

Consultation questionnaire

Joint targeted area inspections

This is a joint consultation by:

- Office for Standards in Education Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted)
- The Care Quality Commission (CQC)
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC)
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMI Probation)

This questionnaire provides a summary of our proposals. It should be read alongside the full consultation document, which can be found here:

www.gov.uk/government/consultations/joint-targeted-area-inspections

We are seeking the widest possible range of views from those who have an interest in, or expertise relating to the protection of children. We particularly want to hear from people who work within local multi-agency arrangements to protect children.

The closing date for the consultation is 11 August 2015

If you would like a version of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231 or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk



Corporate member of
Plain English Campaign
Committed to clearer communication

361

Responding to this consultation

The consultation will be open until 11 August 2015.

There are three ways of completing and submitting your response:

- Complete the online questionnaire: www.surveymonkey.com/r/JTAI
- Download this document from: www.gov.uk/government/consultations/joint-targeted-area-inspections complete it on your computer and email it to socialcare@ofsted.gov.uk with the consultation name – Joint Targeted Area Inspection – in the subject line
- Print this document, complete it by hand and post it to

Social Care Policy Team
Ofsted
Aviation House
125 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6SE

This questionnaire provides a summary of our proposals. It should be read alongside the full consultation document, which can be found here: www.gov.uk/government/consultations/joint-targeted-area-inspections

Confidentiality

The information you provide will be held by us. It will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research to help us to become more effective, shape policies and inform inspection practice.

We will treat your identity in confidence if you disclose it to us. However, we may publish an organisation's views.

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation or as an individual?

Individual response	<input type="checkbox"/>
On behalf of an organisation, please specify The Who Cares? Trust	

Do you work in any of the following areas?

Social care	<input type="checkbox"/>	Education	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Policing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Probation services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Youth offending team	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community rehabilitation company	<input type="checkbox"/>	For a charity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
For a voluntary sector organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local safeguarding children board	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of these	
Other (please tell us)			

I am a:

local authority Director of Children's Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	local authority Chief Executive	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local Safeguarding Children Board Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other local authority director or assistant director	<input type="checkbox"/>
practitioner in education	<input type="checkbox"/>	senior manager in education	<input type="checkbox"/>
practitioner in social care	<input type="checkbox"/>	senior manager in social care	<input type="checkbox"/>
General practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	other primary care professional	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other practitioner in health	<input type="checkbox"/>	other senior manager in health	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police and Crime Commissioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	Police Officer/staff – Child Protection Specialist role	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police Officer/staff – other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Senior Police Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
YOT practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	YOT manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRC practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	CRC manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
NPS practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	NPS manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lawyer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Elected representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
Child or young person	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parent/carer	<input type="checkbox"/>
No / Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other (please tell us) Policy & Research Advisor			

The scope of the inspection

See paragraphs 11–14 of the consultation document for full details on this proposal.

Summary of the proposal

We propose that the joint targeted area inspections will have a tightly defined scope focusing on areas likely to add value for the local partnership. We will evaluate the effectiveness of multi-agency practice to protect children. We also want to include some flexibility within the scope so that we have in place a joint published framework that will allow us to respond, through a 'deep dive' aspect of the inspection, to specific areas of interest or concerns that may arise.

For the period between October 2015 and March 2016, we propose that the deep dive aspect of the inspections is focused on children and young people at risk of sexual exploitation and those missing from home, school or care.

1. Do you agree that the joint targeted area inspections can best help the local partnership to improve by focusing on:
- the multi-agency response to all forms of abuse and neglect at the point of identification, referral/notification?

Yes	No	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- the quality and impact of assessment and decision making in response to referrals?

Yes	No	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- the leadership and management of this work and the effectiveness of the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) in these areas?

Yes	No	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Do you agree that the deep dive aspect of inspections between October 2015 and March 2016 should be the experiences of children at risk of sexual exploitation and those missing from home, school or care?

Yes	No	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Notice period and duration of fieldwork

See paragraphs 15–16 of the consultation document for full details on this proposal.

Summary of the proposal

The inspection fieldwork will be contained within one week (Monday to Friday). We propose to notify the local partnership eight working days before the start of the inspection. To reflect the joint nature of the inspection, we propose to contact the chair of the LSCB first. Each inspectorate will contact each agency's senior leader immediately after we notify the chair of the LSCB.

We will ask the local area to undertake a joint audit of a small number of children's cases during the short notice period. The cases will be associated with the deep dive aspect of the inspection.

3. Should the chair of the LSCB be the first person we notify of the inspection?

Yes	No	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you have answered 'No', please tell us who you think we should notify first.

4. How many children's cases could the local partnership jointly audit in the eight working days before inspectors arrive in the local area?

5 cases or fewer	6 to 10 cases	More than 10 cases	None, it is not possible to jointly audit cases in eight days
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Inspection methodology

See paragraphs 17–22 of the consultation document for full details on this proposal.

Summary of the proposal

Our experience of joint inspection tells us that setting up the inspection jointly is a vital first step to its smooth operation. We propose to use the short notice period to arrange a joint set-up meeting of all local senior agency leaders on the first day of the inspection. A representative of each of the inspectorates will attend to ensure that all parties have a shared understanding of how we will conduct the inspection

We also think joint feedback is the best way to help the local agencies understand what inspectors have found. We propose a single meeting of the joint inspection team and all local senior leaders on the final day of the inspection. The inspection team will set out the key findings, including strengths and areas for improvement/recommendations that will appear in the report and the evidence that supports the findings

5. Is it feasible (with eight days' notice) to organise a joint set-up meeting on the first day of the inspection that brings together all the inspectorates and all the local service leaders?

Yes, this is achievable with eight days' notice	No, this is not achievable with eight days' notice	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

6. Is a joint feedback meeting that involves all inspectorates and service leaders the best way to help local agencies understand the findings of the inspection or should each local agency meet with the relevant Inspectorate separately so they can focus on their part of the service?

All local agencies should hear the findings together at a joint feedback meeting	Each local agency should receive feedback from the relevant inspectorate separately	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reporting the inspection outcome

See paragraphs 23–27 of the consultation document for full details on this proposal.

Summary of the proposal

We propose to set out our inspection findings in a published letter to the chair of the LSCB and senior agency leaders responsible for the agencies inspected that make up the local partnership. The letter will set out the key strengths and recommendations for the partnership or a particular agency but will not make a graded judgement.

We are interested to hear whether we should present recommendations arising from joint inspections as a single list without any indication of priority or whether it would be more helpful to separate them out into ‘areas for priority (or urgent) action’ and ‘areas for development/improvement’.

An area for priority or urgent action would be an indicator of concern about something the local area must do as opposed to an area for development, which the area can improve on. We think this is the most effective way to indicate concern in a report that does not have graded judgements.

We propose to send the draft report to the chair of the LSCB to co-ordinate a single factual accuracy response on behalf of the local partnership.

7. Should the report list the recommendations without any indication of priority or should it indicate which issues need urgent or priority attention?

Without prioritisation	Indicate which issues need priority/urgent action	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Should each agency and the chair of the LSCB be asked to comment on the factual accuracy of the draft report separately or should the chair of the LSCB be asked to coordinate a single joint response?

A single joint response coordinated by the chair of the LSCB	Separate responses from each agency and the chair of the LSCB	Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Identifying areas of good or best practice

See paragraphs 29–30 of the consultation document for full details on this proposal.

Summary of the proposal

For each of the inspectorates, the most reliable source of information about practice is their most recent inspection report. We are very interested in your views on what factors we should consider when identifying areas demonstrating good practice we could inspect. This will help our decision making on selecting geographical areas to inspect as part of the programme so that we can share this good practice more widely.

9. Please give us your views on how the inspectorates can identify areas where good or best practice exists.

Children and young people who are being or have been cared for by the local authority, or have experienced the issues that are being inspected by the inspectorates, will be able to identify where their experiences have been good or bad. We therefore suggest that Ofsted engages with children and young people more widely, both in general and during inspections in order, to seek their views on their experiences (and inform them about different ways they can be involved in Ofsted inspections).

Ofsted’s proposals for a single agency inspection

See paragraphs 31–34 of the consultation document for full details on this proposal.

Summary of the proposal

Ofsted is confident that the scope of the joint targeted area inspections will provide effective assurance about decision making and assessment in child protection and will give the opportunity to look closer into a specific service or the experiences of a specific group of children and young people. Ofsted would therefore like to use the framework to evaluate local authority performance as a single agency exercise.

- 10. Could Ofsted use the joint targeted inspection model to undertake a single agency targeted area inspection of the local authority and LSCB where concerns are identified?

Yes, Ofsted could use the joint inspection model for single agency targeted area inspection	No, Ofsted should use their current full single inspection framework only which is specific to local authorities and LSCBs.	Don’t know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 11. If you have any further comments about Ofsted using the joint framework for single agency inspection please tell us what these are:

We do not think that it is possible to comment on whether Ofsted could use the joint framework for single agency inspection without more information about the framework.

Regardless of whichever framework is used, Ofsted must ensure that the framework allows for children and young people to contribute their views meaningfully. One of our concerns with the proposal of the framework for joint targeted area inspections (and therefore possibly its use as a single agency exercise) is the impact that the short notice and inspection period will have on the ability of Ofsted (and other agencies) to engage with children and young people. Case tracking and case sampling alone does not allow agencies to inspect the experiences and outcomes of the young people who have received the services being inspected. In addition, it is not sufficient to rely solely on the views and

experiences of the young people who are being case tracked, as their experiences may not be representative of the service or other young people in the area. "How do you know if a young person is confident if you don't ask them? Just because you are doing positive things doesn't mean you are feeling positive. Social workers can use examples to show someone's confident but it can be misunderstood." (Young person, as part of a consultation session run by The Who Cares? Trust in 2013 about the joint inspection framework).

Spending such a short time in the local authority does not allow for young people to be meaningfully consulted, and may result in only young people who are suggested by the local authority to be put forward for consultation with the inspectorates. When The Who Cares? Trust has consulted with young people in the past about Ofsted inspections, young people have been suspicious that local authorities will only contact the young people who they know will give them a 'good review'. They have suggested speaking to the Children in Care Council (CICC), but stressed the importance of speaking to other less engaged young people, for example suggesting that the inspectors also say "we would like to hear from the young people who don't attend CICC." Young people that we have spoken to have also said that technology is important to engage with young people who are living out of authority.

We therefore suggest that for these inspections, Ofsted and the other agencies should ensure that young people are able to contribute their views in a number of ways, for example via email and through drop in sessions. All children and young people should be informed that the local authority is being inspected and how to give their views, with specific efforts made to seek the views of children and young people who are living out of authority, or who may not be engaged with the activities of the local authority. Young people in 2014, as part of the integrated inspections framework consultation, suggested that it "should be one person's job to speak to children and young people, then come together and check it matches with what managers and other have said."

What did you think of this consultation?

Thank you for taking part in our consultation.

Please tell us what you thought of this consultation. Your views will help us to improve our consultations.

12. How did you hear about this consultation?

- from Ofsted
- from CQC
- from HMI Constabulary
- from HMI Probation
- Other (please specify)

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know
I found the consultation information clear and easy to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I found the consultation easy to find.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had enough information about the consultation topic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would take part in a future consultation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Is there anything you would like us to improve on or do differently for future consultations? If so, please tell us below.

There was limited opportunity to explain answers. For many of the answers, we would have liked to have provided an explanation, or raise concerns or queries but have been unable to. Four weeks (particularly over the summer) is not sufficient time to consult with young people. Ideally we need 12 weeks to consult meaningfully with young people. This is also because there is no young person friendly version of the consultation documents and we would like to see this produced. In addition, locking the document makes responding difficult. It makes spell checking difficult and not all boxes expand.

Additional questions about you

Your answers to the following questions will help us to evaluate how successfully we are gathering views from all sections of society. We would like to assure you that all responses are anonymous and you do not have to answer every question.

Please tick the appropriate box.

Gender

Female <input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------	-------------------------------

Age

Under 14 <input type="checkbox"/>	14–18 <input type="checkbox"/>	19–24 <input type="checkbox"/>	25–34 <input type="checkbox"/>	35–44 <input type="checkbox"/>	45–54 <input type="checkbox"/>	55–64 <input type="checkbox"/>	65+ <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

Ethnic origin

(a) How would you describe your national group?

- British or mixed British
- English
- Irish
- Northern Irish
- Scottish
- Welsh
- Other (specify if you wish)

(b) How would you describe your ethnic group?

Asian		Mixed ethnic origin	
Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Asian and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indian	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black African and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Caribbean and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other Asian background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other mixed ethnic background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Black		White	
African	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any White background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other ethnic background	
Any other Black background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chinese			
Any Chinese background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Sexual orientation

Heterosexual <input type="checkbox"/>	Lesbian <input type="checkbox"/>	Gay <input type="checkbox"/>	Bisexual <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Religion/belief

Buddhist	<input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christian	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sikh	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hindu	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other, please state:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jewish	<input type="checkbox"/>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>

Disability

Do you consider yourself to be disabled?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------