

# **Effective Child Protection**

## **Evaluation**

### **Project Performance Data**

**March 2022**

**Bruce Thornton**

**Consultant and trainer in social care**

**August 2022**

Extract from the Effective Child Protection Project Evaluation Full Report; sections introducing performance data and its analysis.

1: Introduction to datasets 1 and 2	Page 2
2: Datasets 1 and 2 (performance data)	Page 4
3: Data analysis	Page 6
4: Author of the report	Page 8
Appendix 1: Example of Monitoring Sheet used in Case conferences	Page 9

## 1 Introduction

There are two key datasets which have been used in this evaluation. These measure the factors (input or supportive interventions) that are considered key to monitoring the success factors related to Effective Child Protection. These are:

- Data set 1 (Diogelu 1): Quarterly returns regarding supervision of social work caseloads. This measures the use of Risk 1 Risk Screening in supervision. This relates to the Threshold element of Effective Child Protection. These are documents submitted by Team Managers to the Performance Officer confirming which children were screened during supervision. This provides the data for Diogelu 1 indicator. This has been collected over several years.
- Data set 1 (Diogelu 2): Monitoring reports are completed by Chairs of Initial and Review Case Conferences after each conference. Diogelu 2 checks the Chair's evaluation of the quality of the risk assessment (assessment of risk of significant harm). This has been collected over several years.
- Data set 2 (Qualitative) Monitoring reports completed by Chairs of Initial and Review Case Conferences. These collect a wide range of measures. This includes a range of qualitative measures related to the Conversations, Change and Measure element of Effective Child Protection. This has been collected more recently, for 2020/21 and 2021/22.
- Other data available but was not used: There is also data available for the numbers and registration categories of children on the Child Protection Register, however these are not considered sensitive enough to measure

### Data set 1 (Diogelu 1 and 2)

**Diogelu 1** is collected by getting sheets into the office after supervision from social workers/managers, confirming which of a caseload were considered for risk screening. The purpose of the data is to encourage compliance. It is a slightly dubious method as we can only collect those received and whilst we do follow up, it proves difficult to get the whole dataset of

supervisions in. It results in a slight 'halo bias.' Those who send in the sheet have done the risk screening as well. The out-turn has always been 100%.

**Diogelu 2** is collected by Chair in Case Conferences and is their opinion about the quality of the risk assessment. Its purpose was to see effect of the implementation in general of the Risk Model and use of R2 in Case Conference Reports. This has exceeded 95% consistently.

### Data set 2 (ECP Monitoring data)

More recently introduced and again part of the Chair's quality assurance role in Case Conferences. They fill in a Monitoring Report in each Case Conference. There is whole year data for year 1 COVID (2020/21) and performance quarter Q1-Q3 of 2021/22. I think it shows general improvement and consistency.

However, the ECP project has been implemented in stages. Initially, focussed on Meirion/Dwyfor then Derwen (children with disabilities) then 16+. Finally, the two Arfon Teams. Derwen and 16+ do very little CP work in comparison to Meirion/Dwyfor and Arfon. The Arfon teams are interesting, being a mix of lukewarm welcome to the project at the beginning and staffing turmoil in the later period. As such, the project was gearing up to engaging those Teams and gaining momentum as COVID happened.

We've also had the revolving 'CP Chair' effect as Sue Adams retired in Sept 2020 and Non Davies helped us as interim Chair until December 2021. Delyth Davies was appointed but not released from her IRO role fully until recently.

There are two detailed ECP Monitoring spreadsheets available that give a more granular breakdown of that data. In terms of how the project uses the data to manage the performance and implementation, we are very sighted on Diogelu 1 and 2 for several years. ECP Monitoring is less useful as a performance report. The detail leads to many questions. However, the effect of collecting the data is that it constantly draws the attention of the Chairs to what is considered important to be able to report on. Therefore, they will keep this foremost in mind. It enhances more than anything their governance effect on ECP matters in conferences and how they structure the discussions and challenge. That is the intention of the monitoring work; in addition, of course to provide some data for evaluation purposes.

Dafydd Paul  
Senior Manager Safeguarding  
16/02/2022

## 2 Data

### Data set 1

#### Diogelu 1

**Proportion of children discussed in supervision, where consideration was given to risk of significant harm (and the answer recorded)/ Cyfradd y plant a gafodd eu trafod mewn goruchwyliaeth, lle rhoddwyd ystyriaeth i niwed sylweddol (a'r ateb wedi ei gofnodi)**

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Yes	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### Diogelu 2

**Proportion of risk assessments presented to Case Conferences that were considered to indicate quality in decision making / Cyfradd yr asesiadau risg a gafodd eu cyflwyno i Gynadleddau Achos a oedd yn cael eu hystyried yn rhai a oedd yn dangos ansawdd wrth wneud penderfyniadau**

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Yes	96%	99%	99%	97%	99%
No	4%	1%	1%	3%	1%

### Data set 2 (Qualitative data)

Initial Case Conferences	2020/21	2021/22
	Yes	Yes
In the opinion of the Chairperson has the conference identified the change(s) that the child/family need(s) to make?	100%	94%
In the opinion of the Chairperson has the conference identified the 2 and 8 statements for each change?	86%	75%

In the opinion of the Chairperson had the conference worked in a collaborative way (for example, mutual respect, opportunity for all to contribute, constructive, recognition of family strengths)?	78%	67%
In the opinion of the Chairperson does the family/child understand the change (s) that need to happen?	75%	69%
In the opinion of the chairperson does the child/family understand their part in this work?	64%	62%
<b>Review Case Conferences</b>	2020/21	2021/22
	Yes	Yes
In the opinion of the Chairperson has the conference identified the change (s) that the child/family needs to make?	86%	90%
In the opinion of the Chairperson has the risk of significant harm been reduced since the last conference?	68%	66%
In the opinion of the Chairperson has the conference identified the 2 and 8 statements for each change?	75%	71%
In the opinion of the Chairperson had the conference worked in a collaborative way (for example, mutual respect, opportunity for all to contribute, constructive, recognition of family strengths)?	84%	87%
In the opinion of the chairperson does the child/family understand the change(s) that need to happen?	81%	86%
In the opinion of the chairperson does the child/family understand their part in this work?	77%	75%
In the opinion of the chairperson is the child/family working on the change as part of the Core Group?	76%	85%
In the opinion of the chairperson is the child/family fully and effectively included in the Core Group?	76%	85%

Progress checked in Review Case Conferences	2020/21	2021/22
	Yes	Yes
Has the Outcome/'Statement of change' <sup>1</sup> been recorded?	89%	98%
Score <sup>2</sup> has improved since previous conference - Arfon	66%	56%
Score has improved since previous conference - Dwyfor	70%	82%
Score has improved since previous conference - Meirionnydd	55%	67%
<i>For information – where the scores have not been filled in the Social Worker's Report to Case Conference</i>		
<i>Blanks (score not filled) - Dwyfor</i>	<i>26%</i>	<i>27%</i>
<i>Blanks (score not filled) - Meirionnydd</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>6%</i>
<i>Blanks (score not filled) - Arfon</i>	<i>17%</i>	<i>2%</i>

### 3 Data analysis

#### Analysis of the Gwynedd data sets

##### The Gwynedd data

The first data set identifies that in the period from 2017 to 2022, 100% of children were screened during supervision against the possibility of significant harm having occurred or being likely to occur. This is called Risk 1 or Risk Screening in the Risk Model. It is recorded by Social Workers and Team Manager. This indicates consistent use of Risk 1; the cornerstone of the Risk Model.

The second set of data identifies the proportion of risk assessments presented to Case Conferences between 2017 and 2022 that were considered by conference chairs to indicate quality in decision making. These ranged from 96% in 2017/18, 3 years at 99% with only 2019/20 falling to 97%. This was despite the Covid epidemic and its implications. This is the use of Stage 2 Risk Assessment to inform Social Work Reports to Case Conference. It is

<sup>1</sup>The 'Statement of change' is what needs to change to keep the child safe.

<sup>2</sup>'Score' is the recording of scores of 2 to 8 in the Report.

recorded by Conference Chairs. This indicates that Risk 2 from the Risk Model is being used effectively to inform decision making prior to, and during, Case Conferences.

The third set of data was developed to help track the implementation of Effective Child Protection and measure its impact on practice. This is recorded by Conference Chairs. Data highlights include:

<b>Initial Conference</b>	<b>20/21 %</b>	<b>21/22 %</b>
<i>The conference identified the change (s) that the child/family needs to make</i>	100	94
<i>The conference identified the 2 and 8 statements for each change</i>	86	75
<i>The conference worked in a collaborative way</i>	78	67
<i>The child/family understand the change(s) that need to happen</i>	75	69
<i>The child/family understand their part in this work</i>	64	62
<b>Review Conference</b>		
<i>The conference identified the change (s) that the child/family needs to make</i>	86	90
<i>The risk of significant harm been reduced since the last conference</i>	68	66
<i>The conference identified the 2 and 8 statements for each change</i>	75	71
<i>The conference worked in a collaborative way</i>	84	87
<i>The child/family understand the change(s) that need to happen</i>	81	86
<i>The child/family understands their part in this work</i>	77	75
<i>The child/family are working on the change as part of the Core Group</i>	76	85
<i>The child/family are fully and effectively included in the Core Group</i>	76	85
<b>Progress Checked in Review Conference</b>		
<i>Has the Outcome/'Statement of change<sup>3'</sup> been recorded?</i>	89	98
<i>Score has improved since previous conference - Arfon</i>	66	56
<i>Score has improved since previous conference -Dwyfor</i>	70	82
<i>Score has improved since previous conference - Meirionnydd</i>	55	67

### **Observations and Conclusion re Data collection and analysis**

It is clear from the data above that progress is being closely monitored within the Safeguarding Unit. In Initial conferences there is a clear and consistent focus on all of the Effective Child Protection processes which accord with procedures in Wales.

In Review conferences this focus is extended and additional comparative data from different areas of Gwynedd is also being collected and reviewed.

These provide evidence that a significant amount of change in processes and practice has taken place and is now completely embedded in the current child protections system.

The figures are very satisfactory, but are still probably lower than would have been achieved if the covid epidemic had not disrupted some practice areas over the last 2 years.

In 2021/22 the 'statement of change' which is the key indicator of what is needed to keep the child safe is identified in over 90% of Case Conferences. For the other key features of Effective Child Protection such as collaboration is consistently applied. Some of the data trends show a deterioration in 2021/22 from the previous year; possibly reflective of the staffing changes and pressures of COVID work. This is impressive and evidences a clear and consistent focus on this key element of Effective Child Protection. I do not intend to comment further on this data set as they evidence a highly competent and professional approach to measuring and maintaining progress in relation to the project.

In relation to the key question: *'Is child protection in Gwynedd more effective as a consequence of the Effective Child Protection approach?'*

*Based on this data the answer is confirmed as 'Yes' it is more effective.*

## **4 The author of this report**

### **Bruce Thornton**

I am a registered social worker having qualified in 1971. My background has predominantly been in child care and I have held social work, management and training posts in local authorities.

I have also lectured on a professional social work course and I am a joint author of Community Care's Guide to the Children Act 1989.

Since 1992 I have been a freelance trainer and service developer in both Wales and England. I am the joint author of the Gwynedd Risk Model and have a particular interest in the development of child protection that has a practical application for local authorities.

I have introduced the Risk Model into numerous local authority Children's Services Departments and I am familiar with many child protection systems.

I understand the background of the Effective Child Protection project but I have not been involved in its development or implementation. However, I did undertake a part of the interim review into the project based on comparing and contrasting child protection conference reports from pre and post implementation.



**Appendix 1 – Example of Monitoring Sheet completed by Chairs of Initial and Review Child Protection Case Conferences**

<b>PERFORMANCE DATA</b>									
<b>Section 1</b>									
Type of CP Conference	ICC		Pre-Birth		Transfer In		RCC		
Name of Chairperson									
Name of Child			WCCIS Number	Name of Child			WCCIS Number		
<b>Conference Decision</b>									
Register		De-register		Continue Registration		Not Registered			
<b>Primary Category</b>									
Emotional		Neglect		Physical		Sexual		Financial	
<b>Secondary Category</b>									
Emotional		Neglect		Physical		Sexual		Financial	
<b>Other Category</b>									
Emotional		Neglect		Physical		Sexual		Financial	
<b>Other Category</b>									
Emotional		Neglect		Physical		Sexual		Financial	
<b>Section 2</b>									
<b>Initial Case Conference Performance Data</b>									
Date of conference and unique reference				Date			Unique Reference		
Area of conference				Arfon		Dwyfor		Meirionnydd	
Date of Strategy Meeting within 15 days of the Strategy Meeting?					Yes		No		
If not within timescale please explain why									

Further details about registration patterns, please comment

Name of Social Worker

In the opinion of the Chairperson was the assessment of risk of significant harm that was presented to the case conference well presented and clear? (Diogelu 2)

Yes

No

If no, please give further details

**ECP Performance Data - ICC**

Was this a conference where the Effective Child Protection model was used

In the opinion of the Chairperson, has the conference identified the change (s) that the child/family needs to make

In the opinion of the chairperson does the child/family:

Understand the change (s) that need to happen

Understand their part in this work

Yes

No

Yes

No

Please include any comments on above, if needed

In the opinion of the Chairperson has the conference identified the 2 and 8 statements for each change?

In the opinion of the Chairperson had the conference worked in a collaborative way (for example, mutual respect, opportunity for all to contribute, constructive, recognition of family strengths)?

**Section 3**

## Review Case Conference Performance Data

<b>Date of conference and unique reference</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Unique Reference</b>			
<b>Area of conference</b>	<b>Arfon</b>	<b>Dwyfor</b>		<b>Meirionnydd</b>	
<b>Date of previous conference</b>					
<b>Was the review conference held within the statutory timescale?</b>		<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
<b>If not within timescale please explain why?</b>					
<b>Further details about registration patterns, please comment</b>					
<b>Name of Social Worker</b>					
<b>In the opinion of the Chairperson was the assessment of risk of significant harm that was presented to the case conference well presented and clear? (Diogelu 2)</b>					
<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>			
<b>If no, please give further details</b>					
<b>ECP Performance Data - RCC</b>					
<b>Was this a conference where the Effective Child Protection model was used?</b>					
<b>In the opinion of the Chairperson, has the conference identified the change(s) that the child/family need(s) to make</b>					
<b>In the opinion of the Chairperson is/does the child/family:</b>					
<b>Understand the change(s) that need to happen</b>		<b>Understand their part in this work</b>		<b>Working on the change as part of the Core Group?</b>	
<b>Fully and effectively included in the Core Group</b>					
<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	
		<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	
		<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	
		<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Please include any comments on above, if needed</b>					
<b>Progress in the Child Protection Plan - against each change as checked in the review conference</b>					
<b>Outcome/Change</b>			<b>Previous Score</b>		<b>Current Score (1-10)</b>

	<b>10)</b>	<b>(1-</b>	
Is the progress adequate 'within a child's timeframe?'			
Note any barriers to the effective implementation of the Child Protection Plan?			
In the view of the Chairperson has the risk of significant harm been reduced since the last conference?			
In the opinion of the Chairperson has the conference identified the 2 and 8 statements for each change?			
In the opinion of the Chairperson had the conference worked in a collaborative way (for example, mutual respect, opportunity for all to contribute, constructive, recognition of family strengths)?			

<b>Section 4</b>			
<b>Crynodeb o Faterion Amddiffyn Plant / Summary of Child Protection Issues</b>			
<b>Problemau sy'n effeithio ar allu'r rhieni i ddiogelu a/neu anawsterau'r plentyn / Problems that affect the ability of parents to protect and/or child's difficulties</b>			
<b>Problemau sy'n effeithio ar allu'r rhieni i ddiogelu a/neu anawsterau'r plentyn / Problems that affect the ability of parents to protect and/or child's difficulties</b>			
Camddefnyddio Sylweddau (Rhiant) / Substance Misuse (Parent)	Camddefnyddio Sylweddau (Plentyn) / Substance Misuse (Child)	Camddefnyddio Alcohol (Rhiant) / Alcohol Misuse (Parent)	
Camddefnyddio Alcohol (Plentyn) / Alcohol Misuse (Child)	Trais yn y cartref neu drais tuag at eraill / Domestic Abuse or violence towards others	Iechyd Meddwl (Plentyn) / Mental Health (Child)	

Iechyd Meddwl (Rhiant) / Mental Health (Parent)	Anabledd Dysgu (Rhiant) / Learning Disability (Parent)	Camfanteiso'n Rhywiol ar blentyn / Child Sexual Exploitation	
Ymddygiad Rhywiol Niweidiol / Sexually Harmful Behaviour	Troseddwr rhyw neu honedig / Sex offender or alleged	Esgeulustod (Plentyn) / Neglect (Child)	
Diffygion mewn rhiantu sylfaenol a/neu ymlyniant camweithredol /  Deficits in basic parenting and/or dysfunctional attachment	Plant blaenorol wedi eu cymryd i ofal neu ar Gofrestr Amddiffyn Plant /  Children born previously removed into care or on Child Protection Register	Risg perygl i eraill (Plentyn) / Feared risk to others (Child)	
Rhiant ieuanc yn dod allan o ofal / Young parent emerging from care system	Iechyd Corfforol (Rhiant) / Physical Health (Parent)	Salwch Ffug / Fabricated Illness	
Plentyn allan o reolaeth y rhieni / Child beyond parental control	Dylanwadau allanol eraill / Other external influences (e.g. grooming)	Methiant i ymgysylltu â gwasanaethau (Plentyn a/neu Rhiant) / Failure to engage with services (Child and/or Parent	
Hunan esgeulustod difrifol neu anallu i ofalu am eu hunain (Plentyn a/neu Rhiant) / Severe self neglect or  inability to self care (Child and/or Parent)			
Arall (nodwch os gwelwch yn dda) / Other (please specify)			
<b>Did the Conference hear the child's views?</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Comments</b>			