin explained the first project is in relation to the Big Listen, in which a survey was circulated to all local authorities and the feedback received was in relation to recruitment and retention of BGM Social Workers. Kevin explained the chief executives endorsed this study for all 19 authorities to take part. The data provided will be anonymised, meaning the final report won’t allow for authorities to be recognisable from the findings.  Kevin explained the second project will rely on the group to provide Hillary and Sam with reports such as annual QA reports and thematic audits. These again will be anonymised and the local authorities will not be recognisable from the findings. Kevin requested the group support by identifying focus group and interview opportunities.  Kevin confirmed all DCSs were represented at the SESLIP executive where all their chief executives have represented at the meeting. DCSs were informed this was approved. The next step is to complete an online meeting with the DCSs to explain the projects, meaning there will be a phased process of communication before the research is conducted.  Shungu questioned if the focus groups for the first project will be held regionally or for each local authority. Kevin responded there will be a few dates provided with people being able to participate online as there isn’t the capacity to visit all authorities.  Shungu questioned, in relation to the second project, if the supervision template will be for case supervision or reflective supervision for practitioners. Kevin advised the template will be for both and reflected on the debate of what information should be recorded on a child’s file.  Tina questioned if there is a Southeast group which represents the Principle Social Workers. Kevin advised there is. Tina suggested bringing this research to the attention of the Principle Social Workers. Kevin shared he met with Mark Evans and they discussed the PSW SESLIP Network. Once a ToR is agreed, they will be approached to be the leads.  Senay shared Oxfordshire rolled out a case work supervision tool 18 months ago which is being used by all the social work teams and reflected on how it supports the models or frameworks being used. Suggested the research has a focus on the recording of reflective practice to create consistency.  Kevin shared Kent are recording the frequency of supervision on Power BI, with findings showing 75% of supervisions are taking place within 3 months. Kent is reviewing the supervision form to create more data tabs, so the score changes between supervisions can be monitored.  Teresa agreed with the idea of the PSW network. Medway have spent the last year updating their Mosaic forms completed in discussion with practitioners, managers and signs of safety. Highlighted if a new tool is agreed they may be unable to use it due to the recent work completed. Kevin responded the personal supervision could be an element to be agreed by all as it leads to retention of staff. Senay wondered if this will apply to personal supervision for IROs and CP Chairs.  Kevin summarised what will be required from the group is their support with communication and their time for an interview or focus group. Kevin will circulate the ToR and will email the group with further details around the research project. |
| How do you track actions to make sure they make a difference? |
| Kevin asked the group if they are able to provide information on how they track actions to ensure they are making a difference and impact.  Shungu responded following an audit there is an expectation for managers to have a discussion with Social Workers and to agree objectives which are followed through by management oversight. The QA team will then follow up with the managers to confirm if the actions have been completed and this is checked by reviewing the child’s file. Shungu stated there is an escalation process that is followed if the objectives are not met.  Senay explained the processes used within Oxfordshire have change due to them finding a high number of closed loop activities they were unable to track. An action plan is now included on the end of each child’s audit with the expectation this is monitored and tracked through supervision. They have introduced an audit and moderation panel which is chaired by a QA lead, the moderator and auditor are invited to the panel to discuss the audit and moderation.  Teresa explained the final sign off for audits is made by the Head of Service. Actions are fed through Mosaic into the supervision document so Team Managers can pick these up . In addition to this, Service Managers hold a 3 way supervision with their Team Manager and the practitioners to ensure that actions are reviewed for audits graded as “Inadequate”. The Practice Development Lead follows this up with providing learning for the Team Manager or practitioner. Quarterly scorecards are also produced which allows the Practice Development leads to provide additional support where it was identified as needed.  Fiona shared all audits are word documents, these sit on the child’s file with a separate form used in Mosaic which captures the actions and are pulled through to the Social Workers next supervision. A separate tracker contains all audit recommendations, with this being updated weekly by the managers. Fiona provides a monthly report which highlights which managers have open and overdue actions, those of which related to an audit graded “Inadequate” are then assigned to a Senior Manager for oversight. |
| How to improve feedback, any examples of good effective measures of acquiring feedback from family |
| Kevin asked if any local authorities have effective measure. Kevin shared Kent struggle to consistently obtain feedback and highlighted 33% of audits have a type of family feedback.  Tina explained the Norfolk Summer Leadership Exchange Workshops took place in August with one focusing on integrating the voice of children and families in quality assurance. Tina received the presentation from this and highlighted Norfolk have a 90% feedback response rate. If appropriate, it is mandatory for the manager to obtain feedback as part of an audit. Tina stated she will share the presentation with the group.  Kevin shared Kent’s Analytics Team needed to obtain ethical approval for service user feedback, which was not agreed. Kevin explained service user feedback for the benefit of improving the services is different to direct work with a child to understand risks.  Senay explained Oxfordshire had their ILACs inspection in February this year, and following this they have tried to strengthen the audit programme in making them more collaborative with workers and families. As part of the core audit tool they asked all managers to sit with Social Workers and contact the families as part of the audit. Separately, they included a reflective discussion on what the practitioners learnt through the audit process. Senay shared the compliance with families is low with it currently sitting at 30%, although increasing, and reflected this is due to the culture of changing.  Senay reported there were discussions with young people about how audits are written and were told by children it does not matter how it is written but they want practitioners to do what they say they are going to do. Kevin explained a meeting was recently held with Service Managers, Assistant Directors and young people. They discussed service user feedback and one young person shared they did not like how it felt as if they themselves were being audited. Kevin reflected in making it clear who is being audited to help encourage young people’s engagement.  Senay suggested the way things are written depends on where it will be used. Kevin agreed and noted there must be a balance when writing to the child, ensuring it is child sensitive and age appropriate while also highlighting the circumstances more directly.  Amanda shared Hampshire use service user feedback at the start of the audit process, by asking 5 simple questions which is a mandatory part of the audit. There is a 60-70% compliance for this. The questions are asked and put into the audit form before the auditor sits down alongside the practitioners which helps inform them as they work the case together. Amanda shared this exercise was received well, This data is then given to the participation lead who will identify themes. |
| Number of Moderations vs Number of Audits |
| Kevin asked if the group had any views about the number of audits against moderations.  Tina shared the audits are completed by Social Workers, moderated by pod managers but 20% are moderated by the Head of Service.  Teresa explained they have a monthly audit, and all of them are moderated by 7 practice development leads. Initially hoped to complete only a proportion of the audits going forward, however, after a whole service audit day it was found 40% of the audits completed were moderated down therefore there was low confidence in the operational services to understand audits and moderations fully.  Amanda responded the senior management team review 10% of the total number of audits, with 1300 completed per year. Highlighted it depends on where a local authority is on their Ofsted journey and the expertise of the team managers. Hampshire have been graded as “Outstanding” for 10 years, and reflected there is the assurance Social Workers and Team Managers know what they are looking for.  Kogie shared the number of audits moderated depends on capacity, time and the ability to bring all Heads of Services together. The Heads of Services moderate the audits, the audits which are selected is done so independently by the QA officer. Currently managing to achieve moderating 3 audits per session, with audits taking place every month, which is working out at around 10%. They try to bring some learning from the process by discussing with the moderation panel their decisions on grading.  Fiona raised they were challenged by Ofsted about moderating their externally audited records as well as their internal audits. Initially, the position was due diligence was completed with the external auditors meaning they were confident with the decisions made, however, they now completely moderate both internal and external audited records. Kogie questioned who are completing external audits and Fiona responded they are freelance social work experience Social Workers.  Nicola mentioned within West Berkshire, a whole service single audit is completed, where all managers audit the same child. Nicola then completed an analysis to review the quality of the auditing overall.  Kevin suggested having an agenda item for the next meeting to have a 20 minute discussion regarding improving the audit culture, and for group to prepare for this item with information on how their local authority does this.  **Action 8a – Add “Improving Audit Culture” (20 mins) as an item for the next meeting. The group are to prepare for this item with information on how their local authority does this.**  Amanda shared the senior managers moderate in groups, although not all looking at the same child, to enable conversations around benchmarking. District audits also take place where managers are asked to audit another district’s case. Amanda explained they also have extensive auditing guidance to clarify what the standards are. Follow up emails are sent to congratulate staff on good auditing and reminders of the guidance are sent when improvement is needed.  Kevin explained Kent complete a 2 monthly audit with 100 audits completed each cycle, therefore, 600 audits are completed a year with each case being moderated. It has been found from the staff survey Kent are improving the quality of practice, with staff having reduced caseloads and better work life balance. Kevin reflected on Amanda’s point it is about the LA's own needs, and there isn’t a definitive number of audits that should be being completed, it is more about being able to evidence to Ofsted there is confidence in the quality of the audits and the LA’s know themselves well via the undertaken activity. |
| Kent COA process |
|  |
| AOB |
| Kevin noted the group did not discuss the ToR during the meeting and asked this be added to the agenda for the next meeting. Kevin asked Tina if she can get feedback from Sharon regarding the CP chair network to help inform the next meeting.  **Action 10a – “ToR Discussion” to be added as an item for the next meeting.**  **Action 10b – Tina to remind Sharon to provide feedback to help inform the CP chair network item for the next meeting.**  Kevin thanked all for their attendance and contributions. |

TTENDEES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUGGESTED AGENDA – 16.12.24**  **Items in bold are standing items** | | | | |
| **Item No.** | **Time** | **Item Description** | **Lead** | **Papers** |
|  | 10:00 – 10:10 | **Introduction and Apologies** | Chair |  |
|  |  | **National Ofsted Issues** | Chair |  |
| **3.** |  | **CP Chair feedback from CP Chairs Subgroup** | Sharon Martin |  |
| **4.** |  | **Quality assurance and performance**   * **Area of challenge – all LAs investigate and report back on the area identified. Questions to consider could include:**   + **Process**   + **Performance**   + **What do you understand from this?**   + **How do you quality assure** * **Good practice as identified by QA Framework. Questions to be considered could include:**   + **What is it?**   + **How do they know?**   + **What makes this an area of good practice for this LA, what did they add to make it good practice.** |  |  |
| **5.** |  | **Topic for discussion – presented by participating LA or guest speaker.** |  |  |
| **6.** | 15 mins | Kent COA Processes | Leemya McKeown |  |
|  |  | BREAK |  |  |
| **7.** | 20 mins | Kent’s quality assurance oversight of unregulated placements | Tracy Smith |  |
| **8.** |  | Missing Children | Tina James/All |  |
| **9.** |  | Kent’s Practice Framework | Leemya McKeown |  |
| **10.** | 20 mins | Improving Audit Culture | All |  |
|  |  | Youth Justice Inspection Feedback | Fiona Betts |  |
|  |  | ToR Discussion | All |  |