



REDCAR & CLEVELAND SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
10am – 12.30pm, 18 September 2015
25K YOUTH & COMMUNITY CENTRE, AYTON DRIVE, REDCAR

PRESENT

Jan van Wagtendonk (JvW)	RCSCB Independent CHAIR
Mark Adams (MA)	Asst. Director of Public Health – R&CC
Karen Agar (KA1)	Associate Director - Tees Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust
Dr K Agrawal (KA2)	Designated Consultant, Child Protection, STCCG's
John Anthony (JA)	Head of Education, R&CC
Neil Appleby (NA)	Head Teacher, R&C Education – Secondary Schools
Elisa Arnold (EA)	Service Manager, CAF/CASS
Karen Blackburn (KB)	Deputy Head of Cleveland National Probation Service – representing Julie Allen, Head of Cleveland National Probation Service (NE)
Alison Brown (AB)	Youth Offending Service Manager, ST Youth Offending Service
Anton Curtis Cooper (ACC)	Lay Member
Chris Daniel (CD)	Assistant Director Children & Families, R&CC
David Egglestone (DE)	DTV Community Rehabilitation Company – representing Barbara Gill
Alison Ferguson (AF)	Designated Nurse, South Tees CCG's
Jean Golightly (JG)	Executive Nurse, South Tees & Hartlepool and Stockton CCG's
Rosemary Nicholls (RM)	Lay Member
Ros Pluck (RP)	Business Manager,- RCSCB
Kinga Puztai (KP)	Head Teacher, R&C Education – Primary Schools
Barbara Shaw (BS)	Director of People Services, R&CC VICE CHAIR
Alastair Simpson (AS)	Detective Superintendent, Cleveland Police
Helen Smithies (HS)	Head of Nursing (Safeguarding) STH NHS Foundation Trust
Bev Walker (BW)	Dep. Director of Nursing, NHS England, Durham, D'ton & Tees Area
Louise Walker (LW)	Service Manager, Adults Social Work & Safeguarding, R&CC
Pam Taylor (PT)	Minutes

GUEST SPEAKERS

Peter Medd (PM)	Managing Director, Cygnet Law
Kirsty Murphy (KM)	MAPP Co-ordinator, Cleveland
Wendy Rudd (WR)	Service Manager, Review & Inspection, R&CC
Shane Sellers (SS)	Project Manager, Operation Encompass, Safe in Tees Valley

ABSENT/APOLOGIES

Cllr Craig Hannaway (CH)	Lead Member, Children and Families, R&CC
Jason Lowe (JL)	Head of Independent Living Services, Coast & Country
Karen McGarrity (KMc)	Community Information Officer, RCVDA
Dave Turton (DW)	Cleveland Fire Brigade
Victoria Wilson (VW)	Service Manager, Children and Families, R&CC

1	Welcome/Introductions/Apologies	ACTION
1.1	JvW welcomed attendees to the meeting, particularly, Ros Pluck, newly appointed RCSCB Business Manager. Apologies were noted and brief introductions undertaken.	
1.2	JvW informed the Board that BW would be retiring shortly and this would be her last RCSCB meeting. He thanked Bev for her work with the Board, noted that she would be a huge loss to safeguarding/NHS England and wished her every success in the future.	
2	Minutes of previous meeting 17 July 2015	
2.1	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 July 2015 were reviewed, and with the following amendments, were agreed as an accurate record:	

	<p><u>Page 3, item 2.11</u> – MASH should read MACH, Multi Agency Children’s Hub.</p> <p><u>Page 6, item 10.5</u> – it was highlighted that School Nurses, not LAC nurses are moving into the Local Authority.</p> <p><u>Page 9, item 19.2</u> – point of accuracy, wording “Wendy reported that 69% of children and young people in Redcar and Cleveland are on a Child Protection Plan due to neglect” should read “of all R&C Child Protection Plans, 69% of children are subject to the Plan due to neglect.</p>	
	Matters Arising from minutes	
2.2	Item 2.3 – JG confirmed that Dr John Bye had been appointed to named GP position and he will be in post from 1 September. RCSCB thanked NHS England for funding the position.	
2.3	Item 2.8 – Neil Appleby was nominated and elected as Vice Chair of the Board. BS agreed to support in the interim.	
2.4	Item 2.9 – AS confirmed that two meetings of the Children in Custody Policy sub regional Group have taken place. Work has been divided into a number of work streams, specifically, children & vulnerable people; diversion in custody and a post release programme. ACTION: AS to provide update to November Board meeting	AS
2.5	Item 2.10 – Business Manager advised that presentation to Board regarding PREVENT is in progress. ACTION: RP to update next Board meeting It was confirmed that the Training Sub Group are ensuring the continued delivery of multi-agency training.	RP
2.6	Item 2.13 – Business Manager confirmed that a Task & Finish Group meeting is imminent to continue work on the Business Plan. ACTION: RP to update at next meeting	RP
2.7	Item 4.1 CDOP progress report and annual report 2014-15 – report has been presented to all LSCB’s. It was highlighted that there is not a national data set at present and that it has been suggested by Clinical Networks that they could support collation of data. ACTION: BW & KA2 to discuss Rapid Response remains an outstanding issue. Letter to be forwarded to both CCG’s from Chairs of all four Boards, outlining concerns and requesting response as a matter of urgency. ACTION: RP to expedite It was reported that a ‘refresh’ of Co Sleeping campaign has been undertaken and will be presented to November Board. ACTION: RP	BW/KA2 RP RP
2.8	Item 6.7 RCSCB’s LLIPSG Audit & Review paper – AS confirmed that the offer from the voluntary sector and Board lay members to become involved in audits is welcome as they provide support in terms of professional challenge and ensuring the voice of the child is considered. JA highlighted the need to be cognisant regarding relevancy. ACTION: AS to progress	AS
2.9	Item 7.1 Tees wide CSE Strategy & Action Plan – RP confirmed that the RCBC Social Media Policy is at the draft stage and will be updated. ACTION: RP to present to November Board	RP
2.10	Item 8.5 Safeguarding Policy in voluntary & community groups – JG confirmed that there is a £200k budget for innovation/care needs and that any funding would be released alongside a NHS contract on an asset based approach.	

2.11	Item 10.6 LAC Health Assessments – paper is currently being pulled together relating to reciprocal arrangements across the Tees region. ACTION: JG to report back to November Board meeting	JG
2.12	Item 17.1 School Nursing Service for Redcar and Cleveland – MA confirmed that the school nursing service will be joining the Local Authority on 28 September.	
2.13	Item 18.4 Chelsea’s Choice – RP to discuss recommissioning Chelsea’s Choice with BS/CD. NA recommended that funding should be shared equally between RCSCB, councillors and secondary school heads. ACTION: RP to progress	RP
3	Any Other Business	
	There was no additional AOB tabled.	
4	Audits overview reports & recommendations framework VMT, LAC and CP	
	After some discussion, in which concern was expressed about the effectiveness of the audit process, the Board agreed to RP’s proposal that a Task & Finish Group be established to re-examine the Audit process. ACTION: RP to bring details to next meeting	RP
5	CDOP Funding 2016 – 2017	
	The Board discussed the current financial situation and noted that sufficient grant funding is in place for 2015-16 financial year, albeit this will be depleted during 2016-2017. Continued funding was discussed and it was highlighted that approximately £5k per LSCB will be required in the next financial year and £10k per LSCB annually thereafter. ACTION: BS to discuss expenditure with Tees Directors AS asked for clarification regarding the cost of GP attendance to CDOP meetings and KA2 confirmed that GP’s in general are independent contractors and that there is a need for this extra funding. RP confirmed that CDOP funding will be discussed at next CDOP meeting on 7 October. JG remarked that the budget was simplistic and missing key information, i.e. CCG funding is not reflected in document. ACTION: JG to confirm CCG financial contribution to CDOP.	BS JG
6	MAPPA Process	
	KM briefed RCSCB re the National Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) training process, indicating that, risk management is fundamental to the MAPPA process, i.e. each case is managed at the lowest appropriate level that is consistent with providing a Risk Management Plan. KM was asked to note that Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) no longer exist, replacement organisations are NHS England and Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG’s). There was some discussion around MAPPA risk strategy meetings attendance and the Board agreed that individuals, who can make strategic decisions, should attend all risk strategy meetings. ACTION: RCSCB members to cascade information to their Teams	RCSCB
7	Operation ‘Encompass’	
	Former police superintendent, SS summarised Operation Encompass – the purpose of which is to safeguard and support children and young people who have been involved in a domestic abuse incident. Following such an incident, children often arrive at school distressed, upset and unprepared. This process aims to ensure that appropriate school staff are made aware early enough to support children and young	

	<p>people in a way that means they feel safe and included.</p> <p>He explained the background – Elisabeth Carney-Haworth, head teacher of Torpoint nursery and infant school, co-created Operation Encompass with her husband, former police sergeant David Carney-Haworth. Recognising that schools were being told weeks, or even months, after a domestic abuse incident had taken place in a child’s home, they worked on finding a legally safe way to speed up the process. As a result David gained Devon and Cornwall Police’s approval to create new working practices which would see police share information about such incidents with key adults at schools before the child arrived the next day. These practices are currently being rolled out across the Country and have been operational in Hartlepool since 1 April this year.</p> <p>SS is in post to extend the process through Middlesbrough and Redcar & Cleveland and to this end he confirmed that 1) he has notified safeguarding leads in schools and nurseries and 2) parents have been sent a letter from their child’s school detailing Operation Encompass.</p> <p>In this area, during April 2015 there were 1127 incidents of domestic violence where children were present and the information relating to over 250 children was referred to schools, subsequently, an information sharing agreement around Operation Encompass is currently being scripted and will require the signatures of all concerned.</p> <p>SS advised that circa 250 designated people in this area have been involved in training this week to predicate the Operation Encompass launch on 1 October and that all training should be completed by January 2016.</p> <p>The scheme, which is subject to an ongoing independent evaluation by Teesside Business School, requires that, on a daily basis, a locally based Police Officer from the Neighbourhood Police Team (NPT) will review all violent or abusive incidents that would indicate domestic abuse. If there are incidents where children are living at the home and aged between 4 and 18 years old, the school that the child or young person attends will be contacted and information will be passed to the “Key Adult” in the school. The staff in contact with those pupils will then be in an informed position to support them in a way that is right for that child.</p> <p>There was some discussion about the meaning of ‘child present’ and SS confirmed that if a child is anywhere in the house, this constitutes a ‘child present’.</p>	
8	Darlington Judgement	
	<p>PM presented details of A (2015) EWFC 11 litigation, specifically, the significance of the judgement because it set out some of the fundamental principles of the Children Act 1989 and the approach to be followed by Local Authorities when applying for Care, Supervision or Placement Orders, i.e. Local Authority assessments should ‘draw together relevant information gathered from the child, their family and relevant professionals and demonstrate the facts / the evidence / how strong the evidence is / the nature of the harm the child is likely to suffer / the impact on the child and why it would cause significant harm and why is the harm significant.</p> <p>PM reiterated the importance of obtaining direct evidence and the high degree of responsibility required for preparing cases. He asked the Board to note that Local Authority senior management are being criticised as they are seen as carrying a greater responsibility for failings, than front-line social workers and team managers, but it is the latter group who tend to provide the evidence to the Court. Legal departments have also been criticised on the basis that they reviewed and passed on the inadequate assessments. He asked Board members to reinforce that all Local Authority care plans (s.31A) must set out the needs of the child and proposals for permanency having regard to these needs and adopt multi agency analytical approach when presenting plans to court. ACTION: PT to forward copy of presentation briefing notes to all Board members.</p>	PT
9	Personal Education Plans (PEPs)	
	<p>JA addressed the Board – he explained the statutory requirement for all children who are ‘looked after’ by a Local Authority should have a PEP and this should form an</p>	

	<p>integral part of their overall Care Plan. Whilst initiation of the PEP is the responsibility of the social worker; the content should be developed in conjunction with designated teachers, carers, other relevant professionals and supported by the Virtual School Head. The child should also be involved in the process and where appropriate a parent/relevant family member.</p> <p>Because the successful completion of PEPs in R&CC area has declined to 87.2% in 2014-15 (albeit better than the previous year at 85.7%) various options are being explored to improve both the quantity and quality of the Plans. JA explained that R&CC are considering purchasing a software package, known as the ePEP (electronic Personal Education Plan) which will fit around the needs of both children and professionals and can be customised to meet local needs. It provides the means to improve timely completion and quality of the PEPs and subject to further discussions and demonstration may be rolled out during Autumn term 2015.</p> <p>ACTION: data to be updated and brought back to assure the Board in March/April 2016</p>	JA
10	Section 11 Audits	
	<p>To avoid duplication of effort, Business Managers have been asked to nominate a single format for the completion of next year's sect 11 Audits. RP confirmed that she will be attending a meeting with all Business Managers on Monday 28 September to discuss further.</p> <p>ACTION: RP to update as appropriate</p>	RP
11	Audit at South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust of paediatric assessment of children subject to a protection plan for neglect	
	<p>KA2 gave a brief synopsis of the audit, specifically that in both Tees provider Trusts, in very few assessments, were health/medical problems identified. Most of the problems noted were already known to professionals and were being followed up.</p> <p>There was some confusion relating to the process & analysis data, albeit the Audit concluded that, since the revised procedure was introduced, the number of children referred for paediatric assessments has reduced significantly, i.e. Middlesbrough 6 out of 65 (9%) and R&C 1 out of 41 (2.5%), resulting in a substantial reduction in clinic slots and as a result all but one child, were seen within six weeks of referral.</p> <p>Overall the audit team indicated that the revised procedure is working well in respect of numbers referred, attendance at first appointment and attendance of a social worker. There were a number of recommendations which the Community Paediatrician and Clinical Director of Paediatrics at South Tees NHS Foundation Trust pledged will be actioned and will be demonstrated in future assessments.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the Audit should be repeated next year, utilising data during the period 1 October 2015 – 31 March 2016. ACTION: JvW & WR to discuss paediatric assessments in terms of Plans and IRO's.</p> <p>It was suggested that a live Audit of the next ten cases of neglect should take place in order to assure the Board that the core group has seen a holistic assessment on the child. ACTION: WR/BS to progress</p>	<p>JvW/WR</p> <p>WR/BS</p>
12	Sunderland/Darlington Inspections	
	<p>WR presented the findings from the Ofsted Single Inspection Framework which began on 17th November 2013 and is set to conclude in the spring of 2017.</p> <p>Of 152 local authorities expected to undergo the inspection, 59 (39%) inspections have been published as at 30 June 2015. None so far have been judged to be outstanding; 14 were judged to be good; 31 were judged to require improvement and 14 were judged to be inadequate.</p> <p>The inspection process was made up of 3 sections (children who require help and protection/children looked after and achieving permanency/leadership/management & governance) and also reviews the effectiveness of LSCB's.</p>	

The strongest area overall within the inspection was children looked after and achieving permanence and the weakest area was in Children who are in need and protection. The only key judgement area where any authorities were found to be outstanding was leadership, management and governance which was in Hampshire, Leeds and Trafford.

Ofsted reviewed 58 Local Safeguarding Children Boards and concluded that none were outstanding, 19 were judged to be good for overall effectiveness, 26 were judged to require improvements and 13 were judged inadequate.

Local inspections have concluded that Hartlepool (Nov 13) were judged as good, whilst Sunderland (May 15) and Darlington (June 15) were inadequate.

To assure the Board, current practice was compared with published inspection reports, specifically,

- Sunderland had a number of unallocated cases and unworked cases compared with R&C who have no cases unallocated.
- Sunderland were heavily reliant on agency staff and all have high caseloads, whereas, R&C have invested in additional social workers and now has an almost full complement of staff in the social work teams.
- In Sunderland Ofsted found that threshold was not properly understood by partners, whilst in R&C the First Contact team have a threshold tool that is understood by partners.
- In both Sunderland and Darlington Ofsted indicated that IROS were not given enough profile and status as guardians of the children's plan, whereas the IRO in R&C is more robustly taking up this challenge, i.e. R&C have been benchmarked against the NAIRO check list and now have in place a plan to demonstrate scrutiny. Also an internal audit has been commissioned to independently review IRO effectiveness.
- The timeliness of C&F assessment was deemed as poor in both Sunderland and Darlington; however, current performance in R&C for assessments completed in timescales is a reasonable 81%, although this needs further improvement.
- Darlington were criticised due to an inappropriate use of children accommodated in care via Section 20 1989 CA, therefore R&C has instigated a full review to be undertaken by Cygnet Law.
- In Sunderland it was felt, as corporate parent, they were not being sufficiently ambitious for the children and that the outcomes for children leaving care was poor education, housing and employment. The national indicators are good in R&C for outcomes for care leavers in terms of education, employment, training and housing. In addition this will be strengthened with new accommodation and an officer working with Looked After children who will also work with the newly elected members so they can more robustly hold officers to account for their promises to children.
- Ofsted revealed that senior managers and elected members in Darlington and Sunderland did not ask the right questions about the provision of services for children and young people or robustly hold officers to account. Ofsted said that Darlington managers did not have sufficient grip on practice. In comparison in R&C the Director of People's Services has a firm grasp on quality assurance and drives forward a robust safeguarding assurance framework in which officers at all levels are involved in observation of wide range of social work activities.
- In Darlington Ofsted said there was not sufficient scrutiny from the LSCB and there was no clarity on priorities causing partners to lose confidence in the LCSB. They also indicated that the IRO service did not provide sufficient challenge regarding the plans and highlighted that child protection conferences were cancelled due to reports not been ready. This is not an issue within R&C

	<p>WR concluded that R&C agencies must demonstrate strong partnership working to future Ofsted inspectors, evidencing that good practice and Audit, in general, must be embedded in practice.</p> <p>JF asked RCSCB to put this in proportion with TEWV had 100 inspectors and South Tees dealt with 80 inspectors. ACTION: preparation for inspection to be discussed at next Board</p>	<p>RP</p> <p>BOARD</p>
13	Youth Offending Team – Stocktake Report 2015	
	<p>AB gave a brief rundown of the Deloitte, Youth Offending Team Stocktake, i.e. the purpose of the report was to establish how the YOT model has evolved locally and nationally and at the broadest level. The headlines were as follows:</p> <p>The YOT system has a number of strengths: teams work closely and effectively with partner agencies and in a holistic manner to take account of young people's wider needs.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between what YOTs do and what is measured by the MoJ, which makes assessment of performance and value for money difficult.</p> <p>Early correlation analysis suggests that taking a narrow focus on reducing first time entrants, custody volumes or reoffending rates only suggest that current MoJ funding is poorly allocated and could be revised without affecting these specific youth justice outcomes as measured by the YJB.</p> <p>These risks undermine other outcomes around education, employment and training for young people that YOTs may positively influence.</p> <p>There were 10 recommendations specific to three categories, i.e. 1) measuring and interpreting performance, 2) funding & value for money and 3) accountability. AB indicated that it was going to be difficult to plan for the future as there is a proposed 10.6% funding cut in year and given that the MoJ is not YOT's main source of funding, YOTs' incentives and objectives do not necessarily align with it.</p>	
14	Saville Report – update	
	<p>BW confirmed that work is ongoing and that NHS England have shared the Lampard Report with the Quality and Assurance Group, it has been added to Clinical Commissioning Groups agendas and it will be further disseminated by regional Safeguarding Groups.</p>	
15	Serious Case Review (SCR)	
	<p>JvW updated the Board with regards to the two ongoing Serious Case Reviews. He also confirmed that he is awaiting a court date for the 2014 SCR. ACTION: AS to confirm court date</p> <p>In respect of the SCR XYZ – awaiting update from police regarding prosecution decision and potential involvement of XYZ in any court case. ACTION: AS to provide update</p>	<p>AS</p> <p>AS</p>
16	Any Other Business	
	<p><u>Preparation for Goddard Enquiry</u></p> <p>AS advised the Board that instruction has been received from the Home Office placing a temporary moratorium on all destruction of documents relating the independent enquiry into child sexual abuse.</p>	
	Details of future meetings	
	<p>Future meetings will begin at 10am, closing at circa 12.30pm</p> <p>Venue: 25K, Ayton Drive, Redcar, TS10 4LR</p> <p>Friday, 27 November 2015 / Friday, 15 January 2016 / Friday, 18 March 2016</p>	