

School Safeguarding Audit 2022: Analysis Report

Date: March 2023

CONTENTS

Methodology	2
Outcomes & Purpose	3
Validation of Evidence	4
Findings	5
Key themes	6
Proposed Action Plan	8
Statistical Overview & Analysis:	11
DSL and Named Governor Roles	11
School Ethos	13
Safeguarding Policy	15
Child Protection Procedures	16
Child Protection Record Keeping and Monitoring	18
Use of External Providers	20
Training and Induction	22
Safer Selection & Recruitment	24
Safer Working Practice for all Staff	26
Understanding and managing disclosures of sexual violence and harassment	27
Understanding Child Abuse and Exploitation	29

1. Methodology

Governing Bodies and Headteachers need to ensure that their safeguarding responsibilities in accordance with sections 157 + 175 of the Education Act 2002 are met. *'Keeping Children Safe in Education'* sets out the responsibilities of schools and further education colleges to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people.

The Norfolk Safeguarding Children Partnership (NSCP) is required to ensure that all schools and colleges are meeting these duties effectively. One of the mechanisms by which Norfolk County Council, in partnership with the NSCP establishes this assurance is through individual education settings self-evaluating their performance under an agreed framework and then sharing these results and any improvements required with the NSCP.

The self-review tool was last revised in Autumn Term 2021 to reflect changes in local and national guidance including the NSCP. New and revised fields are highlighted throughout the tool. The tool forms the evidential basis for the Local Authority audit of school practice. It seeks to ensure that education settings are supported in the process of safeguarding and have access to relevant and valid information regarding their statutory safeguarding functions. The tool assists settings to examine the current safeguarding arrangements in place and to identify areas which may require further development.

A completed audit tool with evidence of actions undertaken in response to the review is a valuable source of evidence to demonstrate to the Governing Board/Trust Board and for the purpose of Ofsted inspection how the setting is meeting statutory requirements for safeguarding children and young people.

Three similar audits of Norfolk schools' safeguarding procedures have been completed. An audit of safeguarding procedures was completed in 2015 with a total of 90% of schools that were contacted provided the information. The audit in 2017-2018 also had a 90% return rate. The findings of this audit activity identified gaps in knowledge across the wider school workforce and training and guidance was tailored to meet these needs accordingly. The audit returns in 2019-2020 were affected by the Covid-19 pandemic and therefore 56% of settings submitted.

The findings are based on education settings' self-evaluation scores using Ofsted grades 1 – 4. Settings are asked to document the evidence used to inform the conclusions that they have reached and develop an action plan to address any weaknesses identified in the process of completing the self-review.

In this round of submissions, the scores were defined as per the table below:

1. Outstanding	The area is fully embedded within the setting. There is evidence of positive work in practice and evidence can be provided to demonstrate the impact for children.
2. Good	The area meets requirements and is fully embedded. Evidence is available to demonstrate the practice in the setting.
3. Requires Improvement	This is an area which requires development, however there is some evidence available.
4. Inadequate	This area needs significant work and/or is not compliant. There is no or very little evidence available.

For the purposes of this self-review all maintained schools, academies, independent schools and colleges were asked to submit a completed self-review tool for analysis during 2022:

[Group 1: 4 January – 1 April 2022](#)

[Group 2: 21 February – 27 May 2022](#)

[Group 3: 19 April – 15 July 2022](#)

The findings of this report will be made available to all education settings and shared with relevant teams within Norfolk County Council. Where individual practice issues were identified, contact has been made with the setting to offer support and guidance and to ensure any weaknesses have been remedied.

2. Outcomes and Purpose

The purpose of this review is to enable individual education settings in Norfolk and the Local Authority in partnership with the NSCP to scrutinise safeguarding practice to ensure that there are effective safeguarding systems in place. The areas for consideration in the tool are:

1. DSL and Named Governor Roles
2. School Ethos
3. Safeguarding Policy
4. Child Protection Procedures
5. Child Protection Record Keeping and Monitoring
6. Use of External Providers
7. Training & Induction
8. Safer selection and recruitment
9. Safer working practices
10. Understanding and managing disclosures of sexual violence and harassment (NEW SECTION)
11. Understanding of child abuse and exploitation, signs, symptoms and categories

In-depth findings

Where possible, the data has been analysed to understand any trends developing from the completed audits. The following information best represents this data. The results provide the Local Authority with an overall picture of safeguarding practice in Norfolk settings in line with statutory guidance with an emphasis on the following areas:

- Are settings up to date with current national guidance and local priorities?
- Are settings meeting statutory requirements in relation to safeguarding policy and procedures?
- Do settings implement robust procedures to ensure safer recruitment into the workforce in Norfolk?
- Are staff at all levels appropriately trained?
- How confident are staff to identify causes for concern about a child's safety and welfare and know what to do when they have a concern?
- How confident are staff and managers in promoting good safeguarding practice and challenging poor practice?
- Do settings in Norfolk have robust procedures for safer working practice and the management of concerns and allegations against staff and other adults?

3 Validation of evidence

This audit provides important evidence of education settings' compliance with statutory requirements for safeguarding. The methodology for obtaining this evidence via self-assessment is valid, in accordance with other LA practice and understandable given the resources available to carry out the audit. It can be argued however that the evidence from the audit will not, on its own, provide independent evaluation and assurance regarding the quality of day-to-day practice in accordance with school policy and procedures. We have therefore triangulated this information with spot-checks and Ofsted inspection outcomes.

Safeguarding Compliance Checks

To validate the self-review process, the Safeguarding Advisers undertook a series of safeguarding compliance checks with education settings during the Autumn 2nd half 2022 and Spring 1st half 2023. These checks were unannounced focusing on statutory compliance in line with the [Safeguarding Compliance Checklist](#). A Management Information Sheet ([170/22](#)) was published on 4th October 2022 informing education settings about the spot checks for statutory compliance.

What does the evidence tell us about safeguarding practice and the self-assessment process?

As can be seen from the information below, the Self-Assessment process gave a valid picture of the safeguarding practice undertaken in education settings across Norfolk.

- **Percentage of standards validated- 73% (513)**
- **Percentage standards partially validated- 22% (151)**

- **Percentage standards which were not validated- 3% (19)**
- **Percentage of areas not covered during the check- 2% (17)**

Where fields were partially validated this was for a range of reasons, but often this was because evidence had not been retained by the setting. Partial validation was also given when documents/policies were out of date on the setting's website. Good practice themes included DSLs and Deputy DSLs being named, a culture of listening to children, procedures for visitors and parents in terms of safeguarding information being given, safeguarding policy and knowledge of the Prevent Duty. Areas where evidence was less robust was the single central record, multi-agency training and training for the Governing Board.

Is the evidence supported by data from Ofsted Inspections?

66 Norfolk schools were inspected during Academic Year 2021-2022. In the 62 schools that were judged to be 'Outstanding', 'Good' or 'Requires Improvement', safeguarding arrangements were judged to be effective. This equates to 94% of the schools inspected during this period. Inspection outcomes support the findings of this audit that indicate most schools feel that they not only meet, but exceed, statutory requirements for safeguarding in line with Ofsted expectations and best practice guidance.

Of the 66 schools inspected during this period, 4 were judged as 'Inadequate.' The inspection reports for these 4 settings were reviewed in order to identify those instances where the safeguarding arrangements in place had contributed to the inadequate judgement. Weaknesses in the safeguarding arrangements contributed to an inadequate judgement in 2 of the 4 schools; this equates to 3% of the settings inspected during this period. In this case the failure was related to a lack of evidence that appropriate action had been taken in response to concerns about pupil welfare and that leaders had not effectively checked and monitored the safeguarding systems in place. In the other 2 cases where the setting had been judged to be 'Inadequate', the inspection reports clearly stated that the school's safeguarding arrangements were deemed to be 'effective'.

4 Findings

472 Norfolk schools and colleges were contacted in Groups 1, 2 and 3 via MI Sheets 241/21, 28/22 and 75/22. In total **384** settings completed an assessment.

The audit report captures data from 303 primary schools, 41 secondary, 14 special schools, 3 nursery schools, 2 all through schools, 2 sixth forms and 9 independent schools. No colleges submitted a self-assessment despite being included in the sample. 160 were LA maintained schools and 189 were academies. Overall, this equates to 87% of all primary schools, 80% of all secondaries and 93% of all special schools. **81%** of all settings in Norfolk.

The majority of education settings provided comprehensive evidence in the commentary section of the self-assessment tool to demonstrate and support the

associated grades that they have submitted. The areas of good practice identified are included in the commentary on the subsequent pages of this report.

A small minority of education settings provided very limited information to support the self-assessment grades submitted; these settings were contacted by the Education Safeguarding Team and were asked to add further details to their submission.

What does the evidence tell us about practice?

The evidence demonstrates a positive view of education settings' confidence in the safeguarding arrangements that they have in place. The evidence provided indicates that the vast majority of settings feel that they not only meet but exceed statutory requirements for safeguarding in line with Ofsted expectations and best practice guidance.

The commentary supplied in the majority of the self-review tools demonstrates that settings have taken a robust approach to reviewing their safeguarding procedures and have reached thoughtful conclusions in relation to their assessments. It provides evidence of the variety of ways settings seek to ensure that safeguarding arrangements are robust and understood by all stakeholders. In the best examples, settings provided specific dates for events e.g. training and/or policy review and provided the location of evidence within the school. In the best examples, settings identified specific actions required to get to good or better with clear time scales.

There were five responses that indicated a number of areas were inadequate. Four of these were Local Authority maintained schools (three of which were visited as part of the unannounced compliance checks) and one was an Academy.

14% of all responses identifying requires improvement related to staff knowledge of domestic abuse, 13% in respect of identifying a private fostering arrangement, 9% in respect of describing and explaining child exploitation, 8% in response to the possibility of fabricated or induced illness and 9% for considering if young carers have the right to additional support services. Others area related to having an online safety policy and appropriate procedures in place (17%), the Governing Board having appropriate training (10%), and responding to an incident of sexual violence or harassment (13%) and implementing appropriate risk assessments (8%).

Education settings are supported with many of the areas for development identified above through training and the guidance available in the ['Safeguarding Section' of the Norfolk Schools and Learning Providers](#) website. These themes have however identified actions that the LA should take to support schools further; these are included within the 'proposed action plan' section of this report.

5 Key themes

The following themes for development were common in the action plans of the submissions received:

DSL and Named Governor Roles

- Time is made available for both roles to work together.
- The school/college has systems in place to monitor and quality assure implementation and compliance with safeguarding requirements and procedures.

Safeguarding Policy

- The school has online safety policy and procedures that are reviewed annually.

Training & Induction

- In addition to training, all staff should receive regular safeguarding updates to provide them with relevant skills and knowledge to safeguard children effectively.
- The Governing Body has received suitable safeguarding training.

Understanding and managing disclosures of sexual violence and harassment

- Has procedures in place to respond to and manage a report
- Understand the importance of implementing appropriate risk assessments.

Understanding Child Abuse: signs, symptoms and categories

- Provide further training and guidance for staff on the following areas:
 - Child Exploitation
 - Private Fostering
 - Fabricated or induced illness
 - Support for young carers

6 Proposed action plan

In order to support education settings to address areas commonly identified for development, an action plan has been developed:

Action	Resources	By whom?	By when?	Evaluation
1.1 Review and where necessary re-issue LA guidance for education settings in relation to private fostering, child exploitation and young carers.	Private fostering guidance written and liaison with Wendy Jones.	LC	December 2023	
	Tackling exploitation toolkit produced	CF	June 2023	
	Termly exploitation network	CF	Termly from September 2022	
	Young carers guidance written	LC	December 2023	
1.2 Work with health colleagues to produce some guidance related to fabricated or induced illness (perplexing presentations) which can be shared with education settings.	NSCP guidance Liaison with Dr Richard Allen regarding guidance to share with education settings.	LC	December 2023	

<p>1.3 Liaise with colleagues in Inclusion in respect of online safety to fully understand what training and support materials are already on offer.</p> <p>The Education Safeguarding Team to begin to offer dates for CEOP Ambassador training.</p>	<p>Meeting date set Map out what is already offered to education settings</p> <p>Education Safeguarding Team attend CEOP training courses</p> <p>Access CEOP resources from their website</p> <p>Devise a training offer and advertise on S4S website</p>	<p>LC LG</p>	<p>March 2023</p> <p>February 2023</p> <p>February 2023</p> <p>Autumn term 2023</p>	
<p>1.4 Work with colleagues from Norfolk Governor Services to revise the forms and templates related to governor monitoring and evaluation and deliver a further round of webinars for DSLs and governors on how to work effectively together to assess the safeguarding function within education settings.</p>	<p>Meet with the Lead Governance Officer to discuss the revisions to templates.</p> <p>Set dates for 2 webinars; one for DSLs and one for Safeguarding</p>	<p>LC</p>	<p>July 2022</p> <p>September 2022</p>	<p>COMPLETE</p> <p>All governance related templates were updated with possible exploratory questions which could be used by governors when in meetings or during monitoring visits.</p> <p>Both webinars were delivered in Autumn Term 2022. A recording of the version for DSLs is available on the Safeguarding pages of the Norfolk</p>

	Governors and advertise. Produce a slide deck for the webinars			Schools and Learning Providers website.
1.5 Re-initiate the Independent Schools Safeguarding Forum (which ceased during the Covid-19 pandemic) to offer specific support and guidance to these settings.	Forums to take place in Autumn Term 2022 and Spring Term 2023. Discussion will members to take place about the future of the Forum and support from the Education Safeguarding Team.	CF	End of September 2022 End of January 2023	DSLs made the decision at the Forum in January 2023 that they would continue to meet as a specific DSL network. CF offered support and guidance to the schools as part of the normal offer from the Education Safeguarding Team.
1.6 Develop a training offer to support schools to tackle sexual violence and harassment.	Discussion with UEA about their 'Call it Out' programme and how it can be adapted Create a Strategic Plan for schools and colleges which outlines the programme and the	CB	June 2022 Sept 2022-July 2023	CB used the UEA programme as a template to create age appropriate one for schools & colleges By May 2023, 87 schools and colleges are involved in the programme

	<p>resources for schools -target was to deliver to 50 schools/colleges</p> <p>Deliver a 'Train the Trainers' programme For schools to be able to deliver the staff CPD on 'Importance of Challenging Sexist Language'</p> <p>Create and provide schools/colleges lesson resources for KS2/3/4/5/6 on harmful/inappropriate language/sexism/sexual harassment and its impact</p> <p>Engage with more Trusts to increase numbers of schools/colleges involved to 150</p>		<p>June 2022</p> <p>Autumn Term 2022</p> <p>Academic year 2023-2024</p>	<p>Currently 1400 members of staff have received the CPD- evaluations suggest the CPD has helped to increase staff knowledge and confidence.</p> <p>Lessons delivered to 6500 students – evaluations suggest programme is having impact on reducing sexist language and increased confidence to report incidents of SH.</p>
<p>1.7 Explore how to engage Further Education settings with the Self Evaluation process in the future or</p>	<p>Decisions to be made as to what the</p>	<p>LC CF</p>	<p>Academic year 2023-2024</p>	

<p>potentially as a separate piece of work.</p>	<p>submission for colleges will look like.</p> <p>Engage with college DSLs as part of working group to discuss.</p> <p>Colleges to submit their safeguarding self-evaluation.</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

What is already being done

One of the Safeguarding Advisers has worked with Norfolk Governor Services to develop a narrated PowerPoint for governors. This focussing upon their strategic role in relation to safeguarding and how they can effectively support and hold leaders to account.

One of the Safeguarding Advisers sits on the Workforce Development Group and is kept up to date in relation to multi-agency training and the spaces available. There has been a recent re-tendering process with the new company who has been commissioned being based in Norfolk.

Two members of the Education Safeguarding Team have recently undertaken CEOP Ambassador training to increase knowledge and skills related to online safety. The Team is working with other colleagues within the Local Authority to look to produce a co-ordinated offer of training and support for education settings.

Statistical Overview & Analysis:

1) DSL and Named Governor Roles

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
Has a Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL)	59	41	0	0	=
Has a deputy DSL	62	38	0	0	=
Has a named governor for safeguarding	40	58	2	0	+ 2
The roles are established	44	55	1	0	-1
Time is made available for both roles to work together	29	62	9	0	+4
Cover for the DSL role	54	45	1	0	=
The school/college has systems in place to monitor and quality assure implementation and compliance with safeguarding requirements and procedures	24	67	7	0	-1
Any deficiencies or weaknesses in child protection arrangements brought to the attention of the governing body and senior managers are remedied without delay.	26	67	7	0	-1

Commentary:

All settings that provided a rating in this section indicated that they meet the statutory requirements in respect of the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) role and have multiple staff trained to ensure that this is always cover for the role. DSLs come from a variety of roles from senior leaders to pastoral workers and administrative staff. Submissions stated that having DSLs who were non-teaching meant that they were more available to pupils when required. The training records held by the Education Safeguarding Team validate these findings.

Some settings indicated that they had roles such as Parent Support Advisers or Family Support Workers to provide early help and intervention to prevent concerns escalating. Submissions indicate that awareness of those holding this role was made clear to staff and visitors through the use of posters and leaflets displaying photographs of DSLs. Submissions made clear that the contact details of DSLs were available for staff and, when children were on school trips, there were nominated senior leaders/DSLs to be contacted for advice and support. A number of submissions talked of having DSLs they could seek advice from in other schools within their Trust or federation or in a neighbouring school in the rare event that no trained DSL was available to staff.

In many submissions it was recorded that DSLs had established a cycle of regular meetings to discuss cases of concern, audit case files and discuss safeguarding practice more broadly in school. It is crucial that DSLs have protected time to discuss cases and receive peer support in managing risk and to discuss the level of support being given to individual families. If the appropriate culture is in place this should also be a forum to challenge and for DSLs to hold each other to account in relation to practice. This management oversight is critical so Lead DSLs and senior leaders are assured that the right support is being offered at the right time to children and families.

Section 175 Education Act 2002 and the related statutory guidance makes explicit the responsibility of the governing board to ensure that the functions of the schools are carried out with a view to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of pupils and to remedy any weaknesses that are brought to their attention in this respect. In a significant number of submissions, it was recorded that the safeguarding governor meets with the DSL(s) regularly in order to monitor safeguarding practice. This activity included use of this self-review process, using the checklists for monitoring the Single Central Record and safeguarding compliance more broadly as well as annually reporting to the governors with a full and thorough safeguarding report. In examples of best practice, the meetings between governors and DSLs followed a standardised agenda and minutes were produced. These systems will help to ensure rigorous oversight and management of the safeguarding function.

In a number of submissions, settings described how their Academy Trust provided a further level of scrutiny and challenge through checks, audits and reports required to be written about safeguarding practice.

In wider audit work, practice not always as strong as is described above in relation to monitoring visits between the governor with responsibility for safeguarding and the DSLs. Minutes of Governing Board meetings have not always evidenced the questions, comments, support and challenge to DSLs in order for governors to be

assured that the setting is fulfilling its statutory responsibilities in relation to safeguarding. **See identified action 1.4.**

2) School ethos – providing a safe environment for pupils to learn in (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
Has a culture of listening to children and taking account of their wishes and feelings.	26	68	6	0	New field
The school ethos is inclusive of child protection issues.	29	68	3	0	+1
Children feel safe and listened to at school.	32	66	2	0	+1
Helps children through the curriculum	26	68	3	0	+3
Actively seeks advice on how to develop a child protection ethos	34	64	1	0	+3

Commentary:

The evidence provided in this section of the audit demonstrates an ethos in settings that recognises the central importance of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of all children. This is vital if settings are to ensure that their safeguarding policies and procedures are implemented in practice and provide opportunities for reflection on issues of safety for all members of the school or college community.

Having a culture of listening to children is crucial and supporting them to understand risk, healthy relationships, keeping safe and developing resilience should be embedded throughout the curriculum. Some submissions made reference to the broad and balanced curriculum accessible for all pupils, particularly in Relationships Education.

Submissions routinely talked about using perception surveys to gain the views from pupils, staff and parents and carers regarding safety, wellbeing and the environment.

Curriculum maps were identified by a number of settings as a way of demonstrating what different year groups are taught when and how the learning follows on. Settings identified a number of tools they have adopted to support children to identify and respond appropriately to risk through the curriculum. Schools recorded a broad range of topics covered such as road and fire safety, drugs awareness, 'stranger danger', cycling proficiency, seatbelt safety, healthy relationships and the use of [NSPCC PANTS resources](#).

Settings named a range of programmes/interventions including PATHS, Thrive and ELSA. Many indicated that they have also utilised the support of external agencies such as voluntary sector organisations, Safer Schools Officers, Crucial Crew events and teams from the LA such as road safety.

As in the previous audits, settings identified a number of different ways in which they provide children with the opportunity to talk and raise concerns on both a collective and individual basis including:

School council / parliament	Circle times
Peer mentoring	Playground buddies
Digital leaders	Worry boxes or monsters
Nurture groups	Childline number

This concurs with findings from audit work undertaken by the Safeguarding Advisers. External agencies were also referred to for gaining support for individual pupils such as The Matthew Project, Nelsons Journey and Just One Norfolk.

The returns identified a number of places that DSLs went to when seeking advice and guidance about a 'child protection' ethos. These included:

NSCP website	Local Headteachers and DSLs
Norfolk Schools and Learning Providers website	Members of the Academy Trust
NSPCC website	MI sheets
LA Safeguarding Advisers	DSL Twitter feed
Early Help Hubs	

DSL Networks

A number of submissions made reference to DSL Networks and the opportunities these give to share good practice, offer peer support and liaise with colleagues from other agencies such as the police, Children's Social Care and Community and Partnerships.

The Safeguarding Advisers have supported networks by holding meetings for existing network chairs and for those not in networks to meet to discuss the purpose of these. There are currently 29 networks running; some are longstanding, others are in the earlier stages of development.

In order to strengthen the presence of education settings within the NSCP, education representation on Local Safeguarding Children Groups (LSCGs) has been promoted and DSL networks are asked to have a DSL attend their locality LSCG to contribute to the multi-agency discussions and then feedback to their network. The LSCG annual feedback gave positive responses from education staff with some stating they found the meeting really valuable and informative.

3) Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
The school will have a safeguarding and child protection policy.	51	49	0	0	=
The school policy has been devised with consideration to LA model policy and the most up to date guidance.	51	49	0	0	=
Other school policies have been revised in line with the safeguarding policy.	35	60	5	0	=
The safeguarding and child protection policy is available publicly via the school's website or other means.	37	60	2	0	=
Ensure that every member of staff, volunteer, visitor and parent will know the procedures.	36	61	3	0	=
The school has online safety policy and procedures that are reviewed annually.	13	70	16	1	-5

Commentary:

The existence of a safeguarding policy that is updated annually is a statutory requirement. In addition, '[Keeping Children Safe in Education](#)' makes clear the expectation that this policy is provided to staff at induction and should be available publicly via the education setting's website. The data indicates that all settings are compliant with statutory requirements in this area. Submissions explained that the policy is available on the school website, in the school brochure and can be made available in hardcopy if requested.

Submissions routinely stated that the LA Model Safeguarding Policy is used in the development of and is referenced in a range of policies including, Attendance, Anti-Bullying, Behaviour, Health and Safety and Online Safety. 5% of submissions stated that revising other school policies in line with the safeguarding policy required improvement.

Submissions identified clear systems in place to ensure that every member of staff, volunteer and regular visitor is provided with information to support them to understand the setting's procedures. A variety of communication strategies were identified, examples included:

- Use of leaflets for visitors, parents and volunteers that summarise the procedures

- Safeguarding information such as leaflets and posters clearly visible in reception areas
- Safeguarding information provided to visitors and summarised on visitor badges
- DSL information posters around the school
- Annual provision of the policy to all staff

All of the areas in this section of the audit remained equal to the previous round except Online Safety where there was a 5% decrease in those settings rating this as good or outstanding. It was evident that settings have the monitoring and filtering systems in place however having a policy which is appropriate and regularly reviewed and undertaking an audit remained areas for development and were seen as actions. **See identified action 1.3.**

4) Child Protection Procedures (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 – RI %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
The School has systems in place to identify children who would benefit from early help or additional services at the earliest opportunity in order to prevent issues escalating.	28	69	3	0	-1
There are effective and prompt systems for referring safeguarding concerns about children to the DSL and to relevant agencies.	38	61	1	0	=
The school plays an active role in multi-agency working to safeguard children.	33	64	3	0	-1
School staff carry out the actions attributed to them in any Child Protection, Child in Need and Early Help Assessment Plans.	31	68	1	0	+1
Has appropriate safeguarding responses to children who are persistently absent from school, go missing from education.	28	68	4	0	+1
In line with learning from NSCP serious case reviews, DSLs know what action to when there is professional disagreement about how to safeguard a child.	23	73	4	0	+1
The school or college knows who it cohort of children who have or have had a social worker are.	28	69	3	0	New field

Commentary:

A number of submissions were able to state that at least one DSL had attended Early Help Assessment Plan (EHAP) training and for some settings multiple staff had accessed this training. In the best examples the setting had described their early help offer available to children and families.

A significant number of submissions noted that they had staff trained in specific areas such as bereavement, domestic abuse, and mental health to support pupils and families.

Submissions stated that contact details for the Children's Advice and Duty Service are available to staff in a variety of places including toilets, staff room and offices.

Settings with paper-based recording systems stated that Cause for Concern forms were available to staff in numerous places such as offices, the staffroom and classrooms. The majority of education settings stated they use electronic systems to record concerns and staff had undergone training in order to have confidence in how to raise a concern to DSLs. This concurs with the audit work undertaken by the Advisers in the Education Safeguarding Team. However, it is clear that electronic systems are not always fully utilised for analysing concerns.

Submissions noted that DSLs attend strategy discussions, conferences and multi-agency meetings. DSLs have gained an understanding of the Signs of Safety approach through their DSL training but more specifically through the NSCP multi-agency 2-day training course.

Submissions described how children are spoken with prior to meetings or conferences to ensure their voice is heard. Settings named the Signs of Safety Three Houses approach as the most common tool used but many submissions stated a number of other tools and strategies according to the child's individual needs and age. Best practice identified a staff having 'caseload' of pupils who are regularly seen for 1:1 work whether they are subject to a multi-agency plan or not.

Submissions stated that reports are submitted to the governing board and/or Trust on at least an annual basis with some settings submitting reports more frequently to evidence activity such as the number of pupils under multi-agency plans, number of meetings attended, and the calls made to CADS.

Submissions stated that DSLs are made aware of the contents of multi-agency plans either through attending the specific meetings or shared through DSL meetings.

Settings made clear that they follow the Local Authority CME procedures when taking a pupil off roll. Data from the CME Team from 01/09/2020 – 29/05/2021 demonstrated a 91% compliance rate. It was stated that attendance of pupils is reviewed regularly, the frequency determined by the settings from weekly to half termly. Submissions outlined a number of strategies in place to tackle pupil absence including first day calling, support panel meetings, fast track meetings and Fixed Penalty Notices. During the time of partial school closures, the LA Attendance Team worked with schools and allocated social workers to track the attendance of vulnerable children receiving the support of a social worker to ensure they were attending education setting wherever possible.

Submissions indicated that DSLs were aware of the [NSCP Resolving Professional Disagreements Policy](#) but only a small number stated that had to use it in practice. From scrutinising the Advice Log kept by the Education Safeguarding Team it was evident that there were 11 cases where schools were advised to use or had used the Resolving Professional Disagreements Policy during Academic Year 2021-2022.

Education settings are now routinely invited to Joint Agency Group Supervision (JAGS) which provide a mechanism to reflect on cases including but not limited to those which are very complex, feel 'stuck', or are drifting. Joint supervision provides a reflective space for joint analysis of assessment information, an opportunity to explore what professionals know about the lived experience of the child and should help strengthen the relationship between professionals who are working together with families to secure the best outcomes for children. The procedure for JAGS is promoted in DSL training.

A new field added for 2022 was for education settings to know who its cohort of children who have or have had a social worker are. Only 3% of settings rated this as requiring improvement. The Vulnerable Pupil Attendance List has been provided to education settings since the first period of partial school closures due to Covid-19. DSLs have expressed the importance of receiving this information so they can support children and families effectively.

5) Child Protection Record Keeping and Monitoring (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
Have systems in place for recording concerns about the welfare, safety or behaviour of a child.	42	57	1	0	=
Stores records of child protection concerns appropriately.	48	52	0	0	-1
Child protection concerns are monitored and followed-up in a timely manner.	32	66	2	0	+1
There is a named child protection file for each child there is a cause for a concern for.	32	61	7	< 1	-4
File will have an up to date chronology of significant events and documents included on the file.	38	60	2	0	=
Hand written notes are signed and dated to include year, position of author and person the information is being passed to.	38	61	1	0	=
All records including reports and referrals will be valid, useful and factual.	34	64	2	0	=
Will pass all child protection and safeguarding information on to the subsequent school.	35	62	2	0	=

Commentary:

Overall settings have reported positively in this area and six out of the eight areas had equal or improved responses from the previous round of submissions. From the commentary in submissions, it is evident that the use of electronic systems has continued to support practice as they provide the facility for all DSLs to be made aware of concerns when they are raised and supports communication to identify actions and follow-up. An electronic system also means oversight of cases can happen more easily, including when DSLs are not on site.

The importance of accurate record keeping, monitoring concerns, and passing on relevant information are key themes in both whole-school and DSL training. Submissions recorded that files or electronic logs included all relevant information including contemporaneous notes, e-mail, logs of telephone calls and all relevant reports and minutes.

On analysis of the submissions which identified storing records of child protection concerns as an area requiring improvement, it was clear this is in relation to auditing files, whether this be more frequently, in a more formalised way or keeping a record of this activity. The Education Safeguarding Team have produced [guidance on child protection record keeping](#) which includes a template for an audit tool which DSLs can use to quality assure records and supports reflective safeguarding practice. In audit work undertaken by the Advisers in the Education Safeguarding Team, management oversight and identifying areas of strength and where improvements need to be made is not always a routine part of practice. A [record keeping webinar](#) was delivered in May 2022 to support DSLs understand the importance of quality assuring child protection records, reflecting on current practice and identifying next steps.

In examples of best practice, the requirements for recording concerns are communicated through induction and training is given in using the electronic recording system. The submissions indicate that paper files are held securely, whether this is the current system or the archived files prior to using the electronic system.

The other submissions stating 'requires improvement' across a number of the measures in this area came from different settings related to moving from a paper to electronic systems and therefore ensuring this is smooth and efficient, reminding staff that any handwritten notes should be signed and dated, ensuring staff record concerns comprehensively and two settings identified ongoing work with staff about opinions being clearly identified when concerns are recorded.

Areas of good practice included:

- Clear messages through training and induction that safeguarding is the responsibility of every member of staff and volunteers and the processes for reporting concerns.

- Encouragement to pass on any concern; no concern is too small to be considered.
- Feedback is routinely given to staff who report a concern and encouragement to re-report if any further concerns arise.

The majority of settings stated that an overview of cases is kept and that there are DSL meetings held to review cases of concern. These meetings take place at different timeframes depending on the setting with a number meeting on a weekly basis. Some submissions stated that external scrutiny of practice is also in place from the Academy Trust. Submissions stated that they would follow up on concerns raised by speaking with parents or carers, undertaking wishes and feelings with the child and informing other staff as appropriate.

In line with statutory guidance, it is the responsibility of a school to pass on safeguarding information to the receiving school when a child moves. If the same electronic system is used this transfer can happen electronically between schools. If electronic systems are not compatible or the receiving school does not record concerns electronically then schools explained that records are printed and sent with the LA transfer template. The pupil can then be archived on the electronic system.

6) Use of External Providers (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 – Outstanding %	2 – Good %	3 – Requires Improvement %	4- Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
The school seeks assurance from all providers of work-based placements, alternative provision placements, after-school services or activities, if they are provided separately by another body, that the body concerned has appropriate policies and procedures in place for safeguarding children and child protection; there are arrangements to liaise with the provider on these matters where appropriate.	24	72	4	0	-1
When commissioning a service e.g. when contracting out catering, cleaning or maintenance, there are robust mechanisms in place to ensure that these organisations have appropriate policies and procedures in place for safeguarding children and child protection.	26	72	2	0	=
When hiring or renting out school or college facilities/premises to organisations or individuals, they should ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place to keep children safe.	22	72	5	< 1	New field

Commentary:

Submissions demonstrated that education settings understood what information they should gain in respect of supply staff and contractors.

Submissions stated that supply agencies provide information regarding safer recruitment checks undertaken on their staff. In relation to students and those on work experience, the submissions indicate liaison with school, college or university takes place in relation to appropriate checks.

Where contractors are used for cleaning and catering, schools stated that these staff are invited to annual safeguarding training delivered by the school. For other contractors such as those coming to undertake work on site, submissions stated that, where possible, this work is completed outside of school hours. Most submissions stated that written confirmation is sought from the employer that all relevant safer recruitment checks have been undertaken and that identification is checked on arrival. All contractors have to sign in, some settings stated that contractors are given a different colour badge or lanyard to ensure these people are identified easily by staff and children.

Those settings part of multi-academy trusts often stated that the Trust is responsible for sourcing contractors and/or the Trust have an approved list of contractors that are used.

In a small number of submissions there was an action to ensure the setting had the appropriate level of information when hiring or renting out facilities/premises to organisations or individuals.

7) Training & Induction

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
All staff receive a safeguarding induction.	37	61	2	0	-1
The DSL and deputy DSLs have received suitable training in line with national and local requirements.	27	67	5	< 1	=
In addition to formal training, DSL knowledge and skills are updated at regular intervals, to keep up with any developments relevant to their role.	26	72	2	0	+3
All members of staff receive regular training in line with national and local requirements.	29	67	4	0	-2
In addition to training, all staff should receive regular safeguarding updates to provide them with relevant skills and knowledge to safeguard children effectively.	25	69	6	0	=
The Governing Body has received suitable safeguarding training.	17	72	10	< 1	-2
Inform the Governing Body of updated training.	22	73	5	0	+1

Commentary:

It is a statutory requirement that safeguarding training is accessed by the DSL every two years. The local requirement is that all DSLs attend a multi-agency training course one every 3 years (delivered by the NSCP) and one DSL per setting attends Early Help Assessment Plan (EHAP) training (recommended every 2 years). For the 5% of settings requiring improvement in the area relating to DSLs having received suitable training in line with national and local requirements, the submissions stated this was in relation to member(s) of the DSL Team requiring either multi-agency and/or EHAP training. A number of submissions included a table of training requirements for DSLs.

Following analysis of evaluations from DSL training it was evident that staff (particularly those attending the 2-day course) would have preferred attending face-to-face. The Education Safeguarding Team have therefore been delivering this course in person since February 2022. Virtual delivery will continue for the 3-hour DSL update course and the learning activities have been devised carefully to allow delegates to spend time in breakout rooms to discuss, share and reflect upon implications for practice.

It is a requirement that safeguarding training is provided to all staff annually. The LA provides whole-school training materials and the evidence from submissions indicate that schools continue to make use of these resources. For academic year 2022-

2023, following feedback from Headteachers, a narrated PowerPoint has been developed for delivery of the whole school training package.

It is essential that education settings can evidence the safeguarding training received by staff and that safeguarding information is regularly shared with volunteers, parents and pupils. The submissions indicate that settings have sought to do so through creating a central body of evidence (this could be held electronically or on paper) including the use of training logs and of certification for external courses. In a number of submissions, regular updates were given to all staff through discussions at briefings or meetings, dissemination of a newsletter or bulletins, or through emailing information. However, this area was identified for a small number of settings as an area for improvement.

Thematic webinars which started during the first Covid-19 lockdown in March 2020 continue to run. These continue to be delivered by a range of professionals including Children's Services, voluntary section organisations, and Health colleagues. Themes have included domestic abuse, honour-based abuse, exploitation, engaging fathers and record keeping. The webinars have given DSLs a time to reflect upon their practice, update their knowledge and skills, understand the support on offer across Norfolk and gain key contacts from a variety of different agencies which they can refer to in order to support the children in their settings. Due to the level of engagement from DSLs the webinars are continuing in academic year 2022-2023.

Some submissions talked about a plan for training throughout the academic year which could be using the Norfolk modules. There remains limited commentary related to the impact the training had on safeguarding practice. Analysis of training evaluations and following up with staff (through a questionnaire or potentially face-to-face questions) sometime after the training sessions is key to assess knowledge and understanding the impact of training on practice. It is also important that DSLs use this information to inform future opportunities for safeguarding CPD.

Submissions recorded that visitors are given key safeguarding information on arrival to the school, often through a leaflet or poster. Information related to safeguarding and specifically the DSLs could also be found on the back of lanyards. Information given to contractors, supply staff and volunteers varied. Some schools give a full induction (as per a staff member) to volunteers and long-term supply. Others stated they gave the leaflet, and a DSL had a brief conversation regarding procedures for recording and reporting concerns. It is crucial that the different groups are given an induction appropriate to their role and the level of contact with children.

DSLs update their knowledge through:

- DSL Network meetings
- MI sheets
- Attending or feedback from the Local Safeguarding Children Group
- Subscribe to the NSPCC bulletin
- Safeguarding Team's Twitter feed
- Information received from their Academy Trust
- Safeguarding Team's newsletter
- DSL webinars

Governor Training

'Keeping Children Safe in Education' makes clear that governing boards should receive training that is appropriate to their role and supports them to fulfil their safeguarding functions. Relevant training is available from Norfolk Governor Services, and this now includes a narrated PowerPoint which boards can complete together using the reflective questions and the opportunity to produce an action plan in regard to next steps. Training should be utilised by those schools identifying this as an area for development which was the case for 10% of the submissions.

8) Safer Selection and Recruitment (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
The School has a written recruitment and selection policy that comply with local and national guidance.	32	63	4	1	-2
The Headteacher and at least one governor have completed accredited Safer Recruitment Training.	38	59	1	< 1	-1
Will expect a completed application form to be returned for every available position in school.	46	54	0	0	=
Shortlists against agreed criteria.	38	61	1	0	=
Will always request references and ensure at least one is a current or most recent employer.	35	61	4	0	-3
Will not accept testimonials brought to interview.	51	49	0	0	=
Requests that professional and/or academic qualifications are brought to interview.	37	60	3	0	+1
Will always question gaps in employment history	42	57	1	0	-1
All candidates will be made aware prior to short listed that a satisfactory enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service check with Barred List check will be required.	45	55	0	0	=
All relevant adults are included on the SCR.	41	57	2	0	=
All required checks are evidenced on the SCR.	39	59	2	< 1	-1
Supporting evidence has been retained by the school.	37	58	3	0	-1
The school has obtained relevant information from staff working in childcare in line with Disqualification under the Childcare Act 2006.	40	59	< 1	0	+1
There are robust procedures in place when using agency and third party supply staff	35	65	2	< 1	New field
There are robust procedures in place for monitoring the SCR	32	65	3	0	+4

Commentary:

Statutory guidance and research highlights the necessity for education settings to establish robust safer recruitment practices to deter, reject and identify people who might pose a risk to children or are unsuitable to working with them. Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of all children must be an integral part of all recruitment and selection processes in Norfolk schools and colleges. The Local Authority provides both training, advice, and information to education settings to support

practice in this area and it is evident from the commentary provided that settings are utilising this. Submissions stated that they either used the LA model Recruitment and Selection policy or a version written by their Academy Trust. A small proportion (5%) of settings identified this area as an action.

The vast majority of settings considered they were good or better at accessing appropriate safer recruitment training with a number going beyond the requirements by having DSLs, senior leaders and administrative staff trained and often more than one governor.

Settings made clear in submissions that they follow shortlisting against an agreed criterion, always requesting references and not accepting testimonials. It was noted that evidence of qualifications are required to be brought to interview and standard practice are that job advertisements make clear that posts will be subject to safer recruitment checks including DBS.

The maintenance of a Single Central Record (SCR) of all safer recruitment checks is a statutory requirement for education settings. A LA template SCR and associated guidance is available on the Norfolk Schools and Learning Providers website and a course specifically about maintaining and monitoring the SCR is delivered by the Education Safeguarding Team. In a significant number of submissions it was noted that personnel files had been audited either by staff or the academy trust. In the 3% of settings stating this area required improvement, the vast majority related to staff undertaking an audit of the files.

With regards to monitoring the SCR, the vast majority of settings rated this area as good or better with best practice examples highlighting that the record is checked at regular intervals by the Headteacher and/or named governor and compliance in this area is reported to the Governing Board. Although this practice is seen during audits, it is crucial that the person undertaking the monitoring has a sound knowledge and understanding of the different safer recruitment checks and the roles these to be undertaken on. The SCR training mentioned above is available to governors and those academy trust staff who undertake this task to supporting monitoring and evaluation to be effective.

9) Safer Working Practice for all Staff for the Protection of Children (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	1 - Outstanding %	2 - Good %	3 - Requires improvement %	4 - Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
Will have regard to 'Guidance for safer working practice for those working with children and young people in education settings'	24	69	7	< 1	- 1
Will have guidance for managing low-level concerns and allegations against staff members including the Headteacher, supply staff and contractors in line with national and local requirements.	27	72	2	0	Amended field to include low level concerns
All staff are aware of the school's Whistle Blowing policy and are given a copy upon appointment.	31	66	3	0	- 1
Has processes in place for continuous vigilance, and maintaining an environment that deters and prevents abuse and challenges inappropriate behaviour.	31	68	1	0	New field
All allegations of abuse are reported and responded to appropriately.	29	70	1	0	- 1

Commentary:

Beyond the safer recruitment of staff and volunteers, it is essential that settings embed and, where necessary, enforce a culture of safer working practice and ongoing vigilance by clearly communicating expectations about staff behaviour and procedures for reporting concerns in induction and training.

In accordance with '[Keeping Children Safe in Education](#)', governing boards should ensure that a staff behaviour policy (code of conduct) is in place and provided to all staff at induction. A large proportion of schools issue a copy of '[Guidance for Safer Working Practice for those working with children and young people in education settings](#)' (2022) to staff at induction and then annually as part of safeguarding training. Some settings choose to adopt this guidance in its entirety as the staff Code of Conduct. Some education settings identified the need to improve practice by asking staff to sign and acknowledge receipt of the document.

In addition to communicating procedures for whistleblowing and managing allegations and concerns against staff in training, the majority of settings provided evidence to indicate that this advice is easily accessible for staff at all times e.g., on display in staff rooms and/or available electronically so that staff can access this information in a confidential manner (this included the NSPCC Whistleblowing number). A number of schools submitted evidence to suggest that they have responded to concerns in line with procedures by contacting the LA Education Duty Line for advice and support.

10. Understanding and managing disclosures of sexual violence and harassment (NEW SECTION 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	Outstanding %	Good %	R.I %	Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
Has procedures in place to respond to and manage a report.	19	68	13	0	New field
Understand the importance of implementing appropriate risk assessments.	17	75	8	0	New field
Has procedures in place to support the victim and perpetrator.	20	76	4	0	New field

Commentary:

[‘Keeping Children Safe in Education’](#) makes clear that if education settings do not recognise, acknowledge or understand the scale of harassment and abuse and/or they downplay it, this can lead to a culture of unacceptable behaviour and an unsafe environment.

Due to the significant focus on this area, a specific section was added to the self-review in order for settings to reflect on their practice. It is therefore not possible to compare the findings to previous audits, but it is evident that some education settings still need support in how to manage incidents of this nature (13% of settings rated as requiring improvement). It cannot be underestimated how complex the situations are to manage often requiring difficult professional decisions to be made, particularly if the ‘victim’ and ‘perpetrators(s)’ attend the same setting and maybe in the same year group/lessons. As the guidance states *‘pre-planning, effective training and effective policies will provide schools and colleges with the foundation for a calm, considered and appropriate response to any report.’*

Following the publication of the Ofsted thematic review of sexual abuse in schools and colleges in June 2021 and in order to support education settings, the thematic module of training on Harmful Sexual Behaviour was updated. Also, a series of thematic webinars related to sexual violence and harassment were delivered in Autumn 2021 by the Senior Adviser, Safeguarding, Harmful Sexual Behaviour Team and colleagues from Learning and Inclusion. A guidance document [‘Tackling Sexual Violence and Harassment in Education Settings’](#) was also produced to support

settings in reviewing their practice and identifying any actions needed. 8% of submissions stated that they required improvement in implementing appropriate risk assessments and there is a [template tool](#) available for this purpose.

Bystander Intervention Programme

This programme's main objective is to reduce the number of incidents of sexual harassment and violence in Norfolk's schools and colleges by training children and young people to become Active Bystanders who can safely intervene to prevent such incidents. It has been designed to ensure a 'whole school' approach which enables education settings to involve all staff and students in tackling the issue and embed the programme into the school/college curriculum.

The programme is free of charge and includes:

- Staff/student surveys (these are anonymous and analysed by the Education Co-ordinator)
- Staff CPD – 'Challenging Sexist Language and Sexism' (the Education Co-ordinator trains the trainers)
- Lessons and lesson plans (for KS2/3/4/5)
- Advice on safeguarding and behavioural policies
- Evaluation Impact reports
-

The programme has been available to education settings since June 2022 and currently 87 schools/colleges have enrolled in the programme and the feedback is extremely positive. Approximately 6000 students have received the lessons and been trained to become Active Bystanders and over 1100 members of staff have received the staff continuous professional development.

11. Understanding child abuse and exploitation, signs, symptoms and categories (REVISED for 2022)

The table below shows the overall % ratings provided for this area of practice:

SEF measure name	Outstanding %	Good %	R.I %	Inadequate %	% shift of schools grading themselves Outstanding (1) or Good (2) from 2019-2020 Audit
All staff can describe and explain the categories of abuse.	29	68	3	0	-2
Staff can identify the signs and symptoms of the abuse.	25	72	3	0	-1
Are aware that domestic violence is a cause for concern.	17	69	14	0	Amended field
Can describe and explain what Child Exploitation is and know what to do.	16	74	9	0	Amended field
Are aware of the signs and indicators of So called honour-based abuse and understand the mandatory reporting requirements for teaching staff.	18	77	5	0	Amended field
Staff are alert to the possibility of fabricated or induced illness	15	76	9	0	-6
Staff will consider whether children who are young carers have a right to additional support services	13	77	8	< 1	-2
Staff can describe and explain what constitutes a private fostering arrangement	10	76	13	< 1	+3
Preventing Extremism & Radicalisation	14	80	6	0	-2
Neglect	21	75	3	0	+4
Mental Health	23	69	8	0	New field

Commentary:

All staff in education settings play a vital role in helping to identify concerns about child abuse, exploitation, radicalisation and neglect at an early stage. It is evident that this knowledge continues to be developed through appropriate and regular staff training and access to LA guidance.

As in previous audits, the majority of settings graded themselves good or better for recognising the signs of abuse and understanding the categories of abuse and harm. However, it is evident that some settings felt less confident about staff recognition of some types of abuse such as child criminal exploitation and also private fostering (which was also recognised as an area in the previous audit).

Knowledge of fabricated or induced illness was identified as requiring improvement in 9% of submissions as was young carers (8%). Settings indicated that they wanted to do more work in this area to support children who are young carers, and some talked about wanting to gain the Carer Friendly Tick Award. **See identified actions 1.1. and 1.2.** In terms of Young Carers, the Education Safeguarding Team have promoted the Young Carers Challenge when from Spring 2023 young carers are for the first time to be included on the school census return. The Challenge includes having a 'champion,' a policy and knowing who the young carers are so they can be supported appropriately.

In terms of Domestic Abuse 14% of submissions stated this was an area requiring improvement. This was an interesting finding as 98% of settings in Norfolk are signed up to receive electronic notifications via Operation Encompass. This means that education settings are made aware of domestic abuse incidents which have been reported to the police so appropriate support can be put in place for the child and family. The action from this for some settings was to train or train an additional domestic abuse champion.

Exploitation

The LA has continued to work with the St Giles Trust to offer support for schools in the form of a presentation to pupils related to CCE, awareness raising through webinars for professionals and for targeted settings work with individual pupils. Contextual Safeguarding Mapping meetings have been instigated by Children's Social Care and DSLs from education settings have been invited if a pupil on their role is due to be discussed.

The LA has initiated a termly exploitation network for schools and colleges with the support of Children's Services exploitation specialist teams. The network sessions have focussed on the current child exploitation trends across Norfolk, briefings from specialist teams and reflective learning opportunities for DSLs.

A tackling child exploitation toolkit for schools and colleges has been developed with feedback from DSLs and specialist teams and will be published on the Education Safeguarding Team webpages and the Inclusion Team are developing RSHE webinars to support schools' opportunities to teach about safeguarding as part of their preventative work.

Schools and colleges have been supported to participate in contextual safeguarding mapping meetings focussed on locations of concern or to explore links between specific groups of exploited children who are on roll of the school or college. School specific mappings have taken place with the Targeted Youth Service where DSLs have identified concerns and requested support and Joint Agency Group Supervision is being used regularly by education settings with multi-agency partners in complex child exploitation cases.