

Active Partnerships (AP) Safeguarding Framework Review Template 2020

AP: Kent Sport

Lead officer: Bianca Logronio Children & Young People Development Officer

Management/Board representative/s: Kevin Day – Sport & Physical Activity Service Manager (Kent County Council) & AP Director (Kent Sport)

CPSU development officer: Denise Richards

Date of review meeting: 12th March 2020

How does this AP operate in terms of the balance between its strategic advocacy and influencing role and any operational, delivery and funding activities?

The Strategic role includes links to the LSPS and their stakeholders. Also, the LSP are aware of the AP and their role in terms of safeguarding, including the training offer. Also has strong links with Early Help and Public Health.

Funded projects include Satellite clubs

Delivery – School Games

Kent County Council who host the AP have safeguarding at the heart of all their plans.

The AP still supports clubs by the delivery of safeguarding training

What significant changes have taken place in the organisation since the 2019 Framework review meeting that are relevant to its safeguarding activity?

The CEO was off for a while but now back.

There have been some staff changes which has meant reduced capacity on the safeguarding side. The LO did some reduced hours and the DLO is involved in the Open Golf project management. The safeguarding adults lead has left.

2 new board members. One board member is a champion of Satellite clubs

The risk register has been updated to have safeguarding as a separate item

Equality monitoring is undertaken on all new projects.

To what extent have 2019's safeguarding plans been implemented?

The AP has a 2-year plan and feels a great deal has been delivered despite the reduced capacity.

Progress against priority areas identified in last Framework review (detailed below):

Use of Thought Tree to get young people's feedback.

This was used at the School Games (I was given a picture as part of the report)

Programme of doing school assemblies and monitor this.

These are still undertaken.

Review safeguarding agreement checklist. Revised and signed off by the board

Communicate new local statutory arrangements as soon as they are known.

Completed

By April 2019 all staff will have undertaken safeguarding training.

Completed

Other examples of success:

- SGO Safeguarding group still led by AP and has created level 2 School Games welfare plan
- Speak out in sport resources finalised and are available for school assemblies and are distributed to School Games participants.
- Online newsletter includes safeguarding
- Young leader training programme for school games, includes safe events training.
- Uni students train young leaders and the YL support CYP at school games – so a pathway.
- Young leaders produce news items.
- The AP are using the WES model within the team – Workforce, Equality and Safeguarding
- All staff have completed mandatory safeguarding training
- AP work with virtual schools in Kent and Headstart to look at more co-production with CYP
- School Games posters designed by CYP
- Risk Assessments from Satellite clubs were pulled together and then the good practice produced as a resource and guidance issued.
- Kent Young coach academy has approximately 50 coaches.
- Non- perfect dad project being supported for clubs to put things into practice re parents

Examples of actions not completed:

None

What has the AP done to find out if (at least some of) the safeguarding actions have been effective?

Feedback still being obtained at School Games and Satellite clubs. Pre-and post-event. Including using the Thought Tree

Has a Safeguarding Checklist been completed?

Yes

Outstanding issues arising?

None

Actions needed to support the following priority Standards area (refer to checklist):

Effectiveness assessments: how will the AP find out if (at least some of) the safeguarding actions have been effective?

Impact of co-production work

Impact of the safeguarding resources for level 2 games.

Which CPSU services has the AP accessed during the last year (this may be training, webinars, meetings, 1:1 support etc.). Did CPSU service/s meet the AP's safeguarding requirements?

(This question enables the CPSU to ensure that support is relevant and appropriate.)

- Regional meetings
- Online training
- Webinars
- Yammer
- Mental Health and ACES briefings
- Find CPSU very supportive

Has a revised safeguarding implementation/action plan been developed that addresses outstanding (not delivered), ongoing (maintenance), and additional (new) actions identified through self-assessment/review and effectiveness/impact assessment/s?

Yes

Identify key safeguarding priorities for the next year:

- Co-production work impact on CYP
- Possible recruit/re-recruit Board Champion
- Use evaluation of feedback from School Games
- Follow up comms with Local Safeguarding Partnerships
- Develop workshops with young people re co-production
- Promote Speak out in Sport further
- Time to Listen post workshop evaluation
- Share CPSU events webinar at SGO meeting
- Collate further good practice from Satellite Clubs for sharing

What support does the organisation require from CPSU to implement its safeguarding plan?

- LGBT guidance
- MOS re nontraditional partners
- Clarity on who supports Leisure Providers
- ACES
- Mental Health
- LO Refresher
- Continue regional meetings

Identify examples of safeguarding good practice within the AP or the wider local network which could be shared with other organisations:

- SGO Safeguarding group produced L2 school games welfare plan
- School Assembly Pack
- Sat Clubs risk assessments
- WES
- CYP offer (leaflet produced)

Overall has the organisation demonstrated a commitment to maintaining and embedding effective safeguarding standards?

Yes

Identify any specific areas for improvement and what actions have been agreed to address them and how/when and by whom.

None

Associated support required?

CPSU rating recommendations and outcomes from the meeting:

Policies, procedures and guidance: Continually developing/updating procedures e.g. School Games and Satellite Clubs **Very Good**

Organisational ownership: AP Director present at review. There appears to be strong board commitment with a separate champion for Satellite clubs as well as safeguarding **Very Good**

Responding to safeguarding concerns: There appears to be procedures embedded in the whole staff team and the close links with Kent County Council support this. Most APS do not get lots of cases to test this. **Very Good**

Safeguarding training and learning: Training is still a key offer and includes, schools, SGOS and young leaders. The AP also try to learn from consultation and measuring effectiveness of the safeguarding work. **Very Good**

Communication: Good practice collated and published. The AP try to ensure appropriate formats for CYP - **Good**

Overall rating:

VERY GOOD

Signed: Denise Richards

Date: 20th March 2020