

## Completed Audit Report

## Annex A

Audit (date report issued)	Background to review	Key findings	Audit opinion (1)	Recommendations for improvement (Priority) (2)
<p>Children's Safeguarding Quality Assurance (QA) Process (June 2015)</p>	<p>The Surrey Children's Service Quality Assurance Approach is one of the frameworks used for the improvement of children's safeguarding. It is set in the context of the findings of the 2011 Munro Review of Child Protection, which states that strong local quality assurance mechanisms are essential to ensure safe and effective practice in children's social care.</p>	<p>Whilst some strong QA mechanisms were observed Internal Audit evidence suggests some lack of impact throughout Children's Services for the work of the QA Team and a lack of ownership of recommendations arising.</p> <p>The same recurring issues have been recorded by the QA Team over a number of years and many of the actions agreed are not fully implemented.</p> <p>The line managers in the QA Team did not keep formal records of their QA audit file reviews which makes it difficult to validate the quality of the QA audit. For one case chosen by the Internal Auditor for review, the QA audit file had not been retained.</p> <p>The profile of QA needs to be enhanced so the team's work is more effective.</p> <p>Improvement plans need to be revisited to make them more explicit for each issue raised, to identify who is responsible for any action and what the timescale/ deadline is for this to occur.</p>	<p>Significant Improvement Needed</p>	<p>All planned improvements should show agreed deadlines for completion and have a priority for importance allocated to them. <b>(M)</b></p> <p>Develop a protocol for reviewing QA audit files. <b>(L)</b></p> <p>Establish a document retention policy for all QA audit files. <b>(M)</b></p> <p>QA reports and improvement plans to be presented to the Directorate Leadership Team and a summary provided to the Social Care Services Board. <b>(H)</b></p> <p>Revise the structure of improvement plans to clarify the recommendation itself; who is responsible for implementing it; and, in what timeframe. <b>(M)</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> **Audit Opinions**

<b>Effective</b>	Controls evaluated are adequate, appropriate, and effective to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.
<b>Some Improvement Needed</b>	A few specific control weaknesses were noted; generally however, controls evaluated are adequate, appropriate, and effective to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.
<b>Significant Improvement Needed</b>	Numerous specific control weaknesses were noted. Controls evaluated are unlikely to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Controls evaluated are not adequate, appropriate, or effective to provide reasonable assurance that risks are being managed and objectives should be met.

Page 64

<sup>2</sup> **Audit Recommendations**

**Priority High (H)** - major control weakness requiring immediate implementation of recommendation

**Priority Medium (M)** - existing procedures have a negative impact on internal control or the efficient use of resources

**Priority Low (L)** - recommendation represents good practice but its implementation is not fundamental to internal control