

# Response ID ANON-MCVM-QU2N-S

Submitted on 2015-03-26 15:22:11.153298

## Consulting on the draft framework

### 1 Does the framework set out a clear and supportable set of responsibilities and accountabilities for NHS England?

Partially

**If you selected 'No' or 'Partially', please explain which areas lack clarity, what you would expect to see and provide your suggestions for inclusion::**

The RCPCH welcomes this document.

In particular the College welcomes the recommendation for safeguarding training to be mandatory within organisations. Although it is generally regarded as such, it is useful to have this embedded within the Framework.

The College also welcomes the emphasis on each Trust having a chaperone policy.

The College does query the benefit of having a single framework for children and adults. Although there is some advantage to combining both in the one document, we feel it would be better to have separate documents which highlight where there is overlap and respond to particular issues in relation to the Mental Capacity Act for children 16 years and over.

### 2 Does the framework document set out clear responsibilities and accountabilities for each other organisation across the health system for safeguarding?

Partially

**If you selected 'No' or 'Partially', please explain which areas lack clarity, what you would expect to see and provide your suggestions for inclusion::**

In reference to the fourth bullet on page 18 - designated professionals (children) do not have responsibility to undertake serious case reviews/case management reviews. This is the responsibility of the LSCBs, exercised through their Serious Case Review Subcommittees. Designated professionals will assist in the process.

Regarding section 4.2, Safeguarding Networks, the College would query whether these networks are currently fully implemented, as is suggested by the document. Feedback from the West Midlands highlights that it has been a challenge to establish the network in this area since the demise of the Strategic Health Authority, despite other networks such as Maternity and Neonatal Services being well advanced.

Feedback from members also highlights a need for further clarity around plans for co-commissioning and the role of the Designated Professionals and GPs where this is not happening, along with consideration given to the interface between training provision and Health Education England.

## About you

### 3 Are you responding only on behalf of yourself, or on behalf of an organisation or group?

Responding on behalf of an organisation or group

### 4 If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or group please provide the name of the organisation or group:

**If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or group please provide the name of the organisation or group::**

Child Protection Standing Committee of the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health

### 5 If you are able to provide a contact email address this will enable to the team to check we have correctly understood details of your consultation response if there are any queries, and will allow us to notify you directly when the final version of the document is published.

**If you are able to provide a contact email address this will enable to the team to check we have correctly understood details of your consultation response if there are any queries, and will allow us to notify you directly when the final version of the document is published.:**

Emily Roberts, Policy Lead

emily.roberts@rcpch.ac.uk