

National Framework for Child Protection Learning and Development in Scotland

Analysis of Consultation Findings

**NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR CHILD PROTECTION
LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN SCOTLAND**

ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION FINDINGS

Reid Howie Associates
Scottish Government Social Research
2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
SECTION 1: THE CONSULTATION	1
Background to the consultation.....	1
The consultation process	2
Submissions and respondents	3
Analysis of the data	4
The report.....	4
Summary of issues: The consultation	5
SECTION 2: ACCESS TO MULTI-AGENCY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT, LINKS AND OVERALL AIMS	7
Agencies' access to multi-agency training / learning and development	7
Links to other documents and frameworks	12
Overall aims	17
Summary of findings: access to multi-agency learning and development, links and overall aims	21
SECTION 3: GOOD PRACTICE, SKILLS AND COMPETENCY	22
Good practice examples	22
Skills and competency	26
Summary of findings: good practice examples, skills and competency.....	34
SECTION 4: EVALUATION AND ANY OTHER ISSUES RAISED	35
Evaluation.....	35
Other issues raised	40
Summary of findings: evaluation and any other issues raised.....	46
SECTION 5: EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT	47
The need for additional information about particular issues	47
Impact on groups	48
Changes and further issues for consideration	49
Summary of findings: EQIA.....	50
ANNEXES	51

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a consultation carried out by the Scottish Government on the National Framework for Child Protection Learning and Development in Scotland between 5th April and 5th July 2012.

Background

A new multi-agency “National Framework for Child Protection Learning and Development in Scotland” has been developed, in order to enhance the skills of the workforce who have a role in keeping children safe and to ensure that they are equipped, through learning and development, to protect children and young people from the risk of harm. It provides a set of core skills and “competences” to help to identify the skills required by workers who are likely to have contact with children who require support and protection. The Framework is designed to support those who commission, develop, purchase and deliver education, training and learning for the multi-agency workforce involved with children and young people. The Scottish Government recognised the importance of exploring stakeholders’ views of the new Framework, and a consultation was arranged for this purpose. This report provides the findings of that consultation.

The consultation process

There were two strands to the consultation process: a written consultation; and stakeholder events. The written consultation asked 8 questions about the Framework, one of which was an open text question for any other comments. All of the questions allowed scope for respondents to comment on their answers. Some of the questions invited a “yes” or “no” response, or a “rating”, but the responses to these questions were not sought via tick boxes. As a result, respondents expressed their views of these issues in different ways. There were also 6 additional questions requesting comments on the Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).

A total of 52 written submissions were received to the written consultation. The most common category of respondents was Child Protection Committees (CPCs), from which 27% of responses were received. The other main categories were: professional bodies / representative groups (17%); voluntary organisations (17%); health organisations (15%); and local authorities (13%). The remaining respondents were drawn from a small number of other statutory organisations and child protection training providers. Only one response was received from an individual.

Four events were held in June 2012 in different parts of Scotland (Edinburgh, Glasgow, Inverness and Perth) to gather stakeholders’ views through workshop discussions. Each event involved four or five workshops, and each had a facilitator, most of whom were from the multi-disciplinary working group which developed the Framework. Both strands of the consultation generated a large amount of material, and the findings are summarised below.

Overall findings

Most of the respondents to the written strand addressed each of the questions, and relevant issues were also covered in almost all, or all of the workshops in each case.

Many positive comments were made about the Framework, or aspects of the content of this. The most common comments, however, focused on the identification of concerns or issues with the document (or aspects of this) and suggested developments or improvements.

Agencies' access to multi-agency training / learning and development

Question 1 asked whether respondents have access to multi-agency training / learning and development (including whether there is a strategy / framework in place) and explored who is included in the multi-agency learning.

A majority of respondents stated or implied that they have access to some form of multi-agency training / learning and development in their area, although a few stated that this is not the case, or is limited. In terms of the types of organisations covered by local multi-agency training / learning and development arrangements, a majority of those who provided this information stated that voluntary sector partners are included. The inclusion of partners who provide services to adults was also identified as common. Around half stated that services commissioned to external organisations would be included.

Respondents also provided further details of the types of provision in place. They also made comments on two additional themes. One of these themes was barriers to training / learning and development, and covered issues such as: capacity and resources; aspects of the provision of training / learning and development; perceived priority and relevance; participation and representation; the nature of people's work; and access to information. The other was suggested developments / comments on "what works" and included comments on: particular types of training; improving access to training; aspects of identifying training needs; aspects of training / learning and development practice; and general developments to child protection practice.

Links to other documents and frameworks

Question 2 asked whether the Framework document makes appropriate links to: other strategic documents / frameworks related to child protection; and other strategic documents related to continuing professional development (CPD).

Around two thirds of written respondents to this question expressed the view that the Framework makes appropriate links to other documents, although around half qualified their view, or suggested that this was only "in part". While the Framework was generally seen to make appropriate links to strategic documents / frameworks related to child protection, this was less the case for strategic documents related to CPD. A very small number expressed the explicit view that the document does not make appropriate links to other strategic documents and frameworks.

Many respondents made additional comments, and these focused on: the overall nature of this aspect of the document; views of relevant strategic documents / frameworks related to child protection; and views of other relevant strategic documents related to Continuing Professional Development (CPD).

A number of respondents made positive comments relating to: the clarity of the links; the value of the links; and the inclusion of particular documents / frameworks and links. Concerns, issues and suggestions related to identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing: presentational issues; the general “fit” between the Framework and other national and local documents; and perceived gaps in coverage, the documents included and the links (particularly, but not only relating to CPD).

Overall aims

Question 3 asked whether the Framework is clear in its aims overall and whether it has relevance for: those working directly with children and young people; and those working with adults. Most respondents to this question believed that the Framework is clear in its aims overall (although some qualified this). Only a small number of respondents expressed the view that the Framework is not clear in its aims overall.

In terms of its relevance to particular groups, most of those who expressed a view considered the Framework to have relevance for those working directly with children and young people. Fewer, however, believed that the Framework, in its current form, has explicit relevance for those working with adults (and this was the main reason for the qualified view of the clarity of the aims overall).

Respondents made a number of additional comments, which focused on their more detailed views of the nature of the aims and the relevance of the Framework to particular groups. Positive comments were made about issues such as: the purposes of the Framework; helpful aspects of this part of the document; and its relevance. Concerns, issues and suggestions focused on identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing: a lack of clarity; presentational issues; aspects of the nature or length of the section; and the lack of explicit relevance / reference to particular groups and their roles (including those working with adults; young people aged 16/17; and other specific stakeholders).

Good practice examples

Questions 4 and 5 asked how helpful respondents found the good practice examples and how they could be improved. Views of these were not particularly positive and a majority of the respondents to Question 4 rated the good practice examples as 3 or above (where 1 was really helpful and 5 not at all helpful).

Most made additional comments about the examples, covering both their overall views of the examples, and the subject matter of the specific examples used. These included positive observations relating to: finding the examples themselves, or the idea of examples to be helpful; and some aspects of the nature of the examples (e.g. as good, readable, concise and relevant). Respondents also identified concerns, issues and suggestions relating to the examples, and these focused on identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing: a perceived lack of depth of the examples; lack of added value; the small number of examples; lack of links to skills, competences and current practice; problems with the use of examples; concerns with specific aspects of the subject matter; and perceived gaps in coverage (both of the subject matter and the organisations highlighted). Suggestions were also made about the means of generating examples.

Skills and competency

Questions 6 and 6a asked how helpful respondents found the skills and competency section, as well as asking for examples of how this should be changed and what should be included. This was the question which generated the most information, with a very large amount of qualitative material.

This question did not ask for a numerical rating, but just under half of respondents to this question provided a qualitative rating, and the majority of these stated that they found it “good”, “helpful” or “useful” (although some qualified this with other comments). Several stated that they found it “very” good, helpful or useful.

Most of the respondents, however, provided their views of the section through detailed comments, and these focused on: the section overall; the nature of the competences; the definitions of the workforces; and specific issues relating to the skills and competences included for each of the workforces.

Positive views about the section overall related to: the theoretical approach; the perceived improvement on Version 12; consistency with other frameworks; presentational issues and how the material would be used. Perceived concerns and suggestions with the section overall focused on identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing: the length and repetition; presentational issues; lack of clarity; the perceived prescriptive nature; and perceived gaps.

In relation to the nature of the skills and competences, positive views included that these were seen to be: comprehensive; carefully constructed; and a generally useful approach. Concerns and suggestions related to identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing issues such as: the nature of emphasis or focus of the skills and competences; the definition of terms / headings used; the large number of skills and competences (with a common suggestion being to distinguish between those considered “core” and “desirable”); lack of clarity; aspects of the use of language; and perceived gaps.

Positive comments on the definitions of the workforces related to: the notion of three workforces; the actual descriptions; fluidity between levels; and a perceived improvement on previous “levels”. Concerns and suggestions focused on identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing issues such as: confusion / lack of clarity of who is covered by the terms and definitions; issues with nature of the definitions overall and specific aspects of these; issues with the wider workforce definition (e.g. as not consistent with NHS guidance; too broad; and excluding some workers) issues with the specific workforce definition (e.g. as not helpful; and excluding some workers); and issues with the specialist workforce definition (e.g. as confused; lacking clarity in the inclusion of “intensive support”; and not necessarily most likely to have the role of Lead Professional).

The final theme comprised the identification of specific concerns / issues and suggested developments and improvements to particular competences. Some of these focused on competences across the workforces (or where a workforce type was not specified), but most related to competences for specific workforces. Many

comments for each of the workforces involved the identification of perceived gaps, and the suggestion of specific skills and competences for inclusion or amendment. A specific area of concern with the wider workforce was the view that the list of competences was unnecessarily specialist and detailed (with suggestions made). For the specific and specialist workforces there were also concerns about there being too many skills and competences, and that they could be repetitive and confusing (with suggestions again made).

Evaluation

Question 7 asked whether, if the recommended method of evaluation was implemented, more detailed training materials would be needed to support staff in gathering evidence, analysing and making judgements on evaluating training.

While only a third of those who addressed the question answered or implied agreement or disagreement, nearly three quarters of those who did so believed that, if the recommended method of evaluation was implemented, more detailed training materials would be needed. Some additional comments were made about: the perceived need for such materials; the reasons for these views; the issues for which materials would be needed; or the types of materials required. A number of additional themes emerged, and comments were also made on: the section overall and general issues relating to evaluation; and the proposed methodology and model. A few respondents provided examples of evaluation work.

Positive additional comments focused on issues such as: the value of inclusion of the section, or of evaluation; specific aspects of the section considered helpful; and the value or means of use of the model highlighted. Concerns and suggestions focused on identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing issues such as: lack of clarity and detail; presentational issues; general concerns / challenges with evaluation; and specific concerns with the model (e.g. resource and capacity issues; complexity; the focus of the model; difficulties with collection of evidence; and other implementation issues). A few respondents offered additional / alternative methods of evaluation, identified additional requirements or suggested general developments to evaluation.

Other comments

Question 8 asked for any additional comments. Themes on which additional comments were made included: aspects of the consultation; the Framework overall and its presentation; the overall focus of the Framework and the issues included; and issues relating to implementation.

In terms of aspects of the consultation, some respondents welcomed the Framework, aspects of the Framework or the consultation. A few respondents made comments on: the nature and / or role of their organisation; who the organisation represents; their involvement in child protection work or training / learning and development; and the nature / purpose of their response.

Several respondents stressed the overall need for such a Framework, or made general positive comments about the nature of the document (e.g. as being helpful,

clear, concise, better than the previous Framework and containing appropriate information). Concerns, issues and suggestions were raised which related to identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing: perceived duplication / lack of clarity; aspects of the presentation and structure; the volume of information; and other issues.

In terms of the overall focus of the Framework and the issues included, positive comments were that it is: complementary; flexible; inclusive of everyone's role; non-prescriptive; targeted; and sets out the requirements. Concerns and related suggestions included identifying and / or highlighting ways of addressing views that it: lacks clear purpose / focus; excludes some workers / issues; is compliance-driven and reactive; and contains gaps in the issues covered.

A further common theme on which additional comments were made related to aspects of the implementation of the Framework. A number of positive comments were made about the perceived benefits of the document, generally relating to helping (in various ways) to inform, improve and support various aspects of current training / learning and development work. Concerns about implementation focused on issues such as: a lack of clarity about implementation; capacity and resource issues; issues for some organisations / workers; lack of management skills; constraints in access to training; the "fit" with local developments; and difficulties relating to evidencing change. A range of related suggestions were made.

The Equalities Impact Assessment

A total of 6 questions were included in the written consultation relating to the Equalities Impact Assessment. In summary, these explored: any additional information seen to be required; any negative or positive impact on particular groups; changes required; and any other significant issues relating to equalities groups.

Issues identified as requiring further information included: workforce diversity; disability and additional support needs; transitions / issues for those aged 16/17; abuse in a religious environment; creating / maintaining relationships in families; ethnic minority groups; gender; trafficked children; asylum seeking families; information from partnerships; and the involvement of children, young people and families.

A small proportion of respondents identified a disproportionately negative impact of the Framework on particular groups which were: disabled people; adults; those aged 16/17; and those with communication support needs. Positive impacts were identified for members of staff / workforce, organisations as a whole and children and families (particularly vulnerable families), as well as across groups. A number of specific suggestions were made about issues for inclusion / consideration (covering overall equalities issues and issues for specific groups) and a few more general suggestions were also made.

SECTION 1: THE CONSULTATION

1.1 This report presents the findings of a consultation carried out by the Scottish Government on the National Framework for Child Protection Learning and Development in Scotland. The consultation document was issued on 5th April 2012, and the consultation closed on 5th July 2012.

1.2 The report is in 5 sections. This section outlines the nature of the consultation, the responses received and the means of presentation of the findings. Section 2 covers the findings relating to: agencies' access to multi-agency training / learning and development; links in the Framework to other documents and frameworks; and the overall aims of the Framework. Section 3 covers the findings relating to: views of the good practice examples; and skills and competency. Section 4 covers the findings relating to: evaluation; and any other issues raised in the consultation. Section 5 covers the findings relating to views of the Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).

Background to the consultation

1.3 A new multi-agency "National Framework for Child Protection Learning and Development in Scotland" has recently been developed, building on previous work to enhance the skills of the workforce who have a role in keeping children safe. The Framework has been designed to ensure that those who work with children and young people in Scotland are equipped, through learning and development, to protect them from the risk of harm.

1.4 Keeping children safe and protecting them from harm involves many different agencies and workers. These workers, in turn, have learning and development needs to ensure that they are well-equipped for their role in identifying and responding to children who many need such support and protection.

1.5 A training framework ("Version 12", or the "Protecting Scotland's Children and Young People Training Framework") was published in 2005 to assist with this, and the new "National Framework for Child Protection Learning and Development in Scotland" builds upon Version 12. The new Framework is designed to support those who commission, develop, purchase and deliver education, training and learning for the multi-agency workforce involved with children and young people. It acknowledges the work currently being done by those represented on Child Protection Committees, and it is hoped that it will enhance and support existing local work and local frameworks.

1.6 The National Framework provides a set of core skills and "competences" to help to identify the skills required by workers who are likely to have contact with children who require support and protection. It has been produced by a multi-disciplinary working group, and written specifically for those working in Scotland. In line with good practice, it is underpinned by the Getting it Right for Every Child (GIRFEC) approach, which is a National Practice Model designed to help workers in all agencies to enable access to support for children, young people and their families which is appropriate, proportionate and timely.

1.7 The Scottish Government recognised the importance of exploring stakeholders' views of the Framework, and a consultation was arranged to take place from 5th April – 5th July 2012. This involved seeking written responses, as well as gathering views through a number of facilitated consultation events in different parts of Scotland. This report summarises the views expressed through the consultation process.

The consultation process

1.8 As noted above there were two strands to the consultation, each of which is described below.

The written consultation

1.9 The written consultation asked 8 questions about the Framework, one of which was an open text question for any other comments. There were also additional questions requesting comments on the Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA). Written responses were invited on a response form, along with the completion of a Respondent Information Form (RIF).

1.10 The written consultation sought respondents' views of:

- Whether an agency has access to multi-agency training / learning and development, and a strategy or framework in place; and who is included (Question 1).
- Whether the Framework document makes appropriate links to other strategic documents related to child protection and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) (Question 2).
- Whether the framework is clear in its aims overall, and which staff it has relevance for (Question 3).
- How helpful respondents find the good practice examples, and how these could be improved (Questions 4 and 5).
- How helpful respondents find the skills and competency section, and any changes required (Questions 6 and 6a).
- Whether, if the recommended method of evaluation were to be implemented, there would be seen to be a need for more detailed training materials to support staff (Question 7).
- Any additional comments (Question 8).

1.11 The additional questions on the equalities impact of proposals sought respondents' views of:

- Any additional information seen to be required (Question 1).
- Any negative impact on particular groups and the perceived reasons for this (Questions 2 and 3).
- Any positive impact on particular groups (Question 4).
- Any changes required (Question 5).
- Any other significant issues for consideration relating to equalities groups (Question 6).

1.12 Some of the questions invited a “yes” or “no” response, or a “rating”, but the responses to these questions were not sought via tick boxes. As a result, respondents expressed their views of the issues in different ways, sometimes by writing in “yes” or “no” or a rating as part of their text, sometimes by ticking the side of the question on the response form, and sometimes by responding through more general text alone. The means of analysis of these issues is discussed further later. All of the questions allowed scope for respondents to comment on their answers. A full list of the questions in the written consultation is provided at Annex 1.

The events

1.13 Four events were held in June 2012 in different parts of Scotland (Edinburgh, Glasgow, Inverness and Perth) to gather stakeholders’ views of the Framework through workshop discussions. Each event involved four or five workshops, and each had a facilitator, most of whom were from the multi-disciplinary working group which developed the Framework. Each workshop also had a scribe.

1.14 The issues explored in the four events were similar to those in the main consultation (see Annex 2). The findings were recorded in the form of notes from each of the individual workshops. These events generated considerable additional information, and the outputs were analysed alongside the findings from the written consultation.

Submissions and respondents

1.15 A total of 52 written submissions were received to the written consultation, containing a large amount of qualitative material. Table 1 (below) summarises the numbers and proportions of respondents by category.

Table 1. Respondents by category

Type of respondent	Number	% total¹
Child Protection Committee (CPC)	14	27
Professional body, representative group, trades union etc.	9	17
Voluntary organisation	9	17
Health organisation	8	15
Local authority or department	7	13
Statutory organisation not otherwise classified	2	4
Child protection training provider	2	4
Individual	1	2
Total	52	

1.16 As can be seen from the table, the most common category of respondents was Child Protection Committees (CPCs), from which 27% of responses were received. The other main categories of respondents were: professional bodies / representative groups (17%); voluntary organisations (17%); health organisations (15%) and local authorities (13%). The remaining respondents were drawn from a small number of

¹ Table does not sum to 100 due to rounding

other statutory organisations and child protection training providers. Only 1 response was received from an individual.

1.17 Most of the respondents to the written strand addressed some or all of the specific questions, or provided information relating directly to these. A few respondents provided a more general response, and, in some cases, additional material was provided in a covering letter or other document. Most of the responses were submitted electronically, although a small number were handwritten and transcribed. A large amount of detailed qualitative information was generated.

1.18 In addition, the outputs of 19 workshops held during the four consultation events were included in the analysis. These workshops generally addressed issues very similar to the questions posed in the written consultation. A large amount of detailed qualitative information was also generated from this strand.

Analysis of the data

1.19 The analysis of the data involved a number of stages, as follows:

- An Access database was designed to include the data relating to each of the written consultation questions and the material from the consultation events. The data from the events were “mapped” to the relevant questions in the written consultation.
- The information from the written responses and from the events was input to the database.
- A series of Word documents was generated, containing all of the qualitative material in the responses to each of the questions.
- Key themes and sub-themes were identified for each question and supplementary question, and the detailed comments were organised into a series of issue-based “books”.
- The findings were summarised and the report prepared, covering both the written consultation and the events.

The report

1.20 A full analysis of the material submitted in the responses was carried out, and generated a wealth of information. The method of analysis had a largely qualitative focus, although a small amount of more quantitative material (e.g. numbers and types of respondents, and the broad proportions responding to particular questions) has been included. Even where questions invited a direct “yes” or “no” response, however, it was not possible to identify definitive quantitative numbers, given the issues raised previously about the different ways in which respondents addressed these questions.

1.21 In terms of qualitative material, the analysis identified the themes and issues which emerged in response to each question. The presentation of the qualitative material focuses on these themes and issues, and on highlighting the range and depth of views expressed. Where the question invited a specific “yes” or “no”, or an overall rating, the broad balance of views has been given (but only where this can be ascertained clearly from the responses). It should be borne in mind, however, that these are not definitive numbers.

1.22 It would be inappropriate to attempt to quantify responses to these consultation questions, other than at the broadest level, for several reasons. These include that:

- The questions did not provide a clear means of providing a “closed” response.
- Respondents provided their responses in different ways.
- Some similar points were made at different questions, or covered more than one theme.
- Some responses were submitted on behalf of organisations and / or represented the views of a number of respondents.
- Judgements had to be made about where to include particular material in the report.

1.23 The focus is therefore on the qualitative presentation of the information, giving only broad indications of overall themes, and using qualitative terms such as “many”; “a number”; “several”; “a few” etc.

1.24 At each of the questions, similar views were sometimes expressed by different types of respondents, and it would be inappropriate to list all of the types of respondent who expressed particular views at each issue. Additionally, there was no indication of the type of respondent raising a particular issue in a workshop group. However, examples of types of respondents raising issues are provided where appropriate.

1.25 In presenting the qualitative data, the wording used in the report sometimes follows the wording used in a response. This helps to preserve the sense of the point, even though it is not presented as a “quote”, and to ensure that respondents’ intended messages are reflected accurately. It is considered an appropriate approach, as consultation respondents are aware that their comments will form the basis of a report.

1.26 None of the respondents requested that their material should remain confidential. It should be noted that where the term “respondent” is used, this refers to one response, even where that response may represent the views of more than one contributor.

1.27 The report cannot present all of the individual points made by every respondent, nor can it provide a compendium of material. The responses can be viewed on the Scottish Government website². The remainder of this report presents the findings of the consultation.

Summary of issues: The consultation

1.28 In summary, the main points relating to the consultation are as follows:

- A Scottish Government consultation on the National Framework for Child Protection Learning and Development in Scotland took place from 5th April 2012 to 5th July 2012. The consultation had two strands: a written consultation; and four consultation events.

² Insert reference

- 52 written responses were received. The most common category of respondent was Child Protection Committees (CPCs) (27%). The other main categories of respondent were professional bodies / representative groups (17%); voluntary organisations (17%); health organisations (15%); and local authorities (13%). The remaining respondents were drawn from a small number of other statutory organisations and child protection training providers. One response was received from an individual.
- Four events were held in different parts of Scotland, involving a total of 19 workshops. These events explored broadly the same issues as the written consultation.
- The analysis of the data involved: design of an Access database; input of written responses and material from the events; identification of key themes and sub-themes for each question; and preparation of a report covering both strands of the consultation process.
- The report presents the themes which emerged and the range and depth of views expressed.
- The full responses are available for inspection on the Scottish Government website.

SECTION 2: ACCESS TO MULTI-AGENCY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT, LINKS AND OVERALL AIMS

2.1 This section presents the findings relating to: agencies' access to multi-agency training / learning and development; links in the Framework to other documents and frameworks; and the overall aims of the Framework (Questions 1-3).

Agencies' access to multi-agency training / learning and development

2.2 Question 1 asked:

Does your agency have access to multi-agency training/ learning and development [or a] strategy/ framework in place to co-ordinate the range of training/ learning and development for staff working children?
Does this multi-agency learning include:
a) Voluntary sector partners,
b) Partners who provide services to adults, and
c) Services commissioned to external organisations?

2.3 Almost all of the written respondents addressed this question, and relevant issues were raised in all of the workshops. Many respondents focused on whether or not they had access to multi-agency training / learning and development overall, rather than whether or not they had a strategy / framework per se. As this was not a "tick box" question, respondents provided their answers in a range of different ways (as highlighted at 1.12). Some stated "yes" (although it was not always clear to which specific parts of the question this applied), while some implied that they had access to a specific strategy / framework. Some made more general comments about having access to multi-agency training / learning and development. Others provided details of the nature of their provision, or other issues relating to training / learning and development. Within individual workshop groups, sometimes multiple examples were given of access and practice in different organisations and areas.

2.4 These issues make it impossible to provide definitive numbers at each part of this question, but it should be stressed that this was not intended to comprise an audit of provision across Scotland, rather to give an overview and examples. As such, the general picture of access to multi-agency training / learning and development among respondents, and the types of organisations covered by this is identified below. Respondents also provided further details of the types of provision in place, as well as making comments on two additional themes: perceived barriers to training / learning and development; and suggested developments / comments on "what works". All of these issues are discussed further below.

Access to multi-agency training / learning and development

2.5 In relation to the first part of the question, it was clear from the responses that a majority³ (including organisations of different types and those who provided their views in written responses and through workshops), stated or implied that they had access to some form of multi-agency training / learning and development in their area. A few participants in workshops, however, stated that this was not the case, or

³ These findings, in each case, relate to the proportion of those who addressed the question.

that it was limited, and one workshop group identified specifically that provision in one area tended to be “more single agency”. Two voluntary organisation respondents to the written consultation stated that, while there was access to multi-agency training by local CPCs in some areas, this was not yet “universal”.

2.6 A few respondents did not address the issue of their own access to training (e.g. as they *provided* rather than received training, or did not provide direct services to children), or expressed mixed views. For example, one stated that, while large services providing out of school childcare, education and training in areas with well developed joint working may have access to multi-agency training / learning and development, these were in the minority. Another stated that provision varied across the different CPCs in Scotland, and that there were some areas in which there was limited or no multi-agency training on offer.

2.7 A number of respondents gave further details of local multi-agency work. Some, for example, stated specifically that they had access to a multi-agency strategy or framework to co-ordinate the range of training / learning and development in their area, or had their own strategy or framework (sometimes in addition). A number of examples were given of the types of documents respondents identified as containing relevant material:

- Child protection strategies.
- Child protection training / learning and development strategies (sometimes with a training / learning and development plan).
- An integrated strategy for public protection.
- Childcare strategies / training strategies.
- Workforce learning and development strategies; training plans; and development pathways.
- Frameworks (both CPC and single agency), including training / learning and development frameworks and issue-specific frameworks (e.g. safeguarding).

2.8 A small number of organisations gave details of the basis of their strategy / framework (e.g. as aligned or not to “Version 12”; or located in the public protection agenda), while a few described other aspects, such as the means of development, content or timescale of this.

2.9 Some respondents stated more generally that they had access to relevant multi-agency training opportunities, or to a training / learning and development programme or calendar. One CPC noted that there was a Public Protection Training Calendar in place which pulled together the range of child protection, adult protection and domestic abuse training available locally. Several respondents highlighted the provision of relevant single agency training / learning and development for particular workers / volunteers (sometimes alongside and complementary to multi-agency provision). In one area, for example, it was noted that there were “comprehensive” staff training and development pathways on a single agency basis within the council. Examples of single agency training were also provided by a few health service and voluntary organisation respondents. An example was given in one of the workshops of basic level training being delegated to individual agencies, whereas combined training took place from “Level 2” upwards.

2.10 Other examples were also provided of different types of training / learning and development work taking place, and these included examples of:

- Training / learning and development needs analysis or mapping (with examples at CPC, multi-agency and single agency level).
- Protocols (e.g. for the allocation of places; pathways; and the evaluation of courses).
- Representation on relevant groups; development of links to other relevant work; and networking.
- Development of training / learning and development materials.
- Evaluation and review.

2.11 Examples were also given of a range of types of training / learning and development (in addition to courses). These included: online and e-learning; other media (such as CDs and DVDs); seminars; workbooks; secondments; focus groups; case studies; events; shadowing; private study / university; newsletters; and cascading. A few respondents gave examples of subject matter and content, and a few made reference to the provision of different training to different levels of staff.

2.12 Participants in the workshop groups were asked whether learning and development was seen as a priority for their job or organisation, and while not all of the groups addressed the question, where they did there was general agreement that this was the case. Some participants also acknowledged that there were barriers to learning and development (discussed later). A few respondents made additional comments on the importance of training / learning and development provision, or provided detailed information about how their work had developed.

Coverage and basis of provision

2.13 Around two thirds of written respondents who addressed the question, and some of the workshop participants, provided specific information about which types of organisations (among those specified in the question) were covered by local multi-agency training / learning and development arrangements. It was found that most of those who provided such details stated that voluntary sector partners were included. Additionally, around three quarters mentioned the inclusion of partners who provide services to adults, while over half stated that services commissioned to external organisations would be included.

2.14 Several respondents stated that “all” relevant organisations, or “a range of agencies” would have access to the training / learning and development, including, for example, public, private and voluntary sector partners. Some examples were given of services in which a basic level of child protection training was provided to all staff. One local authority respondent stated that, where it was not possible to provide training directly to an organisation, places would be allocated directly to delegates who would be expected to “cascade” the information to their organisation.

2.15 A few respondents provided specific examples of the types of organisations which could be included, such as: education, social care; community work; housing; police; addictions services; health; leisure services; specific named voluntary organisations; training providers; partnerships (e.g. adult protection, drugs and alcohol); clubs; groups; and faith groups.

2.16 Several respondents provided information about the structure for provision. A common issue raised was that the multi-agency training opportunities were often made available to local agencies in an area through the local Child Protection Committee (CPC), sometimes alongside another body or organisation such as a Community Protection Unit (CPU).

2.17 A few respondents provided further details of the structural arrangements within the CPC for such provision (e.g. the existence of a training sub-group or a specific member of staff with responsibility for this). A small number of respondents (both in the written consultation and workshops) gave details of the training / learning providers (e.g. delivery by a small group; provision by a specific training officer(s); commissioned training; and in-house work).

2.18 Several respondents identified arrangements within their own organisation for accessing multi-agency training. These included through: a Chief Officers' Group (e.g. a social work service); multi-agency co-ordinators (e.g. an education service); child protection officers (e.g. a college) and general attendance at training as required (e.g. a voluntary organisation).

2.19 A few respondents from one area identified the existence locally of an overall Training Consortium covering three local CPCs, and supported by the NHS and Police. This was highlighted as offering a range of inter-agency child protection training, complementing provision by the individual CPCs in the area, and ensuring a consistent approach to the training.

Barriers to training / learning and development

2.20 Participants in the workshop groups were asked to identify any barriers to training / learning and development, and several identified these, as did a small number of respondents to the written consultation (although not asked specifically about this). The barriers identified related to:

- Capacity and resources (e.g. difficulties in releasing staff to attend and providing cover; issues for small organisations; time constraints; staff shortages; workloads; increasing mandatory training; lack of financial resources; and level of demand / need).
- Aspects of the provision of training / learning and development (e.g. irregularity of courses; lack of provision, availability or access; variation in the nature of training / learning and development; access for organisations working across different local authority areas or in rural areas; lack of consistency; issues with methods or models used; practical barriers; complexity in specific settings; allocation of places; perceptions of some forms of provision; and a lack of structure of some provision).
- Perceived priority and relevance (e.g. low priority; lack of taking training / learning and development seriously; competing training / learning and development priorities; increased priority linked to negative events; lack of perceived relevance / understanding; overall culture; lack of requirement to take part; lack of proactive identification of needs; and lack of support for training / learning and development).

- Participation and representation (e.g. low representation at multi-agency provision from particular services; difficulties in access / limited places for some voluntary sector organisations; inadequate identification of needs; lack of personal responsibility for training / learning and development needs; difficulties in checking attendees; lack of preparation by participants; and last minute drop-outs).
- The nature of people's work (e.g. geographical area; working non-core hours or shifts; other timing issues; lack of access to the internet; and perceived limited access for some services).
- Access to information (e.g. difficulties in identifying which training is relevant; difficulties in finding information; lack of information about what is on offer; and poor communication).

2.21 A very small number of respondents also identified potential barriers to general good practice in child protection work, such as: a lack of clear procedures for some staff to raise concerns; and a lack of ability of services to meet identified needs.

Suggested developments / views of “what works”

2.22 Participants in several workshop groups (and a small number of respondents to the written consultation) made suggestions about developments to training / learning and development, or provided views of “what works”. Some of these related to particular types of training / learning and development which could be used alongside face to face multi-agency provision. For example, an issue raised in some of the workshops was a perceived need to recognise the role of e-learning alongside other provision (although some identified constraints, or stressed the need for continuing interactive methods, and it was suggested in one workshop that all child protection training should be delivered on a multi-agency basis). Participants in one workshop stated that “stretch” training was a good model in some areas and that blended learning was useful. Other suggestions relating to types of training / learning and development included: the use of existing staff forums for learning provision; experiential learning; informal learning; action learning sets; developing communication between relevant people; using aide memoirs / briefing packs; and developing training on specific issues (e.g. autism; safeguarder training).

2.23 Suggestions were also made about improving access to training, and one voluntary organisation, for example, suggested that they would welcome the opportunity for more multi-agency training. Other suggestions included: addressing problems of variable access and avoiding “gatekeeping”; developing category-based training; providing good notice of training; and emphasising the responsibilities of management and CPCs in making training accessible. Related to this, an issue raised in some workshops was the need for management support and encouragement for training / learning and development. One group suggested the use of a contract to ensure that staff are given the time and space for courses.

2.24 Other suggestions and developments related to aspects of identifying needs. It was suggested in one workshop, for example, that training needs analysis should be improved, with better administrative support to maintain records. One respondent to the written consultation suggested specifically that consideration should be given to linking the commissioning arm of local authorities to CPCs to provide notification of

when a new service is implemented in an area, to ensure that all new workers can assess joint training.

2.25 Suggestions were also made about aspects of training / learning and development practice. For example, it was suggested in some groups that child protection should be embedded more into other training, and should be part of corporate induction. One group suggested that a core programme of training should sit behind the Framework, and be consistently available across all areas. Another group suggested that there should be more joined up public protection training. Other suggestions included that: training / learning and development should always be followed up; links should be made to quality of practice; and there should be regular scoping of provision. It was also suggested that there could be: twilight sessions; the opportunity for participants to claim back time; and the amalgamation of different subjects into a full day training course. One voluntary organisation respondent stated that the Scottish Government should review examples of good practice and ensure their dissemination throughout CPCs.

2.26 Participants in one group identified developments relating to overall child protection practice, which included: the use of “virtual child protection champions”; and a pilot scheme over the school summer holidays of a contact list of teachers who are named persons and prepared to be “on call”.

Links to other documents and frameworks

2.27 Question 2 asked:

Does the Framework document make appropriate links to:

- Other strategic documents/frameworks related to child protection
- Other strategic documents related to CPD.

2.28 Almost all of the written respondents addressed this question, and relevant issues were raised in almost all of the workshops. Again, respondents made comments on the different parts of this question in different ways, but it was possible to identify their overall views of the issues explored and additional comments made.

Overall views of links to other documents

2.29 Among those who addressed Question 2 in the written strand, around two thirds expressed the view that the Framework made appropriate links to other documents, although many made further suggestions, and around half of these respondents qualified their view, or suggested that this was only “in part”. The most common reason for a qualified view appeared to be that, while the Framework was seen to make appropriate links to strategic documents / frameworks related to child protection, this was less the case for strategic documents related to CPD.

2.30 Around a quarter of those who addressed the question did not express a clear view of whether or not the document made appropriate links, and all of these respondents suggested further developments, as did participants in a number of workshops. A very small number expressed the explicit view that the document did not make appropriate links to other strategic documents and frameworks.

2.31 Many respondents made additional comments, and these focused on: the overall nature of this aspect of the Framework; views of relevant strategic documents / frameworks related to child protection; and views of other relevant strategic documents related to Continuing Professional Development (CPD). Within each of these areas, some of the comments related to positive views, others to the identification of perceived concerns or issues, and the largest number focused on suggestions for further development of the material, or the identification of issues for inclusion. These detailed views are summarised below.

The overall nature of this part of the document

2.32 A number of respondents made positive comments about this aspect of the Framework, a small number of which related to general views of the links within the document. Such comments included that the links were perceived to be clear and informative, and the value of making such links. One local authority respondent, for example, stated that making such links helped to put child protection into context for agencies. It was also suggested that it helped signpost agencies to best practice in child protection, as well as assisting in identifying gaps for the workforce.

2.33 As noted previously, however, a number of comments were also made about perceived concerns or issues and suggestions for improvement. Some of these focused on general views of this aspect of the document or upon Annex B (“Useful Links and References”). Such comments included the views that the terminology used differs from other frameworks, and that it would not be easy to overlay the document with other training frameworks. One workshop group queried generally how the Framework would fit with other guidance and policies, while another stated that they were unfamiliar with the ethical decision making framework (referred to on p16). In relation to Annex B, one CPC respondent in the written strand suggested that this appeared to be a “random” list of key frameworks, legislation and / or documents, and that it was neither all-inclusive nor exhaustive.

2.34 Suggestions for development / improvement included to:

- Check for other relevant national key documents, legislation and frameworks (especially those from a single agency perspective).
- Provide a link to relevant research findings and resources.
- Clarify where the document sits in relation to other strategies, frameworks and guidance, and ensure consistency of language.
- State that each individual area will have local policies and procedural guidelines.
- Ensure that all key documents, legislation and frameworks mentioned throughout the Framework are also included in Annex B.
- Redesign Annex B to group the documents.

2.35 A few respondents in the written consultation and workshops expressed the view that consideration should be given to how to present the material from other documents to ensure that the Framework does not go out of date if these change.

Strategic documents / frameworks relating to child protection

2.36 Most of the positive comments about this aspect of the document related specifically to: acknowledging the inclusion of specific links to strategic documents / frameworks relating to child protection; suggesting that the Framework was complementary to these; or stating that these links were appropriate. Those mentioned most commonly were Getting it Right for Every Child [GIRFEC] and the National Guidance for Child Protection in Scotland [2010]. Smaller numbers of respondents acknowledged or welcomed links to other strategic documents relating to child protection, as follows:

- The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989).
- The Children (Scotland) Act 1995.
- The Children's Charter (Scottish Executive, 2004).
- A Framework for Standards (Scottish Executive, 2004).
- Protecting Scotland's Children and Young People Training Framework (Version 12) (Scottish Executive, 2005).

2.37 One respondent in the written strand stated that the reference to the public protection arena was useful. One workshop group suggested that the use of terms such as "named person" would ensure consistency with the new Children and Young People Bill.

2.38 Although, as noted, the links to strategic documents related to child protection were generally perceived as being appropriate by those who expressed a view, a number of respondents also identified gaps, or suggested further developments or issues for inclusion (both general and specific).

2.39 Several respondents identified general strategic / policy areas which they considered had been omitted or not fully covered, where references to documents and partnerships had not been made, or where links should be included or strengthened. These included the public protection arena generally, and specific issues such as: mental health; substance misuse and recovery; adult support and protection; violence against women / domestic abuse; disability; and hate crime.

2.40 It was suggested in one workshop group that reference should be made to the SHANARI wheel⁴, as it was seen to link everything coming from the Government, and should be taken into account by everyone in work involving children. A small number expressed a general concern that all key child protection policy documents and key legislation were not included. One respondent in the written strand stated that the document assumed a detailed knowledge of existing strategic frameworks, thus making only "passing reference" to them.

2.41 In terms of the identification of specific documents for inclusion or further emphasis, a few of the respondents to the written consultation and some workshop participants raised issues relating to the links to GIRFEC. These included, for example: questioning how well child protection was integrated into GIRFEC; suggesting that GIRFEC is not yet fully bedded-in; and suggesting that the links to GIRFEC in the Framework were not as clear as they could be. Several also made

⁴ Well-being indicators for children.

suggestions about developing the links in the document, including that: there should be a clearer and stronger emphasis on the GIRFEC approach; the implications of the principles could be made more explicit; common language should be used; and the document should be more closely aligned to GIRFEC. One respondent, however, also stated that it should be made clear that child protection training should not replace GIRFEC training, but should be additional.

2.42 A few respondents also made suggestions about the links to the National Guidance for Child Protection in Scotland. These included that: references should be more explicit and should not be paraphrased; a case study could be included to highlight this; and there should be links to, or inclusion of specific aspects of this (e.g. the indicators of risk; and the exact staff training and development business requirements).

2.43 Several respondents identified other strategic documents or legislation relevant to child protection which they considered had been omitted or not fully covered, or where links should be included (or strengthened / developed). These were:

- The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989).
- Guidance on Protecting Children – A Shared Responsibility.
- The Local Government in Scotland Act 2003, and the Concordat between the Scottish Government and local government (2007).
- The Children’s Charter (2004).
- Protecting Children and Young People: Child Protection Committees (Scottish Executive, 2005).
- A Curriculum for Excellence.
- The Early Years Framework (Scottish Government, 2008).
- Pre-Birth to Three (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2010).
- National Guidance: Under-Age Sexual Activity (Scottish Government, 2010).
- Children’s Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011.
- Getting Our Priorities Right (Scottish Government, 2012).

2.44 A small number of other comments were made. One respondent suggested that the Framework should not be anchored in the Children (Scotland) Act 1995, as this may confuse staff. One stated that the Framework should state explicitly that the set of competences reflect many of those established in Version 12. Another suggested that, in Annex B, “Protecting Children - A Shared Responsibility” had now been replaced by the National Child Protection Guidance, and should be removed.

Strategic documents related to CPD

2.45 In terms of strategic documents related to CPD, one respondent to the written strand acknowledged the inclusion of reference to the Scottish Social Services Council Continuous Learning Framework. Another mentioned the Core Competency Framework for the Protection of Children (NHS Education for Scotland, 2011).

2.46 A number of respondents, however, identified perceived gaps or issues with the links to documents related to CPD, or suggested further developments or issues for inclusion. As noted, a number considered these links to be less well-developed than

those relating to child protection. A few made general comments about perceived gaps or overall areas to which reference should be made, and comments included the views that: all relevant frameworks may not currently be included; there are gaps relating to health, police and those working with adults; there should be more links to CPD throughout the Framework; the documents mentioned have an education and social work focus; and there should be links or reference to single agency CPD frameworks, competences and practice. One voluntary organisation respondent expressed concern about the level of variation in CPD and learning opportunities across different disciplines, and the difficulties in integration.

2.47 A few respondents identified specific organisations / resources with a role in CPD to which they felt additional links should be made in this context (while not necessarily mentioning particular publications). These were:

- The Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC).
- NHS Education for Scotland (NES).
- Learning and Teaching Scotland (LTS).
- Multi-Agency Resource Service (MARS).
- Scottish Child Care and Protection Network (SCCPN).
- Skills for Health.
- Changing Lives Knowledge Network.
- Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services (IRISS).
- Scottish Online Appraisal Resource (SOAR).
- HM Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) and the Care Inspectorate.

2.48 A number of respondents identified specific documents which they considered had been omitted or not fully covered, or where links should be included, strengthened or developed. The document mentioned most commonly was the “Common Core of Skills, Knowledge, Understanding and Values for the Children’s Workforce in Scotland” (2012), which it was noted in one workshop was published after the draft Framework. Several respondents highlighted the relevance of this, and one CPC respondent expressed the view that there was a lot of duplication between the two documents. Suggestions included: the need for reference to, and emphasis on the Common Core; provision of explicit links; clarity of how to use the documents in tandem; and, in the view of some respondents, the opportunity for inclusion, combination or integration of this with the Framework. One respondent questioned the need for a separate child protection framework.

2.49 In terms of other specific documents for inclusion, a common suggestion, particularly from health respondents, was to make close and explicit links to the NHS Knowledge and Skills Framework (NHS KSF) (Department of Health, 2004) and the eKSF. One health respondent to the written consultation, however, stated that linking the competences may present a challenge.

2.50 Other relevant documents which it was suggested had been omitted or not fully covered, or where links should be included, strengthened or developed were:

- Changing Lives (Scottish Executive, 2006).
- The Standard for Childhood Practice in Scotland (Scottish Government, QAA and SSSC, 2007).

- Relevant Scottish Vocational Qualifications (SVQs) and National Occupational Standards (NOS).
- A Framework of Competences (Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, 2009).
- Safeguarding Children and Young People: Roles and Competences for Health Care Staff – Intercollegiate Document (Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, 2010).
- The Healthcare Quality Strategy for NHS Scotland (Scottish Government, 2010).
- Core Competency Framework for the Protection of Children (NHS Education for Scotland, 2011)
- Teaching Scotland’s Future (Scottish Government, 2011).
- The Continuous Learning Framework (SSSC).
- Looked After Children: Knowledge, Skills and Competence of Health Care Staff. Intercollegiate Role Framework (Royal College of Nursing and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, 2012).
- GMC child protection guidance for doctors (Forthcoming).
- Clinical governance guidance for primary care.
- A review of safeguarding in Family Nurse Partnerships.
- Modernising Nursing in the Community (NHS Education for Scotland).
- Pre- and post-registration curricula for professionals.

Overall aims

2.51 Question 3 asked:

Is the framework clear in its aims overall?

a) Does it have relevance for:

- *Those working directly with children and young people and*
- *Also for those working with adults?*

2.52 Almost all of the written respondents addressed this question, and relevant issues were raised in almost all of the workshops. While not all of the respondents answered “yes” or “no”, and not all addressed the different parts of the question separately, it was again possible to identify the overall pattern of views.

Overall views of aims and relevance

2.53 Around two thirds of those who addressed this question in the written strand expressed (or implied) the view that the Framework is clear in its aims overall. Over a quarter of respondents to the written strand who addressed the question did not express a definitive view, but most made comments, as was the case among workshop participants. A small number of respondents expressed the view that the Framework is not clear in its aims overall, and one stated that it is confusing in what it is trying to do. One respondent stated that the rationale for the Framework is not clear.

2.54 Among those who did express the view that the aims are clear, the reasons given included that respondents believed that: the aims are explicit; the document outlines who it is for; and the document states how it should be used. Some of those

who believed the aims to be clear, however, provided a more qualified view and one respondent stated, for example, that the aims are clear, but the execution is less clear. The main reason for respondents' qualified views, however, appeared to relate to Question 3(a), and the perceived relevance of the Framework to particular groups, particularly those working with adults.

2.55 Although a smaller number of respondents directly addressed question 3(a), most of those who did so expressed the view that they considered the Framework to have relevance for those working directly with children and young people. Fewer, however, believed that the Framework, in its current form, has explicit relevance for those working with adults. The concern among these respondents appeared to relate to the clarity of the aims and the *explicit* relevance for this group. A number expressed the view that the aims are less clear for those working with adults, or that the Framework has more explicit / recognisable relevance for those working directly with children and young people.

2.56 Respondents made a number of additional comments, which focused on their more detailed views of the nature of the aims and the relevance of the Framework to particular groups. Within each of these overall themes, while a number of respondents provided positive views of aspects of the aims and relevance, the largest number of comments focused on the identification of perceived concerns or issues relating to this part of the document, or suggested developments and improvements.

The nature of the aims

2.57 Several respondents made comments about the overall nature of the aims, or about aspects of the section of the document dealing with the nature of the Framework, who it is for and how it will be used. Among these, one respondent, for example, stated that they believed the aims to be “ambitious” and “admirable”, while a few gave their views of what the purposes of the Framework were (or should be). These, which were expressed in various ways, included to:

- Provide a tool to assist in identifying training needs and to help agencies to establish, implement and evaluate inter-agency child protection training.
- Ensure that all workers have the knowledge, skills and competency to allow workers and volunteers to contribute effectively to the multi-agency task of protecting children and young people.
- Ensure that those who come into direct or indirect contact with children are aware that they have a duty of care towards children.
- Provide a reference to complement existing material or to provide guidance to be adapted for local use across Scotland.
- Promote the welfare of the child, early intervention and improve outcomes for children and young people.
- Encourage and enable collaborative working.

2.58 A few respondents to the written strand and participants in a small number of workshops highlighted particular aspects of this part of the Framework which they found helpful, and these included:

- The information on page 5 relating to functions.
- The diagram on page 9 “Children in the Public Protection Context”.
- The outline of where people fit in the Framework (discussed further at Question 6).
- The outline of roles and responsibilities (including leadership and CPC responsibilities).

2.59 A number of comments were also made, however, about perceived concerns and issues with this part of the document, along with related suggestions for further development / improvement. A few respondents, for example, suggested that the section, or the aims lacked clarity. One voluntary organisation expressed the view that the document seemed “caught between being a strategy document and a practical tool”. It was also suggested that there is no vision or mission statement. A further respondent stated that the document seemed to be aiming to “upskill the entire children’s workforce”. Further general comments on the section included the view that the beginning of the document was too long before reaching the aim.

2.60 Suggestions included to amend the aims / section and to:

- Specify the aims, objectives, who the document is for, how to use it and the key points clearly, concisely and in one place (e.g. at the start).
- Identify responsibilities more clearly, with a few suggesting this particularly for managers (although one respondent stated that ensuring that everyone is aware of these responsibilities would not be a function of the Framework).
- Make the aims Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (SMART).
- Make more specific reference / links to public protection.
- Amend specific issues relating to, for example: language; definition; structure / ordering; typos; and particular wording / terminology.
- Split the document into two, with the Framework (having a vision, strategy, aims and details of implementation), and an accompanying competences document.
- State that the purposes include: working towards safeguarding; using the Framework as a tool when writing job descriptions; and providing guidance which should be adapted for local use.

The relevance of the document

2.61 Several respondents made additional comments to reiterate their view of the relevance of the document to those working with children and young people, and in a smaller number of cases, its relevance to those working with adults. In relation to the latter, for example, one local authority respondent stated that it was particularly helpful to make explicit links to those who work with adults, and a similar view was expressed in one of the workshop groups. One CPC respondent described the Framework as having a “four step” approach, with different steps relevant to different groups. Another noted that the Framework also has relevance for public protection.

2.62 A number of respondents, however, identified concerns or issues with the current relevance of the Framework, and the group highlighted most frequently for

whom the relevance was less clear was those working with adults. Within this, a few respondents highlighted the lack of reference to adult services per se, or to specific services (e.g. mental health; substance misuse; domestic abuse; learning disability; criminal justice etc.) where they believed that child protection should be an integral part of the core function. A few respondents highlighted the lack of explicit relevance to those working with parents and carers. One workshop group, for example, expressed the view that those working with parents (and infrequently and / or indirectly with children) needed many of the same core skills as specialists, but that the Framework, as drafted, would not support their development. One respondent suggested that they felt that the links to the adult workforce seemed to refer more to family work than specialist work with adults.

2.63 A small number of respondents raised issues relating particularly to adult protection. These included the view, for example, that it was not clear whether this question related to a framework for adult protection or those working with adults in relation to child protection (which two respondents argued would have different implications). One local authority respondent stated that, although vulnerable adults were not mentioned specifically, the skills and competences would be relevant to those working in that sector.

2.64 Other gaps or issues highlighted in relation to the relevance of the document for particular groups included concerns about:

- The current relevance and impact of the Framework on young people aged 16 and 17.
- A perceived social work focus within the document.
- The lack of reference to specific groups (e.g. generic staff who do not work directly with children and young people but come into contact with them daily; volunteers; medical staff; and “emerging professionals”).
- Differentiation of private and third sector organisations from single agencies.
- The use of specific examples in the section on managerial leadership which may exclude some managers from adopting the Framework.
- Specific issues which are considered unclear (e.g. the general relevance of the Framework for different groups; who would use it; and whether it relates to multi-agency training only, or includes single agency training).
- The definitions of the workforce (considered in detail at Question 6).

2.65 The issues raised above imply particular developments and improvements to address these. In addition, some respondents made specific suggestions. These included that the Framework should:

- Make it clear that everyone has a role in learning and development, and capture the breadth of need for all organisations.
- Place a stronger and more explicit emphasis throughout the document on its relevance to those working with adults / adult services.
- Give additional consideration to the relevance to young people in transition from children’s to adult services.

- Identify the role of specific organisations (e.g. housing, voluntary organisations and volunteers, GPs, Scottish Government) and ensure that the document is made relevant to them.
- Identify the role of different types of stakeholders at different levels for whom the document is relevant (with suggestions including, for example: CPCs; senior management; managers; those with training / learning and development responsibilities; supervisors; individuals).
- Capture the role of partnerships (e.g. Alcohol and Drugs, Violence Against Women, Adult / Public Protection, Community Planning).
- Identify staff in particular workforce groups and reflect the role of adult services (discussed further at Question 6).
- Highlight CPCs' role in strategic oversight of training / learning and development, and identify agencies' own responsibilities for meeting staff needs (working with others and the CPC as appropriate).

Summary of findings: access to multi-agency learning and development, links and overall aims

2.66 In summary, the main findings relating to multi-agency learning and development, links and overall aims are as follows:

- In relation to Question 1, a majority of respondents stated or implied that they had access to some form of multi-agency training / learning and development in their area, although a few stated that this was not the case, or was limited.
- In terms of the types of organisations covered by local multi-agency training / learning and development arrangements, most of those who provided this information stated that voluntary sector partners were included. The inclusion of partners who provide services to adults was also common. Around half stated that services commissioned to external organisations would be included.
- In relation to Question 2, around two thirds of written respondents to this question expressed the view that the Framework made appropriate links to other documents, although around half qualified their view, or suggested that this was only "in part".
- While the Framework was generally seen to make appropriate links to strategic documents / frameworks related to child protection, this was less the case for strategic documents related to CPD.
- In relation to Question 3, most respondents believed that the Framework is clear in its aims overall.
- In terms of its relevance to particular groups, most of those who expressed a view considered the Framework to have relevance for those working directly with children and young people. Fewer, however, believed that the Framework, in its current form, has explicit relevance for those working with adults.
- A large amount of additional information was provided at each of the questions to support the views expressed and to provide additional suggested developments / improvements to the draft document.

SECTION 3: GOOD PRACTICE, SKILLS AND COMPETENCY

3.1 This section presents the findings relating to: good practice examples; and skills and competency (Questions 4-6).

Good practice examples

3.2 Questions 4 and 5 asked:

(4) How helpful do you find the good practice, please provide a rating of 1 to 5. 1 being really helpful and 5 being not at all helpful.

(5) If the good practice examples require changes, how might they be improved, please give examples.

3.1 Almost all of the respondents to the written consultation addressed both of these questions, and relevant issues were raised in all of the workshops. There were overlaps between the responses given at each of the questions (with, for example, many respondents suggesting improvements to the examples in their response to Question 4). For that reason, the findings from Questions 4 and 5 are considered together.

3.2 The ratings given to the examples are provided first, before summarising the additional comments.

Rating of good practice examples

3.3 Only the respondents to the written strand were asked to provide a rating of the good practice examples, and most of those who addressed Question 4 did so. Views of these examples were not particularly positive, and a majority of the respondents rated them as 3 or above. The most common specific rating was 3 (just over a third of those who rated the examples). Also common was 4 (just under a third). A small number (around 1 in 10) rated the examples as 1 or 2; and over a third rated them as 4 or 5. Just under a fifth provided a rating that was non-specific (e.g. 2-3; 2-4; 3-4).

3.4 Most respondents made additional comments, and these covered both their overall views of the examples and the subject matter of the specific examples used. In each case, the comments included: positive observations; the identification of concerns and issues; and suggested developments and improvements to the examples.

Overall views of the examples

3.5 Despite the ratings provided, several respondents in the written strand and in some of the workshops stated that they found the examples, or at least the idea of using examples, to be helpful. It was suggested that these could help to: put the Framework in context; support understanding; demonstrate aspects of the document; inform discussion; and make links to practice. Other positive comments made by a few respondents were that they were seen to be: good; readable; useful; concise; and relevant. Several respondents stressed the overall value of including good practice examples.

3.6 A larger number of respondents, however, identified perceived concerns and issues with the overall nature and use of the examples, and a larger number still provided suggestions about how these could be developed or improved further. In terms of the issues raised, the most common comments on the examples overall were that they were seen to be: bland, simplistic and too generic. Additional related comments included that they do not provide sufficient depth to ensure competency, do not explain the improvements required, and do not reflect the complexity of the challenges faced by practitioners. Several respondents also stated generally that the examples are not particularly helpful, or that they do not necessarily add value to the Framework. A few respondents suggested that they could be seen to be patronising. One voluntary organisation stated that some of the language used to describe families is quite negative, inappropriate and “labelling”.

3.7 A range of other perceived concerns were also raised about the overall nature of the examples, including that they are limited in number and are not tied in well to the rest of the document. Some respondents suggested specifically that they do not link well to skills and competences, and one respondent stated that they make little or no reference to the well-being indicators or to GIRFEC language. It was also suggested that they are not particularly relevant or “real”, nor do they take account of the challenges (discussed earlier) of accessing training. A few respondents stated that they do not represent current good practice, and participants in one workshop group stated that they are no longer appropriate. One respondent stated that the title is not clear in terms of what the examples set out to achieve. A further respondent stated that they raise more questions than they answer.

3.8 A few respondents identified more general issues with the use of examples, suggesting that: these can be very subjective; can discourage people from thinking for themselves; and might vary between areas, depending on existing provision and partnership working. Participants in one workshop group suggested that they would need to be approved by the relevant professions and / or inspection agency. A small number of respondents considered the examples to be generally unnecessary.

3.9 A number of suggestions were made about how the examples overall could be developed or improved. These included to:

- Increase the number, and include them in each section.
- Clarify the purpose of the examples and reflect this in the title.
- Ensure that they are realistic.
- Include descriptors of competence, link the examples clearly to skills and competences and present them at appropriate points in the Framework.
- Identify how the examples can be used.
- Ensure that they are accessible and creative.
- Provide an appendix containing the examples.

3.10 A few respondents suggested that examples should perhaps not be included.

The subject matter of the specific examples

3.11 Many comments were made on the subject matter of the specific examples used, and a few respondents made positive comments about these. These

comments related largely to the example on page 12 (the primary teacher) and the example on page 20 (where a staff member identifies a gap in their knowledge). It was suggested that these made use of formal training and other learning opportunities. It was also suggested that the example on page 12 seemed realistic and clear. Most of the comments on the subject matter, however, focused on perceived concerns or issues with the examples, and suggested developments and improvements.

3.12 Some of these comments related to the individual examples, and among the concerns or issues identified with the one on page 11 (the police officer) were that it was seen to be: basic; unclear; unrealistic; and inaccurate (with further details given). It was also suggested that it undermines the responsibility of single agency training and raises questions about how it will impact on knowledge, skills, practice and outcomes. Among the concerns or issues identified with the example on p12 were that it was seen to be: basic; unclear who it was for; and not illustrative of particularly good practice (with further details given). It was also suggested that it: lacks detail of the process to be followed; raises concerns about the teacher's knowledge of child brain development and the relevance of this; does not have a clear link to a personal development plan, nor to outcomes; and contains typos. Among the concerns or issues identified with the example on p20 were that it was seen to be: very general (but also by another respondent as quite specific); poor; and lacking reference to the need for a joint visit.

3.13 While these issues imply related developments or improvements to the examples, a number of specific suggestions were made. These were that:

- In relation to the example on page 11: the last sentence should be reviewed and reference made to single agency training; the example should involve an issue for which a police officer might have less experience; and details could be given of who could provide the officer with what he needs .
- In relation to the example on page 12, this should include: recognition of the need from home support from other agencies, multi-agency working and information sharing; reference to the teacher considering the GIRFEC questions; reference to the planned supports; and how the training / learning and development was applied.
- In relation to the example on page 20, this should include: information about circumstances where relevant training is not available and needs to be developed; a link to outcomes and how the improved outcomes would be measured.

3.14 As well as the comments on the individual examples, some respondents made comments on perceived general gaps in the subject matter or coverage of the examples. Among these, it was suggested that the examples did not make any reference to the organisational context in which the individuals are working, the role of the line manager, the likelihood that services will have had some single agency training, nor multi-agency procedures. Additionally, one respondent stated that there is a lack of emphasis on where else the child, family and worker can get help, or make a referral to. Participants in one workshop group stated that the examples focus on training as the only way to address a development need. It was also

suggested that the examples provide no evidence of how the improved knowledge makes the children safer.

3.15 Again, while developments and improvements are implied by these comments, specific suggestions were that the examples should include:

- Genuine material which is specific, detailed and explores the complexity of practice.
- A variety of ways to meet staff learning and development needs.
- Links to the development cycle, “pathways”, supervision and reflection.
- Direct reference to the skills and competences.
- Reference to local child protection protocols / procedures.
- Reference to multi-agency working.
- Clearer information about how the training / learning and development links to practice and outcomes.
- Questions to challenge the practitioner.
- Examples of what not to do.
- Working with challenging families / involuntary clients.
- Working with ethnic minority groups.
- Evaluation and review (including self-evaluation).

3.16 Several respondents raised issues with the actual nature of the organisations covered in the examples, with comments including: a perceived statutory focus; a focus on children’s services; and a lack of range of practice situations. It was suggested that there is no example involving the unpaid workforce, the voluntary sector or the private sector. In terms of suggestions relating to this, a number of respondents argued that a wider range of staff / workers and situations overall should be included in the examples. It was also suggested that examples should be included from different areas, and that examples of different levels of training and related roles should be included.

3.17 More specific suggestions included providing examples from:

- The voluntary sector (including paid and unpaid workers).
- Adult services.
- The private sector.
- The wider workforce.
- Seniors, on the ground managers and practitioners.
- Children and young people (including different ages).
- Family Nurse Partnerships.
- Mental health services.
- Learning disability services.
- Emergency services.
- Substance misuse services (e.g. an addictions worker).
- Domestic abuse services.
- A youth group or organisation.
- An early years nursery.
- Housing.
- Leisure services (e.g. a swimming pool attendant, sports club).

- A child care social worker.
- A librarian.
- A Community Warden.
- A committee member.
- A GP.
- A community police officer.
- A plumber.

3.18 As well as concerns about the nature of the examples, some of the suggestions related to the means of generating examples, and these included seeking examples from:

- The Care Inspectorate (from their programme of inspections).
- ChildLine.
- Scottish Out of School Care Network (SOSCN).
- HM Inspectorate of Education (HMIE).
- Multi-Agency Resource Service (MARS).
- The Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC).
- Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services (IRISS).
- Youth Justice and Criminal Justice Social Work.
- Other agency representatives and stakeholders.

Skills and competency

3.19 Questions 6 and 6a asked:

- (6) How helpful did you find the skills and competency section.
- (6a) Please provide examples of how this should be changed and what should be included?

3.20 Almost all of the respondents to the written consultation addressed Question 6 (generally both parts), and relevant issues were raised in all of the workshops. This was the question which generated the most information, with a very large amount of qualitative material provided.

3.21 Unlike Question 4, this question did not ask for a numerical rating, and none of the respondents provided this. However, just under half of the respondents to this question made direct comments on how helpful they found the section, and the majority of these stated that they found it “good”, “helpful” or “useful” (although some qualified this with other comments). Several of those who provided a qualitative rating stated that they found the section “very” good, helpful or useful (or, in one case, potentially very helpful).

3.22 Most of the respondents, however, provided their views of the section on skills and competency through detailed comments, and these focused on a number of themes: the section overall; the nature of the competences; the definitions of the workforces; and specific issues relating to the skills and competences included for each of the workforces.

The section overall

3.23 In relation to the section overall, a number of respondents made positive comments about aspects of this. These included the views that it was: based on a good theoretical approach; better than the previous Framework in Version 12 which focused on “levels” (although one respondent suggested that there could be concerns about moving away from this for managers); consistent with, and complementary to other frameworks; comprehensive; and clear. A small number of respondents suggested that it identified key issues, and participants in one workshop stated that the tables were good visual aids. Several respondents identified how the material would be used, and comments included to: improve organisations’ own frameworks; shape training; promote interagency work; develop training needs analysis; set a consistent standard; and evaluate learning / training opportunities.

3.24 The largest number of comments on this section overall, however, focused on perceived concerns or issues, or suggested developments or improvements. The main issues raised were that it was seen to be repetitive and too long. Other concerns were that it was: confusing; vague; prescriptive; lacking clear structure or priority; lacking some essential requirements. It was also argued that it uses some concepts that might be new to some workers. Participants in two workshops expressed concerns that the material in the section would be used as a “tick box” list.

3.25 Suggested developments were to make the section: shorter; sharper / less repetitive; more concise; less detailed (but more explanatory); and generally clearer (including definitions of terms and the use of appropriate language). A few respondents argued that this section should cross-refer to other relevant work (e.g. as highlighted at Question 2). A number of respondents made suggestions about the presentation or layout of the material, including: the use of a diagram, pyramid or table of the competences; a “menu” approach; and the inclusion of particular subsections, headings, themes or wording. Two local authority respondents suggested that the document should read like a framework, rather than a “statement”. One voluntary organisation respondent suggested that the current Framework should be split into two documents: a strategic framework and a separate competences document. Participants in one workshop group identified a typo for correction.

The nature of the skills and competences

3.26 Many comments were made about the overall nature of the skills and competences in the section, and this was a common theme. While a few respondents expressed positive views about these, or about the idea of using competences, most comments again focused on perceived concerns or issues, potential developments or improvements. Positive comments about the overall nature of the competences included that they are: comprehensive; carefully constructed; a useful self-evaluation tool; and a good “blended learning” approach. Two respondents suggested that the definition of competence was useful and a few supported the overall notion of identifying these. Two CPC respondents stated that they found the headings (“be aware of”, “know”, “understand”, “recognise” and “be able to”) useful.

3.27 Among the concerns about the nature of the skills and competences overall, however, issues raised frequently related to the nature of emphasis or the definitions of terms within these. Views included that: there is more focus on “knowledge” than

skills and competences; and there is no definition of “skills” nor sufficient emphasis on these. A small number of respondents raised other issues with the headings, including that: there are too many; they are too general; they are unclear; and some terms are subjective or imply that no action is required.

3.28 Other common concerns related to views that there is: a high number of skills and competences; a lack of clarity about their development; and a lack of relevance of some to particular staff groups (discussed further later). A few respondents suggested that the competences could create bureaucracy, and could be daunting.

3.29 Issues were also raised about other aspects of the skills and competences. These included concerns about: a lack of clarity or use of inappropriate language or concepts; a question of whether all of the competences are “essential” for workers; an implied “progression”; and an implied focus on self-directed learning. A few respondents suggested that the competences had a social work or statutory service focus. It was also suggested that some competences were missing (e.g. relating to domestic abuse, ethnic minority groups, disabled children, those with complex needs, and those in training / educator roles). One workshop group raised a question about how they would translate to outcomes and one respondent stated that simply meeting a “competence” did not mean that a worker was competent.

3.30 Among specific suggestions for development or improvement of the overall nature of the skills and competences, the most common (expressed in a range of ways by respondents) was that there should be some distinction made between skills and competences considered “core” or “essential”, and those considered optional / desirable, or which may apply dependent on a particular role or function (with examples). Similar comments were made in relation to each of the different workforces, and some respondents (including participants in a few of the workshop groups) suggested prioritisation of competences within workforces. A few respondents (including two workshop groups) suggested that there could be a progression through the competences, from core to highly specialist.

3.31 A further suggestion was that the terms “competence” and “skills” should both be defined, and a distinction made between them. It was also suggested that there could be fewer headings and that they could be linked or grouped. One respondent considered the explanation of the headings to be unnecessary, and one CPC respondent suggested the use of more specific terms (with suggestions).

3.32 It was also argued that the competences could be clarified further, including the skills needed and the steps that could be taken to achieve them. Several stated that guidance (including examples) about how to use the competences would be helpful. One workshop group suggested that competences could be more general, to allow discussion with staff.

3.33 A range of other potential developments / improvements were also highlighted, including that: skills and competences should be SMART and measurable; the number should be reduced, they could be grouped or “building blocks” could be used; learning outcomes / objectives should be identified; there should be a greater emphasis on skills and competences; the language should be more authoritative; and other forms of terminology should be used. A few respondents suggested that the competences should be aligned or integrated with the Common Core, and one

suggested that, in the field of childcare, it would be useful to “map” them onto those within the qualifications and training workers are required to take part in. One voluntary sector respondent argued that the competences must reflect issues such as the “multiple adversities” faced by children, the growing understanding of harm and abuse, changing practice and the increasing diversity of Scotland’s population. Participants in one workshop group suggested that “child” should be defined.

Definitions of the workforces

3.34 A further common theme on which comments were made related to the definitions of the workforces (i.e. the wider workforce; the specific workforce; and the specialist workforce). Again, these included some positive comments, although a higher number of respondents identified issues and concerns with the definitions, or made suggestions for potential developments and improvements.

3.35 Positive comments (both from the written strand and workshops) included views that: the notion of three workforces is helpful and practical (e.g. facilitating access to appropriate information; grouping practitioners); the descriptions / definitions are good; the categories are better than the previous levels; the distinctions are helpful; and the fluidity between levels is good. One workshop group welcomed the wider workforce section specifically, as it would include people who, historically, had not received training on child protection.

3.36 The most common concern identified with the terms and definitions of the workforces, however, were that these were confusing and / or misleading. Related to this, some respondents made additional points that: the terms “specific” and “specialist” are too similar; some other terms are confusing; the sectors are too wide; it is not clear which organisations and workers are covered (e.g. whether those occasionally coming into contact with children and families, such as plumbers, are included; whether volunteers would feel included; whether adult services are included); and it is difficult to identify where particular services and workers “fit”. A few respondents stated that there are overlaps between the workforces. One respondent argued that the criteria give the impression of “levels” and one CPC respondent argued that the definitions could be seen to be “somewhat disparaging”. It was also suggested that other framework levels do not necessarily correspond to the three bands.

3.37 Concerns were also raised about individual workforce definitions, particularly the definition of the wider workforce. These included the views that: the definition is in conflict with current NHS guidance; it may cover too diverse a group and may not be specific enough for staff working in some key areas; it is too broad for the level of prescription; there is no reference to adult services; and some staff would not recognise themselves in the definition, but need some basic child protection awareness training (e.g. those who may come into contact with children, young people and their families). One workshop group argued that the use of “child” may not be seen to include those up to 18 who had previously been looked after or are vulnerable in some way. One respondent also identified a typo on page 13.

3.38 Concerns with the definition of the specific workforce included that: the term is not helpful in describing what is a wide and diverse workforce; and the definition may exclude those who may not see a child regularly (e.g. police; adult services).

Concerns with the definition of the specialist workforce included that: the definition is confused, as most professionals would not regard themselves as “specialist”; it is unclear why there are two separate lists without a second definition for those involved in intensive support, advanced practice and management; and it is not clear how “intensive support” fits with other groups, as management is not confined to the specialist level. A few respondents questioned whether this section of the workforce is most likely to have the role of the Lead Professional, as this could also apply to the specific workforce.

3.39 A range of suggested developments and improvements to the definitions were highlighted. At a general level, the most common suggestion was to clarify and / or refine the workforce definitions and the terms used. A number of respondents suggested that examples (e.g. using roles or job titles) or further explanation should be provided to clarify who fits into each of the three workforces. Two workshop groups identified particular staff who they believed should be mentioned explicitly. Participants in one workshop, and a respondent in the written strand, suggested removing the workforce headings altogether (in conjunction with having a core skill set). Participants in another workshop group suggested that CPCs and employers should have the flexibility to determine who fits within their workforce.

3.40 Among other suggested developments and improvements to the definitions were: the need to reflect the roles of children’s services, adult services and other public protection partnerships, and the creation of “competency profiles” for different roles. One CPC respondent and participants in one of the workshops suggested an additional group of competences for decisions makers (e.g. Sheriffs, judges, panel members). Participants in one workshop group suggested clarification of what would be expected from pre-registration training for core professional groups, and one CPC suggested that it should be made clear the competences that can be expected from a newly qualified worker.

3.41 Among the suggestions for development or improvement of the individual definitions, in relation to the wider workforce, a number related to the perceived need for clarification of particular issues, such as: who is covered (including adult services; and those in roles that do not need PVG disclosure); and the need for all staff to have awareness of child protection as a minimum standard. Other suggestions included to: subdivide the wider workforce; provide guidance on how to use the competences with specific staff (such as, for example, refuse collectors, tradesmen working for housing and Registered Social Landlords); make reference to GIRFEC; and explain why child protection is everyone’s job. One CPC respondent offered a new, slightly amended definition of the wider workforce.

3.42 In relation to the specific workforce, one workshop group suggested particular wording changes, and one respondent to the written strand offered a new, slightly amended definition. A further suggestion was that the specific workforce should reflect that not everyone who has day to day contact with children will be involved in child protection assessments.

3.43 In relation to the specialist workforce, again one respondent offered a new, slightly amended definition. Other suggested developments / improvements included to: give the description careful thought; recognise that not everyone in this category will have a managerial role; make reference to “Lead Professional / Named Person”;

and ensure that it is clear that it does not exclude those who are not the Lead Professional or Named Person. A few respondents (from CPCs and workshop groups) suggested the addition of a category for managers / supervisors, and one offered a potential definition. A few suggested a fourth level reflecting skills at a higher level, and a few suggested the inclusion of a section for “communities” or a recognition of the need for wider societal learning. Participants in one workshop suggested having a group with a single competency of “know what do if you are worried about a child”.

Issues relating to the skills and competences included

3.44 The final theme in relation to skills and competences comprised the identification of specific concerns / issues and suggested developments and improvements to particular competences. Some of these focused on competences across the workforces (or where a workforce type was not specified), but most related to competences for specific workforces. The largest number of comments were made about those for the wider workforce.

3.45 In terms of concerns about skills and competences across workforces (or where a workforce type was not specified), a number of perceived gaps were highlighted. These included skills and competences relating to: being skilled and understanding changes in the benefit system; skills needed for working directly with children (other than for specialist workers); the need to understand key theories (other than for specialist workers); understanding of healthy child development; forming good relationships; analysis of material / professional critical analysis; working with 16-17 year olds; disability issues; and issues of power and oppression.

3.46 These perceived gaps imply some developments and improvements to competences across workforces (or where the workforce was not specified). Additional particular suggestions were the inclusion of skills and competences relating to: child-centred working, seeking children and young people’s views and promoting their rights (with detailed suggestions); the importance of attachment; relationship skills; child development; higher order communication skills when working with children, young people and families; professional confidence in challenging each other; responding appropriately (at the time) to disclosure; and confidentiality and information sharing. It was also suggested that the existing competences relating to: how to effectively observe, record and report; the internet; and the roles, functions and skills required from the named person / lead professional should be extended from the specialist workforce to all levels. Other suggestions included to: review the allocation of competences between different workforces; allocate these relative to key performance indicators; and include a section on corporate responsibility for core skills. Participants in one workshop group suggested the creation of an “absolute” of “recognise, report and record”.

3.47 In terms of concerns about skills and competences relating particularly to the wider workforce, the issue identified most commonly was the view that the list of competences was unnecessarily specialist and detailed, and the expectations too high for those who would be included in this definition. Some respondents added that these workers would need only a basic understanding of the issues, to be aware of their responsibility to pass on concerns, and to know who to contact.

3.48 Some respondents identified particular skills and competences (or aspects of these) seen to be unnecessary (or non-essential) for the wider workforce, and these were: knowledge of GIRFEC; awareness of specific vulnerabilities; awareness of the significance of secure attachments for children; awareness of multi-agency child protection guidelines and the role of the CPC; knowledge of child protection procedures, accountabilities and responsibilities; knowledge of statutory powers; understanding of the issues about consent; understanding of the legal framework; and ability to identify support agencies. It was suggested that the term “categories of abuse and neglect” is no longer used and also that the wider workforce is unlikely to have any statutory powers in relation to the protection of children.

3.49 Again, the above concerns imply some developments and improvements to the skills and competences for the wider workforce. Additional particular suggestions were to: review these skills and competences; include a description of the process of referring a child where there is a concern; simplify the language; identify core / essential skills and competences and others (as mentioned previously); and prioritise these (with some suggestions made).

3.50 It was also suggested that skills and competences should be included relating to: alcohol and drug awareness; domestic abuse; understanding the referral process; understanding the impact of child abuse and neglect on child development; and ability to access local child protection procedures. It was suggested that recognising concerns about children should be included from the specific workforce section and that the following should be included from the specialist / intensive support section: understanding internet safety; understanding immediate intervention measures; ability to give evidence in formal proceedings; understanding child protection and responsibilities as a manager; ability to contribute to a child’s plan; and ability to supervise and support workers / colleagues.

3.51 Several respondents expressed concerns about the skills and competences relating to the specific workforce, and these included the views that: there are too many of these; there is some repetition in their coverage (and the first bullet is included twice); some are contradictory; some are not particularly relevant to the police role; and it is not clear whether workers are required to meet them all. One respondent argued that the competence about awareness of interagency roles is covered in the wider workforce, while another pointed to a typo in this. A CPC respondent suggested two competences on which the wording appears confusing (“understand and be able to communicate effectively ...”; and “understand and be able to evaluate interventions ...”). Another respondent identified several competences which they considered should be desirable rather than essential (understanding child and adolescent development; ability to contribute to a child’s plan; and ability to contribute to the assessment process). One written respondent and participants in two workshops questioned the inclusion of “be aware of criminal injuries compensation” here (with one workshop group suggesting that it belongs with the specialist competences).

3.52 As well as the implied developments and improvements to the skills and competences for the specific workforce, additional suggestions included: that some could be joined together (with suggestions); they could be more succinct; the first three should be at the “know” level; the assessment and intervention section should

be in the skills / competences; and they should be split into “essential” and “desirable” (with some suggestions)

3.53 It was also suggested that skills and competences should be included relating to: disability and complex needs; keeping updated on changes to legislation and guidance; understanding the impact of domestic abuse in pregnancy; self-assessment of practice; ability to collate a “chronology”; participating in a child protection enquiry; issues relating to sexual exploitation; female genital mutilation; and child trafficking. It was suggested that understanding the issues about consent should be added from the wider workforce, and that those relating to the following should be included from the specialist section: effective observation; the internet; work with violent / dangerous families; resilience; the roles, functions and skills required from the Lead Professional / Named Person; and attending and leading the child’s plan meetings. It was suggested that the following should be added from the intensive support section: understanding child protection responsibilities as a manager; ability to supervise and support workers / colleagues; and ability to contribute to a child’s plan. There were mixed views about whether to remove, or move to the specialist workforce, the competence relating to awareness of criminal injuries compensation.

3.54 Concerns expressed about the skills and competences relating to the specialist workforce included the views that: there are too many; they can be confusing; some are repetitive (and the first one is included twice); many are not relevant to the police role (with examples); and some would not be considered “specialist” (with examples). A few respondents identified competences they considered unclear or not to make sense, and one noted a typo in the competence relating to “whistle blowing”. As noted previously, some of the skills and competences were seen to have wider relevance to the other workforces, and will not be repeated here.

3.55 As well as developments and improvements implied by these concerns, additional suggestions for the skills and competences for the specialist workforce included: identifying those that are “essential” and “desirable” (with suggestions); providing clear headings; and providing additional clarity where required (with suggestions).

3.56 It was also suggested that skills and competences should be included relating to: participating in a child protection enquiry; developing the skills of the Lead Professional; considering longer term outcomes; understanding self-harming behaviours, suicidal ideation and suicidal intent; working with difficult to engage or evasive families; understanding and responding to boundary issues / conflicts of interest; ability to refer on; ability to collate a “chronology”; and collecting and representing children’s views. One respondent identified issues for inclusion at a “fourth level” of higher level skills, while another identified those that they considered essential for managers.

3.57 In addition to all of these suggestions, some respondents made very specific wording suggestions about changes to particular competences, and these will not be detailed here. A small number of other actions to support the skills and competences were also identified (e.g. additional training) which are discussed later.

Summary of findings: good practice examples, skills and competency

3.58 In summary, the main findings relating to the good practice examples, and to skills and competency were as follows:

- In relation to Questions 4 and 5, views of the examples were not particularly positive, and a majority rated these as 3 or above (where 1 was really helpful and 5 not at all helpful).
- Most made additional comments about the examples, including positive observations (such as finding the examples themselves, or the idea of examples to be helpful) as well as the identification of concerns and issues (e.g. the lack of depth or added value, issues with the subject matter, perceived gaps in coverage and other issues).
- A number of developments and improvements to the examples overall, and to the specific subject matter were suggested.
- In relation to Questions 6 and 6a, while respondents did not provide a numerical rating, just under half made direct comments on how helpful they found the section, and the majority stated that they found it “good”, “helpful” or “useful”, although some qualified this.
- Most respondents provided their views of the section on skills and competency through more detailed comments, which focused on a number of themes: the section overall; the nature of the competences; the definitions of the workforces; and specific issues relating to the skills and competences included for each of the workforces.
- While a number of respondents made positive comments at Questions 6 and 6a, the largest number of comments on this section focused on perceived concerns or issues, or suggested developments. Many such suggestions were made, with potential improvements identified at each theme.

SECTION 4: EVALUATION AND ANY OTHER ISSUES RAISED

4.1 This section presents the findings relating to evaluation, and any other issues raised in the consultation (Questions 7 and 8).

Evaluation

4.2 Question 7 asked:

The framework does provide a recommended method of evaluation - if this is implemented will more detailed training materials be needed to support staff in gathering evidence, analysing and making judgements on evaluating training?

4.3 Almost all of the written respondents addressed this question, and relevant issues were raised in almost all of the workshops. Only a third of those who addressed the question answered “yes” or “no”, and, of these, nearly three quarters stated or implied “yes” while the remainder stated or implied “no”. A few respondents stated that they had difficulties understanding the question.

4.4 Many additional comments were made. Among these, some comments were made about the perceived need for more detailed training materials, and the types of materials seen to be needed. Most of the respondents, however, made broader comments on the content of the Framework relating to evaluation, from pages 19 to 24 (and the flowchart) rather than particularly addressing the need for training materials. A number of additional common themes emerged, and these focused on: the section overall and general issues relating to evaluation; the proposed methodology and model; and examples of evaluation work. All of these issues are considered below.

The need for more detailed training materials

4.5 Few details were given by those who answered “yes” or “no” about their reasons for their views of the need for more detailed training materials, but some comments were made. Among those who answered or implied agreement, for example, it was suggested that work will be needed in order to develop evaluation tools and materials to gather evidence in a convenient and manageable way, and that the method of evaluation needs resources and technology to produce the evidence. Participants in one workshop group suggested a general need for support with the type of evaluation recommended in the Framework. Where respondents did not feel that more detailed training materials would be needed, the reasons given included that: this is already included in staff training records; each organisation could insert details relevant to their own experience; and time is needed rather than materials. In one case, the respondent had concerns with the model proposed.

4.6 Several respondents (mostly, but not only those who stated or implied “yes”) made additional comments about particular issues for which training materials would be needed. These included: training needs analysis; self-evaluation; evidence gathering; analysis; quality assurance; and measuring impact. Two CPC respondents argued that further training materials would be particularly welcome at levels 3 and 4 of the Kirkpatrick model. A few respondents made comments on the

importance of training materials (e.g. to support staff; to enable a consistent and objective approach; and to assist in promoting shared ownership of multi-agency training and the importance of contributing to future events). A few respondents made comments on the nature of materials, and suggestions included that they should comprise: consistent national tools (although one CPC identified a risk with this in terms of limiting the development of local programmes to fit local needs); a standardised method; templates for questionnaires and evaluation sheets; examples of good practice; and e-learning packs. It was also suggested that materials should be easy to apply, and should not lead to duplication of work with single agencies, or increased workloads. Participants in one workshop group suggested the centralised collation of training and evaluation examples.

The section overall and general issues relating to evaluation

4.7 A number of respondents made comments on the section overall and more general issues relating to evaluation. Some made positive comments or general observations, while some identified concerns, issues and challenges. Among the positive comments were that: it is helpful to have a section on evaluation and / or an evaluation model included in the document; the section provides good guidance; the flowchart is useful; and the learning and development needs analysis section is useful. A few respondents to the written strand, as well as participants in some of the workshop groups stressed the overall importance of evaluation of learning and development, and the importance of self-evaluation for CPCs and other agencies. Other general observations included noting the link to inspection, and one respondent highlighted that the specific quality indicators referred to will change with the publication of a new integrated inspections toolkit.

4.8 Among the concerns expressed or issues raised with this part of the Framework overall were some relating to the presentation of the material and some relating to the challenges of evaluation work. In relation to the presentation of the material, issues raised included the views that: although the evaluation process is long and detailed, some of the material is vague / unclear; there is not enough information on how evaluation would take place; and the specific paragraph on “evidencing outcomes” is light on how to evidence outcomes from learning and development. One respondent stated that, while the flow chart headings are useful, the rest of the diagram is too descriptive.

4.9 One respondent stated that the benefits of training needs analysis for multi-agency training must be questioned when the training being offered is desirable rather than essential. Participants in one workshop group stated that the learning and development needs analysis section gives a multi-agency learning and development cycle, but much child protection training, learning and development takes place in single agencies, and learning needs must also be analysed on an individual basis. One respondent identified a typo in the section.

4.10 A number of respondents raised general concerns about evaluation, with the most common relating to: the overall challenge of evaluation of training / learning and development; difficulties of measuring impact, outcomes and change for practitioners and for children and families; the complexity of evaluation; difficulties in gathering evidence; resource and capacity issues; and lack of skills to undertake

evaluation. One CPC respondent stated that evaluation also sometimes has limited benefits.

4.11 In terms of suggested developments or improvements to this section overall, these included to:

- Provide examples of evaluation of training / learning and development (with participants in two workshop groups suggesting that MARS should play a part in collating and providing these).
- Clarify the roles of the CPC and individual agencies.
- Include guidance on individual evaluation of learning within the CPD framework.
- Identify what sort of record of learning and development would be expected to be maintained.
- Include either a generic Learning and Development Cycle or separate versions for individual, single agency and multi-agency levels.
- Set out issues relating to the baseline assessment of current skills or competence in the Learning Needs Analysis section.
- Include “Leadership and Working Together” in the quality indicators.
- Check that the indicators are still relevant (given the new children’s services inspection tool).
- State clearly that this is a recommended evaluation system and is not prescriptive.

4.12 A few respondents suggested specific wording or presentational changes (e.g. the inclusion of the evaluation Framework as an appendix).

The proposed methodology and model

4.13 A further common theme on which comments were made related to the proposed methodology and model in the draft Framework. As with other parts of the document, these included positive comments and concerns and issues, as well as a number of suggested developments or improvements.

4.14 Several respondents suggested that they found the model useful, or recognised its value. A few stated that they already use this system or that the model was familiar to them (although one stated that, while robust, there are difficulties with its implementation). A few stated that the approach was consistent with their local approach. One respondent expressed the view that a common approach to evaluation would be helpful. A small number of respondents identified how they would use the model, including to: assist in developing or informing local arrangements; and assist in considering options (although a few stated that the decision about methods of evaluation rests with the CPCs and partner agencies, depending on the focus of the training).

4.15 Several respondents, however, expressed concerns or issues with the model, the most common of which related to capacity or resource issues. It was suggested, for example, that the model involves a significant amount of work and a significant time commitment (which may not be available), and would be generally resource-

intensive. Participants in one of the workshop groups argued that, given these issues, the model might not be suitable for all.

4.16 Other concerns or issues raised with the model included a general view that there would be significant problems in implementing this and a concern that the model seems based on evaluating “formal” learning, or training courses. It was also suggested that: the model is very detailed and complex; it is out of date; some of the descriptions are vague (particularly levels 3 and 4); and there is a lack of clarity about some issues (e.g. the expectations of voluntary organisations). One local authority respondent stated that it is likely to be perceived as burdensome, and one CPC stated that undertaking a full evaluation of this type would be impractical for some training (e.g. half day provision).

4.17 Some respondents suggested that there may be difficulties collecting the evidence required for the model (e.g. difficulties of including evidence from professional supervision; difficulties for voluntary organisations and private sector organisations in providing the analytical information required; or a low response to follow-up requests). Additional concerns expressed were that: it is not clear how the model can work without a baseline assessment; there is no mention of using the data to determine whether there have been improved outcomes for children; and child protection training is only one aspect of improving child protection services (causing difficulties at Stages 3 and 4).

4.18 A number of suggestions were made about developments to the model, and these included to:

- Precede the 4 stage approach with an additional stage, identifying the need and rationale for CPD.
- Mention training needs analysis at Stage 1 rather than Stage 4.
- Expand Stages 2-4 and explain the techniques in more detail.
- Provide further guidance on Stages 3 and 4.
- Use different methods for Stages 1 and 2 and the other stages.
- Make a clear connection to reflective practice and supervision, and the impact of learning on practice.
- Incorporate evaluation of outcomes, including outcomes for practice and outcomes for children and young people.
- Identify what constitutes evidence of outcomes.
- Ensure that the method fits with existing training strategies and is proportionate to the rest of the learning and development cycle.
- Ensure resources / support for implementation.
- Carry out work to develop a fuller evaluation framework and toolkit.

4.19 A few respondents made comments relating to offering additional / alternative methods for evaluation, and suggestions included that:

- General consideration should be given to the best methods of evaluation (including, for example, wider consultation).
- A more flexible / broader evaluation process with a range of evaluation and assessment tools may be required.

- Audit tools could be used to provide evidence, and inspection could be a driver for evaluation (including, for example, more targeting by the Care Inspectorate of evidence on training / learning and development).
- Evaluation could be carried out / incorporated into: supervision, CPD, Personal Development Plans and performance reviews.
- Consideration should be given to additional methods such as: the inclusion of service users' views; the use of IT (e.g. survey monkey and other self-evaluation tools); 360° feedback; appraisal.
- Resource links could be made to evaluation frameworks / support.
- A “record of experience” may be required rather than an evaluation of outcomes.
- A tiered approach may be more practical due to capacity issues.
- The Framework could highlight other evaluation models and / or research documents relating to the evaluation of training / learning and development.

4.20 As well as changes to the model or approach to evaluation, suggestions were made about a perceived need for:

- A statutory requirement and instruction to ensure follow-up on training.
- Services, managers and individuals to take an active part in evaluation.
- Good and effective supervision, monitoring, appraisal and management to enable learning from training to be applied, to change practice.
- Training for managers / supervisors.
- Provision of time to staff for reflection.
- Culture change in relation to evaluation.

4.21 Some respondents suggested more general developments to evaluation, which included to:

- Consider how CPCs can have an input to this.
- Encourage intermittent evaluation after specific time periods.
- Establish more specific national evaluation indicators.
- Ensure evaluation work undertaken fits with the Scottish Government's requirements on feedback.
- Provide further guidance on how to evaluate learning.

4.22 One health respondent suggested that it is perhaps not the method of evaluation that is important, but the broad standards by which agencies can measure the effectiveness of their learning and development strategies. One CPC stated that, whatever evaluation model is proposed, it would require support materials and guidance to enable effective implementation. A few respondents stated that evaluation systems should be kept as simple and generic as possible.

Examples of work

4.23 A few respondents provided examples of relevant evaluation work that has taken place, or that they considered to have worked well. These included examples of:

- Training on evaluation (e.g. self evaluation, post-registration training and learning [PRTL] and reflective writing).
- Particular models (e.g. reflective time out; self-evaluation; learning sets and discussions; and the “Bristol” evaluation of interagency training).
- The use of specific forms of evidence (e.g. file audits; appraisal systems and learning records; and PRTL forms).

4.24 One voluntary organisation respondent suggested that consideration be given to including their current quality assessment tools in an evaluation framework.

Other issues raised

4.25 Question 8 asked for any additional comments. A majority of respondents to the written consultation provided additional material (either specifically at Question 8 or elsewhere in their response) and participants in all of the workshop groups also did so. Where these were relevant to a particular question, they have already been included at that question. Where comments were made at a particular question but are more relevant to these additional comments, they are included below.

4.26 Themes on which additional comments were made included: aspects of the consultation; the Framework overall and its presentation; the overall focus of the Framework and the issues included; and issues relating to implementation. In terms of the substantive material about the Framework, while positive comments were identified in each case (sometimes with the proviso that any concerns raised previously would need to be addressed), the most common focus of the comments was on concerns or issues raised, and suggested developments and improvements.

Aspects of the consultation

4.27 A number of respondents to the written strand, and participants in a few of the workshops made comments on aspects of the consultation. Among these, some respondents welcomed, for example: the Framework itself, or the concept, or production of the Framework; the commitment to continuous improvement; the focus or emphasis of the Framework; the consultation itself; and / or the opportunity to respond to the consultation. One respondent stated that they “applaud” the Scottish Government’s work to protect Scottish children from abuse.

4.28 A few respondents made comments on the nature and / or role of their organisation, who the organisation represents, and their involvement in child protection work or training / learning and development. Similarly, a small number of respondents made comments on the nature of their response (e.g. how it was generated; who was consulted; how it links to other responses; and the focus of the response). Two CPCs made comments on specific aspects of the consultation process (e.g. both noted their representation at the consultation events and one stated that comments on the Framework had also been expressed in other forums). A few respondents commented on the purpose of their response (e.g. to provide helpful and constructive information and to strengthen the Framework).

The framework overall and its presentation

4.29 A number of respondents identified aspects of the Framework overall, or its presentation. Some of these comments related to its general value / importance and have been included previously at other questions, so these will not be reiterated here. A number of additional comments were made and several, for example, stressed the overall need for such a Framework, or made general comments about the nature of the document, including that it is: generally helpful / useful / good; informative; clear; concise; flexible; and easy to read; as well as containing appropriate information. A few respondents to the written strand and in a few of the workshops expressed a specific view that this Framework was better than Version 12 and the use of levels.

4.30 As has been the case at previous questions, however, a number of respondents raised concerns or issues, or suggested developments or improvements to the Framework overall and its presentation. Concerns and issues raised included that:

- The general presentation contains some unnecessary duplication.
- The title does not fully reflect all of the agencies / partners.
- There are a number of typos / grammatical issues in the document.
- There is a lot of information and it may be difficult to digest.
- It is vague, complex, disjointed and unclear in places.
- The beginning is too long.
- Some use of language may be difficult to understand.

4.31 One respondent questioned the need for the Glossary, and participants in one workshop group suggested that, although the Framework is said not to be a prescriptive list / checklist, it reads as though this is the case.

4.32 Two respondents questioned whether the Framework is actually needed. One CPC respondent questioned why the focus was only on child protection, and suggested that the same principles would need to apply to other areas of work, to avoid a two tier staff appraisal / development process. An overall negative view of the document among some of those consulted was noted in one workshop group.

4.33 While these issues imply some changes, specific suggestions included to:

- Make the document shorter, clearer and more user-friendly.
- Present it in a SMART format.
- Change the title (with suggestions) and add a logo.
- Clarify the initial sections.
- Use section and paragraph numbers, headers and themes, visual representations; and revise Annexes A and B following amendment (including listing wellbeing indicators in the Glossary).
- Ensure the terminology is explained and consistent (with a number of terms identified for clarification and some suggestions made).
- Make other structural / wording changes (with suggestions).
- Provide a summary.

The overall focus of the Framework and the issues covered

4.34 A number of respondents made comments on the overall focus of the Framework and the issues covered. Among these, some respondents highlighted perceived positive aspects of this, with views that the Framework:

- Complements other relevant material.
- Emphasises that everyone has a role.
- Sets out the skills and competences required.
- Takes a flexible approach to training / learning and development.
- Targets those developing and delivering training.
- Is non-prescriptive.

4.35 Participants in one workshop group also expressed positive views that the Framework relates to different aspects of the child's life.

4.36 Alongside these comments, however, a number of concerns and issues were also raised about the overall focus of the Framework and the issues covered within it. In terms of the overall focus, for example, concerns included that the Framework document seems to be:

- “Caught” between being a strategy document and a practical tool.
- Unfocused, in trying to contain information for everyone.
- Targeted at managers and is of less benefit to on the ground workers than educators.
- Oriented to the statutory sector.
- Compliance-driven rather than needs-driven.
- About reacting to harm rather than promoting wellbeing for children.
- Not fully reflective of a public protection agenda.

4.37 One respondent stated that the suggestion in the Framework that individual training needs should be considered within personal learning plans is at odds with existing processes which have resulted in discontinuation of formal appraisal and personal development plans for staff. Participants in one workshop group suggested that the Framework did not appear to provide for continual learning and development.

4.38 Other concerns and issues related to perceived gaps in the issues covered in the document, and these included the views that there is:

- Limited reflection on the balance between different forms of training / learning and development.
- Too much emphasis on knowledge and not enough on skills and methods of intervention.
- No guidance on timescales / frequency of training.
- No mention of changes to the benefit system and the impact of these on families.
- No reference to disability and additional support needs.
- No reference to advocacy.
- No mention of the service user.

- Insufficient connection with a recovery strategy.

4.39 Again, these concerns and issues in themselves imply some developments and improvements to the overall focus of, and issues covered in the Framework. In terms of the overall focus of the document, suggestions were that it should:

- Focus on public protection / take a “protecting people” approach.
- Deliver a robust and consistent message (and avoid “politics”).
- Be proactive in promoting wellbeing.
- Promote early intervention, good inputs / outcomes, and an holistic approach.
- Emphasise that it is everyone’s job to protect.
- Emphasise confidentiality in information sharing.

4.40 In terms of the issues covered, specific suggestions made by respondents were that the document should include reference to:

- The context for the Framework.
- The impact of specific issues (e.g. including some equality issues discussed further later).
- Advocacy, understanding of roles and work with children.
- Children’s rights.
- The “unseen” child.
- What constitutes a child protection issue and what is a “concern”.
- Roles and responsibilities of a range of stakeholders (including, for example: the need to include all sectors; specific individuals / organisations; and adult services).
- Good supervision and reflective practice.
- Further and higher education and initial professional training.
- Joint agency training; single agency training; and other forms of training / learning and development.
- Creating a learning culture / organisation, and ongoing learning.

Implementation of the Framework

4.41 A further common theme on which additional comments were made related to aspects of the implementation of the Framework, and one voluntary organisation stressed the overall importance of effective implementation. A number of positive comments were made about the perceived benefits of the document, and included suggestions that it would help to:

- Review, assess and improve training / learning and development.
- Develop understanding of expectations.
- Provide a baseline, improve training needs analysis and identify actions required in relation to training / learning and development.
- Inform strategic workforce development.
- Support different types of training / learning and development.
- Standardise the key issues covered, enable benchmarking and provide some quality assurance.
- Enable staff to identify whether particular training will meet their needs.

- Support multi-agency learning and development strategies.
- Complement local work.
- Focus on establishing a practice-led approach and develop confidence among workers.
- Establish child protection training / learning and development as a priority.
- Assess whether outcomes are being met.

4.42 Participants in one workshop group stated that they considered there to be no barriers to the Framework being implemented. Participants in another group argued that, if child protection issues are picked up earlier, there will be less use of services.

4.43 Again, however, several respondents raised concerns and issues about aspects of the implementation of the Framework. At a general level, participants in one workshop group, for example, expressed the view that it was unclear how the Framework might be implemented, while those in another identified a general concern about how to use it. One group also stated that the usefulness of the document will depend on how many agencies adopt it and organise their training around it. Another stated that the quality of trainers is essential. A number of more specific issues were raised.

4.44 The implementation concerns identified most frequently related to capacity and resource issues. One CPC, for example, raised the question of whether there would be any additional resources available to implement the Framework. It was also suggested that capacity and resource issues might have a particular impact on smaller organisations, and those where staff work weekends / evenings, or are contracted to work a small number of hours. One voluntary sector respondent identified the challenge of implementation of CPD in the context of restrictions to finance, staffing and time resources.

4.45 It was also suggested that there may be a problem in networks “reaching out” to small organisations which are not part of an umbrella group, and participants in one workshop group identified other types of workers for whom there may be implementation issues (e.g. volunteers, panel members, court staff, staff working with those on supervision). Participants in one workshop group stated that staff moving on would also impact on implementation (with, for example, the loss of their experience).

4.46 Participants in one workshop group stated that a lack of skills among managers may also impact upon implementation. A few respondents also suggested that some of the constraints to access to training (detailed earlier) could be a barrier. One voluntary organisation respondent suggested a specific gap in training opportunities for advanced social work skills for child protection staff.

4.47 A few respondents also raised concerns about how the implementation of the Framework will fit with local developments. One CPC, for example, stated that, as there is no requirement for all agencies to adopt this, there is likely to be disparity if they do not all agree to use this as the basis for their child protection training / learning and development. It was suggested that there may also be issues with how the document will fit into local frameworks, and the steps that need to be taken locally to enable this. One respondent to the written strand also stated that

presenting the document as CPC-led does not take account of other partnerships leading on other aspects of the training.

4.48 It was also suggested that it would be difficult to identify whether competences have been achieved, and to evidence whether the Framework overall has brought beneficial changes.

4.49 Again, some developments and improvements are implied by the concerns and issues raised, but a number of specific suggestions were also made. For example, participants in some of the workshop groups (and the written strand) suggested that clarity / guidance on how the Framework should be used needs to be provided, and some identified issues for inclusion in this. One voluntary organisation stated generally that there is a need for more detail on how the Scottish Government will implement the Framework to ensure it is embedded in all sectors and workforces.

4.50 A few respondents suggested a need to specify individual and collective responsibilities for implementation and accountability, and a few highlighted the responsibilities of the CPC in their areas. However, participants in one workshop group stated that, in areas where CPCs are less active, it is important that others can make use of the document, and another group stated that it must be accessible for everyone. One CPC stated that the design of learning and development material should be pitched to different levels and learning styles, and participants in one group stated that the Framework should be appropriate for single agency training as well as at a wider level.

4.51 The perceived need for the document to fit with local frameworks was also identified and participants in one workshop group emphasised the need for an equitable response. Participants in another group stated specifically that the change to a single police force should help with roll-out and consistency. Participants in a number of workshops and the written strand suggested that senior managers and line managers should be expected to attend training, and one group stated that consideration should be given to how to introduce the Framework to leadership first. Another group suggested that continuous development plans should be made compulsory, with child protection as a priority.

4.52 Other suggested developments and improvements relating to enabling effective implementation included to:

- Make resources and support available for this.
- Develop a Foundation Course or similar for basic skills; and require pre-qualifying training (e.g. in the curriculum) and induction.
- Deliver training in GIRFEC principles and additional training locally.
- Agree common standards for assessing competence.
- Consider whether a training strategy is needed.
- Invest in trainers, with the onus on CPCs to ensure their quality.
- Promote wider culture and systems change.
- Continue to highlight child protection issues and good practice.
- Identify / evaluate whether the Framework is making a difference.
- Consider issuing the Framework with all PVG scheme applications.

- Develop a communication strategy / disseminate information (including making basic information widely accessible).

4.53 A few organisations made other observations, largely relating to their own role or that of others in taking the Framework forward. In terms of their own roles, these included a willingness to: share specialist knowledge / experience; engage in further discussion; provide case studies; help develop and deliver evaluation resources; consider how to embed the principles into their own work; and assist local organisations with implementation. Participants in some workshop groups identified a role for MARS in the implementation / delivery of the Framework. Two groups identified a need for leadership from the Scottish Government, and another group speculated about whether there should be a national co-ordinator.

4.54 A small number suggested wider actions relating to tackling abuse. One respondent, for example, made a series of recommendations about tackling abuse in a religious environment and expressed the hope that the information from the consultation would be acted upon. Participants in one workshop group suggested an approach to asking a child questions, while those in another suggested developing capacity in the community and developing “communities of practice”.

Summary of findings: evaluation and any other issues raised

4.55 In summary, the main findings relating to evaluation and any other issues raised were as follows:

- In relation to Question 7, while only a third of those who addressed the question answered or implied agreement or disagreement, nearly three quarters of those who did so believed that, if the recommended method of evaluation is implemented, more detailed training materials will be needed.
- Some additional comments were made about the perceived need for more detailed training materials, or the reasons for these views, as well as about the issues for which materials would be needed, or the types of materials required.
- A number of additional common themes emerged, and comments were made on: the section overall and general issues relating to evaluation; and the proposed methodology and model. In each case, comments included: positive comments; concerns and issues; and suggested developments or improvements. A few respondents provided examples of evaluation work.
- Question 8 asked for any additional comments. A majority of respondents to the written consultation and participants in all of the workshop groups provided additional material.
- Themes on which additional comments were made included: aspects of the consultation; the Framework overall and its presentation; the overall focus of the Framework and the issues included; and issues relating to implementation. In terms of comments on the Framework, while positive comments were identified at each theme, the most common focus was on concerns or issues, and suggested developments and improvements.

SECTION 5: EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 This final section presents the findings relating to the Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA). A total of 6 questions were included in the written consultation relating to this (see Annex 1). In summary, they explored: any additional information seen to be required; any negative or positive impact on particular groups; changes required; and any other significant issues relating to equalities groups. Some relevant issues have been raised at previous questions, but the findings from the EQIA questions are summarised below.

The need for additional information about particular issues

5.2 In terms of additional information seen to be required, or other issues for consideration relating to equalities groups (Questions 1 and 6), around half of the respondents to the written consultation and participants in a few workshops made comments at each. The issues covered were similar, and are presented together.

5.3 Several respondents identified issues for which they considered there to be a lack of information or a need for further information or reference in the document. These were identified as issues relating to: diversity within the workforce; disability and additional support needs; transitions / issues for young people aged 16/17; abuse in a religious environment; creating and maintaining relationships in families; ethnic minority groups; gender; trafficked children; asylum seeking families; and information from partnerships. One CPC stated that it is unclear whether children, young people and / or families had been involved in the design and / or development of the Framework. Suggested changes to address the need for information are included later in this section.

5.4 Several respondents actually provided additional information. A few, for example, provided information about disability issues, including: the increased risk of abuse for disabled children (including those with learning disabilities and those with additional support needs); the importance of communication training or the involvement of experts in these circumstances; and the need for skilled workers (which may require specialist modules). A few respondents provided information about issues relating to age, including: the impact of transitions between children and adult services and the potential crossover with adult support and protection; the potential for young people in this situation to fall through a gap; and the need to ensure their inclusion.

5.5 One respondent provided very detailed information about the existence of abuse in a religious environment as well as: specific issues in such an environment; the consequences of such abuse; barriers to addressing this; the need for awareness of the issue; and the continuing need for action (with recommendations). In terms of families, one health respondent highlighted the importance of the relationship between the worker, the child and their family and the need for the worker to have such skills. One health respondent identified their work in supporting teenage parents and children of teenagers, and the experiences of this group.

5.6 One respondent provided information to suggest that, where English is not a child's first language, it is important that specialist staff undertake training in communication, and that trusted experts are brought in where required.

5.7 One respondent suggested that Shakti Women's Aid and multi-cultural family centres could be a source of further information relating to gender-based violence issues and issues affecting ethnic minority groups. Another suggested that organisations providing a service to specific groups (e.g. Age Concern⁵) could be targeted for their views.

Impact on groups

5.8 Although around two thirds of respondents addressed the EQIA Question 2, relating to whether they considered the Framework would have a disproportionately negative impact on particular groups of people in the target audience, only around a fifth identified any such impact. Most of the respondents answered or implied that they did not believe that this would be the case (or that it would not be the case if the information identified above, or changes suggested earlier were made). In the small number of cases where a negative impact was identified, this was seen to be upon: disabled people; adults; those aged 16/17; and those with communication support needs. One respondent also stated that the wider workforce may not immediately see the relevance of the Framework to their work (an issue raised previously).

5.9 In relation to disabled people, two respondents stated that there is no mention of practitioners with impairments or other specific learning needs, and how they might access learning and development opportunities. Additionally, it was identified that children with, or affected by impairments (including learning disabilities and profound and multiple learning disabilities [PMLD]) are not highlighted as a specific vulnerable group. It was suggested that the Framework could have a negative effect on them if they are not highlighted as a specific group, or if their needs are not fully recognised within it (e.g. as relevant issues may be seen as lower training priorities than the vulnerable groups mentioned, or specific training might not be provided or sought). One respondent also suggested that there could be a negative impact if those who offer the training / learning and development on child protection are not fully versed in the risk factors and vulnerabilities of particular groups such as children with learning disabilities / PMLD.

5.10 In relation to issues for adults and those aged 16/17, reference was made to issues raised in response to the main consultation questions and covered previously. For those aged 16/17, the potential negative impact on their transition from children's to adult services was again highlighted. In relation to communication support needs, the lack of mention of working with children and parents with English as a second language, or with a communication impairment was again noted, along with the particular complexities of investigating abuse where this is the case, and the potential for these groups to be disadvantaged if their needs are not highlighted.

5.11 Around half of respondents addressed Question 4 to identify positive impacts on particular groups of people (sometimes again with the proviso that the developments / improvements suggested were made). The most common group identified was staff / the workforce, or the organisation as a whole and diverse groups within the workforce. It was suggested that they would be: better prepared; better trained; more confident; and more skilled / competent. It was also argued that the Framework would help to: identify learning requirements; underpin better

⁵ Now Age Scotland

training; encourage those not working directly with children to seek more learning opportunities; help ensure that staff reflect learning points in practice; and support discussion at performance review / personal development meetings. Two CPCs suggested that the Framework could be used well by Training Co-ordinators.

5.12 A few respondents highlighted a positive impact on children and families, particularly vulnerable families (e.g. those affected by parental substance misuse, young carers, disabled children etc.). For example, it was suggested that the positive impact would take the form of consistency of quality of practice and better outcomes (based on the impact of some of the implications for the workforce noted above).

5.13 A few respondents identified a general positive impact across groups through, for example: consistency and clarity of approach; promoting difference, participation, consultation and inclusion; promoting awareness of the increased risk of abuse among some groups; promoting early intervention; and widening knowledge and understanding. One CPC also stated that the Framework consolidates and updates previous guidance and training frameworks.

Changes and further issues for consideration

5.14 Less than half of the respondents addressed Question 5 to identify changes, and less than half of these respondents actually identified additional changes. However, changes were also suggested at, or implied by responses to the previous EQIA questions detailed above. All of these are summarised below.

5.15 At a general level, it was suggested that the Framework should include recognition of diversity / equality issues (for the workforce, and for children, young people and families). A few respondents suggested including a general equality statement to say that the Framework applies to all, or to state the intention to promote diversity in meeting the needs of all groups. A small number suggested that the competences could be strengthened in terms of recognising and responding to diversity issues. It was also argued that training materials should take these issues into account. One respondent raised the question for consideration of how confident managers will feel in relation to these issues. There was also seen to be a need to clarify the involvement of children, young people and families in the Framework.

5.16 In terms of specific equality issues, there was seen to be a need to make reference to issues relating to disability and additional support needs affecting practitioners, children, young people, parents and families (including, for example, physical impairments, learning disabilities and mental health issues). Particular information identified for inclusion related to: the impact of these issues; the risk of abuse for disabled children and young people and their identification as a vulnerable group; the need for specialist information / training relating to disability issues for parents and children (including parental learning disabilities); the need for awareness of communication support needs and the use of specialist staff. One respondent suggested making reference to learning disability research or websites. It was also suggested that information about learning and development needs and support of practitioners with impairments or specific learning needs should be included, as should access to learning and development opportunities for them (including alternative modes and formats for training, and issues of accessibility and quality).

5.17 A further suggestion was that the Framework should make reference to issues relating to transitions (e.g. for 16/17 year olds) and the impact of these issues. One respondent identified a particular need for recognition of, and reference to issues relating to abuse in a religious environment and the need to address this. The importance of creating and maintaining relationships in families and issues for teenage parents were also highlighted for inclusion. It was also identified that issues for ethnic minority groups should be covered, such as cultural considerations and the effects of intervention. There was also seen to be a need for the Framework to recognise the support required for people for whom English is a second language and the need for communication in other languages (e.g. ensuring all materials are accessible in languages of all communities in Scotland, and using appropriate trusted experts for communication support). It was also suggested that the Framework should make reference to issues for asylum seeking families.

5.18 A need for a gender perspective / reference to gender issues was also highlighted, as was the need for inclusion of information about honour-based and other gender-based violence. There was seen to be a need for information from other relevant partnerships (e.g. violence against women; adult protection; MAPPA⁶; drugs and alcohol) and to locate the Framework in a public protection context. There was also seen to be a need for reference to trafficked children.

5.19 A few non equality-specific suggestions were made. These included to: decrease the number of competences and use “building blocks”; make reference to relevant MARS provision and academic study available in Scotland; make links to other frameworks; include different examples; make the document more concise; and outline expectations of CPCs. A further issue raised was a perceived need to build in capacity to update and respond to the findings of research and Significant Case Reviews, and developments in GIRFEC.

Summary of findings: EQIA

5.20 In summary, the main findings relating to the EQIA were as follows:

- Issues identified for which further information was seen to be required included: workforce diversity; disability and additional support needs; transitions / issues for those aged 16/17; abuse in a religious environment; creating / maintaining relationships in families; ethnic minority groups; gender; trafficked children; asylum seeking families; and information from partnerships. Some information was provided.
- A small proportion of respondents identified that the Framework would have a disproportionately negative impact on particular groups and these were: disabled people; adults; those aged 16/17; and those with communication support needs. Positive impacts were identified for members of staff / workforce, organisations as a whole and children and families (particularly vulnerable families), as well as across groups.
- A number of specific suggestions were made about issues for inclusion / consideration (covering overall equalities issues and issues for specific groups). A few more general suggestions were also made.

⁶ Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1 THE WRITTEN CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Does your agency have access to multi-agency training/ learning and development [or a] strategy/ framework in place to co-ordinate the range of training/ learning and development for staff working children?

Does this multi agency learning include:

- a) Voluntary sector partners,
- b) Partners who provide services to adults, and
- c) Services commissioned to external organisations

Comments

2. Does the Framework document make appropriate links to:

- Other strategic documents/frameworks related to child protection
- Other strategic documents related to CPD

Comments

3. Is the framework clear in its aims overall?

a) Does it have relevance for:

- Those working directly with children and young people and
- Also for those working with adults?

Comments

4. How helpful do you find the good practice, please provide a rating of 1 to 5. 1 being really helpful and 5 being not at all helpful.

Comments

5. If the good practice examples require changes, how might they be improved, Please give examples.

Comments

6. How helpful did you find the skills and competency section?

Comments

6a. Please provide examples of how this should be changed and what should be included?

Comments

7. The framework does provide a recommended method of evaluation if this is implemented will more detailed training materials is needed to support staff in gathering evidence, analysing and making judgements on evaluating training?

Comments

8. Any additional comments.

EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. From your knowledge of the diverse needs of children and young people, can you provide any further information that you think we should know on child protection learning and development? In addition, is there any other information you think we should obtain? How or where should we find this information?

Comments

2. Do you think the framework will have a disproportionately negative impact on particular groups of people in our target audience?

Comments

3. If you think this framework will have a negative impact on a particular group, why is this?

Comments

4. What positive impacts do you think the framework will have on particular groups of people?

Comments

5. What changes to this framework would you suggest to reduce any negative impact or enhance any positive impact you have identified?

Comments

6. When we complete our impact assessment on the national framework for learning and development – are there any other significant issues we need to consider in relation to:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender
- Sexual orientation
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy or maternity
- Race
- Religion and Belief?

Comments

ANNEX 2 THE EVENT QUESTIONS

Discussion questions – session 1

Question 1: What multi agency training/ learning and development strategies / frameworks are available/used within your workplace?

Question 2: Do you see learning and development as a key priority for your job and organisation? Are there any barriers in your workplace which may prohibit you from undertaking the necessary/relevant learning and development?

Question 3: How do you feel the new framework can help you and your organisations?

Question 4: How do you think the framework will be used and what support would be required to ensure effective use?

Discussion questions – session 2

Question 1: What are your views of the draft framework?

- Is it clear and concise?
- Do you feel that it meets the requirements for your post and organisation?
- Can you see how this will help provide consistency both within your organisation and wider to all those who work with children?
- Does the framework meet your expectations on what it should cover?

Question 2: How useful do you find the good practice examples within the framework? Do these help set the scene and give you a steer?

Question 3: How helpful did you find the skills and competency section. Is it easy to follow and can you place yourself within one of the workforces detailed?

ANNEX 3 THE RESPONDENTS

The respondents were as follows:

Action for Children
Angus CPC
Argyll and Bute CPC
Association of Directors of Social Work (ADSW)
Barnardo's
Bright Horizons Family Solutions
Children and Families, City of Edinburgh Council
Children in Scotland
Circle
CPC APC Joint Working Group
Dundee City Council
East & Midlothian CPC
East Ayrshire Council
East Renfrewshire CHCP
Education Scotland
ELBEG Public Protection Partnership Office
Every Child and Young Person Matters Network – Dundee Third Sector Interface
Family Nurse Partnership Programme National Unit (FNP)
Glasgow CPC
Highland CPC
Inverclyde CPC
Multi Agency Resource Service (MARS)
National Child Protection Learning and Development Group
National Joint Investigative Interviewing Tutors Forum
National Secular Society
NHS Ayrshire & Arran
NHS Education for Scotland
NHS Grampian
NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde
NHS Lanarkshire
NHS Lothian
NHS Tayside
North Ayrshire Child Protection Training Sub Group
North East Scotland CPC
North Lanarkshire Council
North Lanarkshire CPC
NSPCC Scotland
Orkney CPC
PAMIS
Perth and Kinross CPC
Renfrewshire CPC
Royal College of General Practitioners
Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health
Scottish Borders CPC
Scottish Out of School Care Network

Shetland CHP
Strathclyde Police
West Dunbartonshire Council CHCP
West Dunbartonshire Educational Services
West Lothian CPC

There was also 1 individual respondent.



© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (excluding logos and images) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

ISBN: 978-1-78256-164-4 (web only)

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

Produced for the Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland
DPPAS13490 (10/12)

Published by the Scottish Government, October 2012

w w w . s c o t l a n d . g o v . u k