



REDCAR & CLEVELAND'S SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD

MINUTES OF LSCB MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 9 JANUARY 2015, 10am – 12.30pm MAIN HALL, 25K YOUTH & COMMUNITY CENTRE, AYTON DRIVE, REDCAR

PRESENT:

Jan Van Wagtendonk	RCLSCB Independent Chair
Barbara Shaw	Director of People Services, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Chris Daniel	Assistant Director, Children & Families, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Dr K Agrawal	Desig. Consultant, Child Protection, NHS Tees
Bev Walker	Dep. Director of Nursing, NHS England, Durham, Darlington & Tees Area Team
Janice Deakin	CAFCASS
Karen Agar	Associate Director - Tees Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation
Alison Brown	Youth Offending Service Manager, South Tees Youth Offending Service
Cllr Joan Guy	Lead Elected Member - Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council
Karen Blackburn	National Probation Service (NE) (representing Julie Allan)
Helen Smithies	Lead Nurse for Safeguarding, South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Mark Adams	Asst. Director of Public Health – Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Karen Hedgley	Designated Nurse Safeguarding Children – South Tees CCGs
Neil Appleby	Redcar & Cleveland Education – Secondary Schools
Sue Beevers	Education, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council (representing John Anthony)
Karen McGarrity	Community Information Officer, Redcar & Cleveland Voluntary Development Agency
Anton Curtis Cooper	Lay Member
Barbara Gill	Durham Tees Valley Community Rehabilitation Company Ltd.
Rob Donaghy	DCI, Cleveland Police
Deanne Taylor	Business Manager - Redcar & Cleveland Safeguarding Children's Board
Alison Hill	RCSCB Administrator (Minutes)
Joanne Stoddart	R&C Review and Inspection Unit (Item 10 only)
Sue Willoughby	NEPACS (Item 15 only)

APOLOGIES:

Kinga Puzstai	Head Teacher, Redcar & Cleveland Education – Primary Schools
Ronny Harris	Chief Executive – Coast and Country Housing
John Anthony	Head of Education, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
John Feeney	Group Manager, Cleveland Fire Brigade

		ACTION
1.	Welcome/Introductions/Apologies	
1.1	Jan van Wagtendonk welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted and brief introductions undertaken.	
1.2	Jan thanked Karen Hedgley for all her work on the board and acknowledged she had been a valued Board member and made a great contribution to the work of the Board. Jan wished Karen all the very best for the future on behalf of the RCSCB.	

		ACTION
	Karen thanked the Board.	
1.3	Barbara Shaw also expressed her appreciation to Karen for the great support she has given to the Board.	
1.4	Jan asked Karen if she was aware of where the STCCG were in terms of providing her replacement to sit on the Board. Karen confirmed to Jan that Jean Fruend is currently looking at the structure of Safeguarding across the team and she has not yet been informed that a decision has been made on a replacement.	
1.5	Bev Walker reported that this has been raised with STCCG on a couple of occasions and escalated to director level.	
1.6	Jan stated he will write to the CCG asking for a swift replacement for Karen Hedgley and request an update in respect of appointing a named GP. Jan confirmed he will also raise the non-implementation of the early response admin support.	
1.7	Jan stated he could not understand why this had been delayed, as the finance has been made available and agreed to include this in his letter.	JvW
2.	Minutes of previous meetings	
2.1	The following amendments were noted:-	
2.1.1	Rob Donaghy stated that he was in attendance at the meeting on 28 November 2014 and his name is not shown on the minutes.	
2.1.2	Item 7.1: Jan highlighted a typographical error – Rib – should read Rob.	
2.1.3	Item 9.2: Karen Hedgley requested that the wording be amended as it reads incorrectly. Karen advised the minutes should read <i>'Karen Hedgley advised the guidance for managing injuries in Immobile Children (Community) was developed following a SCR in County Durham. County Durham had in fact developed guidance for Injuries to Immobile Babies; however on Tees it was felt we need to include all immobile children to reflect the particular vulnerabilities of disabled children. A separate guidance document for managing injuries to immobile children who attend A/E or Minor Injuries Units is under development and will be presented to Board in due course'</i> .	
2.2	Matters Arising	
2.2.1	Item 2.6: Deanne advised she had made enquires with regards to the role of Youth Work Services in relation to CSE. Deanne has received responses confirming that they are all attending CSE training shortly and aware of the pathways and what they need to do if they notice symptoms.	
2.2.2	Item 2.8: Rob advised that a decision has been made not to pursue the research from the Northern Rock Foundation. Jan asked Rob to confirm if the Northern Rock Foundation has been informed of this decision and Rob advised he believed that they hadn't been informed. Jan requested that Deanne and Rob discuss this further and liaise with Northern Rock Foundation regarding this decision.	DT/RD
2.2.3	Item 7.1: Deanne advised she has emailed Pam Collinson at Cleveland Police and requested a copy of the amended SAFER referral form for circulation to the Board. Deanne confirmed she has not yet received this document from Cleveland Police. Rob agreed to follow up this matter.	RD
2.2.4	Item 8.4: Deanne advised that this item has been addressed and an initial meeting has been arranged to discuss the terms of reference for the peer safeguarding supervision which is to be held on a termly basis across Secondary Schools. Deanne also confirmed she is in the process of arranging a meeting with the Primary School representative to pursue the same process.	DT
2.2.5	Item 13.2: Jan asked if the audit regarding decision making at strategy and conference with regards to CP Plans has been undertaken. Chris Daniels confirmed that this Audit has been arranged and does involve partners.	
	Item 24: Deanne stated that the extraordinary meeting arranged for the Board to be presented with the Serious Case Review on 19 December 2014 did not go ahead	

		ACTION
	and is to be re arranged.	DT
3.	Items for any other business	
3.1	Sue Beevers informed the Board she had one education services matter item to raise.	
3.2	Deanne informed the Board she had the following 3 items to raise – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on SCR • Revisions to the DfE Working Together Document • Invite to Rochdale in respect of their CSE initiatives 	
	DECISION ITEMS	
4.	RCSCB's NEGLECT STRATEGY	
4.1	Deanne presented first draft of the Neglect Strategy. Deanne informed the Board that this document has been produced in isolation for comments today and further development is required with input from partners. Deanne confirmed that she has considered the document alongside other LSCB's Neglect and Early Help Strategies. Deanne requested that that partners assist her in developing this document to which they agreed and Deanne to arrange a meeting with representatives from STHFT, Social Care, Voluntary and Community Groups and STCCG.	DT
4.2	Karen Hedgley confirmed that she will forward some wording to Deanne regarding Section 9 of the strategy in respect of the recommendation of the serious case review for complex case supervision and will explain what the terminology means and the impact on the child.	KH
4.3	Rob suggested that an explanation was added to the front cover of the report to support the pictures of the developing brain. Jan agreed that the effect of the pictures was very powerful however an explanation would enhance the effect.	DT
4.4	Jan asked the Board if they were happy with the structure of the report and Neil stated he felt the report structure was good however was missing reference to Foetal Alcohol Syndrome which is a clear sign of neglect. Jan agreed with this point and Deanne agreed to include this.	DT
4.5	Deanne expressed her concern that the report needs further action points in order to fully recognise what partners are currently doing to address the issue of neglect.	
4.6	Helen Smithies asked how the report is to be promoted. Jan advised that the report needs to feature in the ebulletin, on the website and also to be promoted through all LSCB Training.	
4.7	Karen McGarrity informed the Board that she is intending to complete a piece of work within the voluntary sector around the issue of neglect and agreed to liaise with Deanne regarding this project.	KMc
5.	CHILD PROTECTION INFORMATION SHARING	
5.1	Bev Walker provided an update on the Child Protection information sharing system. Bev confirmed that a lot of work has been done around this following a serious incident in another part of country. Bev acknowledged that there is still further work to be done, however the systems are robust.	
5.2	Jan asked if Board Members had any concerns regarding endorsing the development of this project.	
5.4	Chris Daniels stated that the LA was happy to endorse the development however highlighted that there would be a cost to the LA to purchase the software.	
5.5	Barbara Shaw raised her concern that the hospitals should not use the information sharing as a diagnostic tool and that people on the front line should not assess young people differently based on the information sharing system.	
5.6	Helen highlighted that the Hospital Trust currently have systems in place that would flag up a child that is subject to a Child Protection Plan. Helen advised all that would change with this information system is that the child would be known by a unique	

		ACTION
	identifier, which is better, as children from other areas who are on a Child Protection Plan would not be missed.	
5.7	Jan requested Anton's opinion and he raised the concern that as the hospital would know details of the Child Protection Plan, he felt that this could lead to assumptions being made. Helen confirmed that the hospital is only informed that the child is subject to a Child Protection Plan and not to details contained in it.	
5.8	Jan advised that the training for Accident and Emergency Staff should be highlighting that children subject to a Child Protection Plan or a Looked After Child should not be treated any differently.	
6.	LSCB SELF-ASSESSMENT PRESENTATION	
6.1	Deanne presented the RCSCB self-assessment and outlined the governance arrangement structure, which demonstrates how sub groups report into the RCSCB. Deanne stated that the RCSCB Business Plan is continually being developed in consultation with practitioners from all services.	
6.2	Deanne informed the Board that the Quality Assurance, Learning and Improvement Framework underpin the work of the Board and what assurance measures are utilised for Board. Deanne expressed that the progress against our challenges have moved forward significantly since the self-assessment was written, especially in relation to improving the interface with the Board and practitioners and the planned RCSCB Conference on 27 February 2015 will further assist with this.	
6.3	Kailash expressed that he felt gaining the views of young people is a big challenge faced by the Board, however Barbara acknowledged the numerous strategies that have been used in Children's Services, which Deanne advised is now being incorporated into the LSCB multi-agency audits.	
6.4	Helen Smithies highlighted it would be useful to explain the role of each organisation on the board in terms of Safeguarding and what they contribute. Deanne agreed to take this forward and add the descriptions once received in the detailed self-assessment report.	ALL
6.5	A discussion was held regarding the Quality Assurance Framework Learning and Improvement Framework and Deanne advised that the LSCB in Durham were undertaking a peer review. Jan asked if the RCSCB would be interested in undertaking this and Barbara advised that the LGA have a programme framework around safeguarding reviews of LSCB; members agreed this would be useful to pursue. Bev agreed to send Deanne the feedback from Durham's review.	BW
7.	FEEDBACK FROM THE SESSIONS WITH PRACTITIONERS IN RESPECT OF THEIR EXPERIENCES IN RELATION TO THE THRESHOLD: CONTINUUM OF NEED	
7.1	Jan provided feedback to the board and highlighted the following points from the report presented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43 Practitioners attended the sessions. • The practitioners who attended were from Early Help, Welfare & Health however it was noted there was a low attendance from Social Care. • All staff attended were aware of the Threshold Criteria: Continuum of Need document and they reported that they felt it was useful. • Delays were highlighted in relation to Domestic Abuse and Domestic Violence when it's reported from the Police; Jan stressed it is essential in these situations that information is shared as soon as possible. • In respect of Early Help, some referrals were being made to Social Care which is then being allocated to Early Help workers. Jan advised the workers need to understand why cases are being allocated to them. • Jan highlighted the concern around early help workers being withdrawn unnecessarily when social workers become involved. Jan questioned how flexible services are in interpreting rules and to ensure we remain focused on 	

		ACTION
	<p>the best interests of the child.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan advised there was only one member of who stated they were aware of the Tees Safeguarding procedures. 	
7.2	Jan confirmed it was a very worthwhile session and suggested further sessions to be held which will focus on assessment processes, raising awareness of Tees Procedures and RCSCB's eBulletin, ensuring that timely escalations take place from Early Help and increasing safeguarding training for managers.	JvW/DT
7.3	Helen Smithies reported that an internal risk alert was sent out immediately when advised that staff were unaware of Tees Procedures. Helen advised that feedback resulting from this was that the question posed by Jan had been misunderstood and confirmed that they did know how to access the Tees Procedures but were not aware of the procedure in relation to the process to challenge. Jan welcomed this and advised that this exercise would provide assurance to the RCSCB.	HS
7.4	Chris added that in response to the report Children's Services are producing an action plan that will demonstrate how we have responded to the issues raised. Helen agreed to add her actions to this report. Kailash advised that feedback should be added to the future action for practitioners.	CD HS
7.5	Jan asked the board if they felt it would be helpful to have further sessions with practitioners; members agreed.	JvW
7.6	Karen McGarrity asked if voluntary sector workers were invited to the practitioner sessions and Jan confirmed they were as the invite was circulated to the training circulation list alongside Board members and on the eBulletin.	
7.7	Deanne confirmed the feedback to the session will be circulated when received in the eBulletin.	DT
8.	SAVILLE REPORT	
8.1	Bev presented her report in response to the Saville Enquiry and reported back to the Board that unfortunately she was still in the disappointing position not to have the final report. Bev confirmed she was therefore only able to give an overview of the 3 assurance processes and investigations that have taken place within the NHS.	
8.2	Bev stated that the investigations had been well discussed within the media and are very complicated enquiries resulting in lengthy reports. Bev confirmed that the Stoke report has opened up further lines of enquiry and also a large number of other investigations have resulted from the reports of sighting of Saville at hospital sites.	
8.3	Bev advised the main investigation oversight team is being led by Kate Lampard, who is looking at consistencies across the hospitals including the terms of reference. The same legal advisors have been appointed across the 3 NHS Trusts to undertake investigations. Bev advised there are 31 other investigations within the NHS which should provide a robust, rigorous oversight.	
8.4	Jan asked if any of the reports have yet been published. Bev advised that Kate Lampard is currently producing an overarching NHS report, which Bev will present to the Board when it's complete.	BW
8.5	Jan stated there are no learning points as yet, even though the Board is reassured by the investigations taking place.	
8.6	Bev confirmed that hospitals have been asked to review their policies for 'Celebrities Visiting' which is provided assurances to the CCGS.	
9.	CP MULTI AGENCY OVERVIEW REPORT (RK) AND AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS	
9.1	Deanne advised the RCSCB that the audit overview report have been approved by the agencies that contributed to the audit and has been discussed at the Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group. The recommendations relating to the audit have been	

		ACTION
	transferred to the recommendations framework.	
9.2	Deanne highlighted that some tasks in relation of the recommendations need further dialogue, as the representative from CCG was not present at the last meeting and the recommendations for social care need agreeing.	
9.3	Neil Appleby referred to the recommendation in relation to Cypshare and questioned what this was. Deanne confirmed it was a tool used to send secure emails to organisations that do not have a secure email account. Deanne clarified that although schools may not have this software, they are able to receive information securely from the local authority when this is used. Deanne reported that Sue Beevers has been tasked by the Monitoring and Evaluation sub group with taking this forward on behalf of schools.	SB
9.4	Deanne confirmed that all audit recommendations that were discussed at the previous Board on 28 November 2014 which were marked as completed have been removed from each of the recommendations framework.	
10.	RESPONSE TO REFERRALS	
10.1	Joanne Stoddart presented the briefing note produced as requested from the LSCB. This report details the audit of some Child Protection referrals that were received by the First Contact team. Joanne reported that the findings were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 referrals into First Contact were analysed • Out of the 10; 6 could not be pursued due to the age of the cases • In respect of the 4 remaining cases, letters were sent in August 2014 to the referrers to ask if they were satisfied with the outcome and if they were aware of how to escalate this further if required • Only 2 responses received and both referrers stated they were dissatisfied and unaware of how to escalate concerns The report recommended RCSCB consider ways to ensure all agencies are aware of the escalation process.	
10.2	Jan asked board members to consider what would be the most effective way of getting staff to understand the escalation process and professional challenge procedure. Bev advised this issue is discussed in training sessions and supervision throughout the NHS. Deanne advised that this is now incorporated into the LSCB core training and has been highlighted on the ebulletin	
10.3	Alison Brown asked in terms of supporting staff to challenge decisions, we need to be sure that referrers are receiving feedback as to whether the referral was accepted or not. Neil confirmed that schools are always informed of the outcome of the referrals they make.	
10.4	Jan advised that we need to ensure that feedback is provided to 100% of referrals made.	
10.5	Helen raised the point that Accident and Emergency /Urgent Care are not required to know the outcome of all referrals, as it brings limited value after the child has left and the regular health professions would know about the referral through internal processes.	
10.6	Jan suggested it would be very difficult to differentiate between referrers and would make the system become extremely complicated. Chris Daniel agreed to discuss what currently happens with the First Contact team in this respect, as Chris advised it is her understanding is that that they respond back to all referrals made.	CD
10.7	Jan requested that future audits contain details of the referring agency, which will help identify if there are any patterns in which agencies receive the reports.	JS
11.	AUDIT REPORT ON CHILD PROTECTION AND STEP DOWNS	
11.1	Joanne presented the Quality Assurance Audit which was undertaken at the request of the LSCB to determine the timeliness of closure of cases following the ceasing of a Child Protection Plan and to determine if a step down meeting took place prior to Social Worker involvement ending.	

		ACTION
	<p>It was reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67 Child Protection cases were closed during the period 1 January 2014 to 6 August 2014 were examined; of these 7 families had moved to another area so were discounted for the purpose of this audit • 33% of cases had a step down meeting whilst 28% of cases remained open to Social Care under the category of Child in Need • 35% of the sample audited made no reference to a step down meeting occurring; however after further exploration the auditor found this could be due to poor record keeping, as opposed to the meeting not occurring. 	
11.2	Jan stated that 61% compliance was poor and Joanne highlighted that this figure could be much higher if the record keeping systems were correct. Chris stated if step down meetings were not captured correctly in the recording process some training needs to be undertaken to correct this.	
11.3	Barbara Shaw referred to Appendix 1 in the report and asked for more information regarding the case which was closed and re-referred within 1 month. Joanne will look into this further and report her findings to Barbara.	JS
11.4	Jan highlighted the number of families withdrawing from Social Care as soon as the children are no longer subject to Child Protection and how to engage with these families and questioned how good is the training process surrounding this?	
11.5	Jan clarified how important this work was and suggested this audit is completed again in 6 months.	JS
12.	AUDIT RE CORE GROUPS	
12.1	Joanne presented the audit that was undertaken at request from the board in relation to whether participants in core groups have received minutes.	
12.2	<p>Joanne reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 Random cases from core groups that were held in Aug 2014 were examined. • Contact was made with one member of each Core Group ensuring a range of professionals were contacted. • 9 core group members had received the minutes; 4 had not received the minutes and 1 did not respond therefore 69% had received the minutes by November 2014. 	
12.3	Helen enquired was there a standard in place for distributing of Core Group minutes. Joanne reported that the minutes are sent from the Social Worker and Deanne advised that the Core Group Guidance is currently being reviewed.	
12.4	Karen Agar stated there should be an audit trail to ensure the minutes are going to the correct professionals. Jan felt it was worrying that professionals have not asked for the minutes when they haven't been distributed.	
12.5	Jan recommended that this is audited on a quarterly basis and reported into the Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group.	
12.6	Barbara advised of the practicalities of social workers chairing and taking minutes at Core Groups, which should be reviewed.	
13.	RESTRAINT BRIEFING	
13.1	<p>Deanne advised the LSCB on the restraint techniques briefing note which has been produced to collate the multi -agency replies to the letter that was sent on its behalf to gain assurances that restraints were used where necessary in a safe way. Deanne advised the report highlighted the following findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The de-escalation technique Team Teach is used widely. • Recording systems are in place when techniques have been required, it was reported that these are regularly reviewed. • Training is received where required. 	

		ACTION
13.2	Jan referred to Page 2 in the briefing note and questioned in terms of outsourcing residential care, if we monitor compliance restraint. Chris confirmed this is monitored through Social Workers when they visit and observations are included in their records and when regulation 33 work is undertaken.	
13.3	Jan questioned if schools have national guidance regarding restraint techniques. Neil confirmed there is national guidance for schools which states they are allowed to use reasonable force when required. Neil confirmed that most mainstream do not use Team Teach as it is special schools that are required to be trained in this technique. Neil advised that the policy states if restraint is used this should always be investigated.	
13.4	Neil highlighted the reports that have been in the media surrounding Prince Bishop's school in Middlesbrough using pain inducing techniques. Barbara confirmed that there are three children placed in the school from Redcar and Cleveland. Barbara advised that the outcome of these children has been reviewed with the families concerned and it was felt that there are no significant issues and the children want to remain at the school.	
13.5	Jan highlighted a typographical error on Page 6 of the report should state ' <i>do not</i> ' rather than ' <i>will not</i> '.	
13.6	Rob Donaghy asked if the LSCB are asking for organisations to report when restraint techniques have been used. Jan questioned if this was necessary and Alison Brown stated that the YOS report quarterly which is included in the LSCB dataset. Jan clarified that agencies have provided assurance that they have systems in place and the LSCB are satisfied the reports provided. Jan asked if the Local Authority have an overview of what is happening in schools. Alison suggested that regarding safeguarding children in school, the terms of reference for the peer safeguarding supervision in schools could include reporting restraints. This proposal was accepted and Deanne agreed to take forward.	DT
14.	UPDATE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY GROUPS	
14.1	Karen McGarrity updated the LSCB regarding safeguarding initiatives that have been undertaken with the voluntary sector and community groups. Karen confirmed the DfE have a set of core standards for the voluntary sector and there is also a Safe Network standards brochure to support these. Karen advised a RCSCB event was held in September 2014 and participants were registered for the online safety training, contributed to the LSCB business plan and received VEMT training.	
14.2	Karen advised that although the Safe Network safeguarding standards are free to use, there is no way of tracking if the standards are being followed. Karen reported that as a result of this event Safe Network have advised to projects that are being undertaken in other regions where links are established between organisations that can demonstrate that they are meeting the safeguarding standards and therefore as a result are being charged reduced costs for using the Local Authority's community buildings. This has also provided commissioners with a level of confidence that safeguarding procedures are being followed within organisations.	
14.3	Karen requested approval from the Board for support from Deanne to visit these areas and consider developing them in Redcar and Cleveland; the board approved. Karen agreed to report back to a future LSCB.	KMc
	INFORMATION ITEMS:	
15.	NEPACS PRESENTATION:HIDDEN SENTENCES	
15.1	Sue Willoughby from NEPACS presented her organisation to the LSCB. The presentation highlighted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEPACS is a Charity to support prisoners and their families. • The focus is on the families and children and the charity can provide support 	

		ACTION
	<p>at court and on prison visits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEPACS have family workers in all local prisons Holme House, Deerbolt, Kirklevington and Low Newton. • They have strong links with probation and prison staff to ensure visits are appropriate for children • NEPACS find that children want to talk regarding their experiences - where in R&C do we have skilled staff to talk to children? • A Survey conducted by NEPACS in May 2014 showed that 54% of parents do not inform school that children are absent due to visiting prison. • NEPACS Hidden Sentence training can be tailored for needs of all organisations. 	
15.2	Helen questioned why prison visits cannot be arranged outside school hours and Sue advised that weekend and evening visits are arranged whenever possible. Sue also informed that a homework session has been introduced at Durham prison for children that visit on an evening.	
15.3	Julie Allan and Barbara Gill stated they are very aware of the excellent initiatives undertaken by NEPACS and advised that the work is well coordinated between probation and NEPACS. Julie and Barbara reinforced that the impact of having a parent in prison should not be under estimated.	
15.4	Alison Brown informed Sue that YOS would be interested in working alongside NEPACS regarding concerns around the hero worshiping of fathers when children see them in prison. Sue expressed that she would be happy to work with the Youth Offending Service on this.	AB
16.	REDCAR AND CLEVELAND PEOPLE SERVICES EARLY HELP STRATEGY	
16.1	Chris Daniels briefed the LSCB behalf of Linda Bulmer in respect of the Redcar and Cleveland's People Services Early Help Strategy 2014-16	
16.2	Jan stated it links well into other strategies such as the Neglect Strategy and it reads easily. There were no other questions from the Board in respect of this document.	
17.	MAPPA ANNUAL REPORT	
17.1	Deanne advised this report has been circulated for information.	
18.	Any Other Business	
18.1	Sue Beevers informed the LSCB that there is a vacancy in her team which has been deemed as a critical role for safeguarding business; the Child Protection Education Officer/Safeguarding Officer for Schools. Sue stated the intention was to advertise this role internally as a 12 Month secondment, however questioned if partners feel it would be beneficial to extend the vacancy to partner organisations? Jan confirmed that the Board would agree to this, however advised the key was to get the Person Specification correct to appeal to the correct applicants.	SB
18.2	Deanne advised the Board that the DfE Working Together Document has two main suggested revisions that are pertinent to Board. The first in relation to the LADO and the second is reviewing the definition of serious harm. Board members attributed this review with the recent correspondence between RCSCB Chair and the DfE. Deanne agreed to email to proposed changes for board members to respond by 23 January 2015. Jan will then liaise with Deanne and reply to the DfE on behalf of RCSCB.	JvW/ DT
18.3	Deanne explained that the Extra Ordinary Meeting arranged for 19 December 2014 was stood down as the SCR was not agreed by Panel Members. The SCR Panel Members have since reviewed the report and it is now agreed and they are in a	

		ACTION
	position to present the report to the Board. Deanne will arrange an Extra Ordinary Board Meeting to present this report however stated that we are not in position to share the report outside of the Board due to the ongoing criminal investigation. Deanne confirmed that learning can and is still being disseminated and a Learning Lessons and Improving Practice sub group is scheduled to produce the Action Plan.	DT
18.4	Deanne informed that Rochdale Council is having a CSE Multi Agency Open Day on 29 January 2015 and the RCSCB have been allocated two places. Deanne will email the invitation to Board Members after the meeting and ask for nominations.	DT
19.	Date of Next Meeting:	
19.1	Extraordinary Meeting to be held Friday 13 February 2015 10am-12.30pm 25K Ayton Drive, Redcar	