

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
THURSDAY 1 OCTOBER 2015 – 2 PM – 5 PM
THE SHAY STADIUM, HALIFAX**

Meeting Attendance

Initials	Agency	2.4.15	4.6.15	6.8.15	1.10.15	3.12.15
IB	Adults Health & Social Care	D	A	Y	N	
JS	CAFCASS	D	D	Y	D	
PW	Calderdale CCG	Y	Y	A	D	
HB	Calderdale College	Y	N	A	A	
RU	Calderdale Governors Association	-	Y	A	Y	
JY	CHFT	Y	-	-	-	
PO	CHFT	Y	D	Y	A	
RT	Communities & Service Support	D	Y	Y	N	
JC	CSCB	Y	Y	Y	Y	
RB	CSCB Independent Chair	Y	Y	Y	Y	
BW	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	D	
SS	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	Y	
IH	Democratic & Partnerships	N	Y	D	N	
JP	Housing	D	Y	A	Y	
SK	LAY Member	Y	A	A	Y	
JT	LAY Member	Y	A	N	Y	
CR/CS	Lead Member	Y	A	Y	Y	
MS	National Probation Service	A	Y	Y	Y	
GPY	NHS Commissioners	Y	A	Y	Y	
CS	NHS England	Y	Y	Y	Y	
VT	NHS Trust	-	Y	Y	Y	
LB	Primary Heads	A	Y	A	Y	

LN	Primary Heads	A	Y	A	D	
NH	Probation CRC	A	A	A	Y	
CW/BL	Public Health	A	A	A	Y	
LK	Safeguarding & Quality Assurance Service	Y	Y	Y	Y	
DL/WM	Secondary Heads	Y	D	A	Y	
TB	SWYPFT	Y	Y	D	D	
JL	Voluntary Sector	Y	Y	Y	Y	
MG	West Yorkshire Fire	A	N	A	Y	
DW	West Yorkshire Police	Y	Y	Y	D	
AE	Women's Centre	Y	Y	A	Y	
JR	YOT/Early Intervention	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Key: Y = Attend, N = Did Not Attend, A = Apology, D = Deputy attended in place

In attendance for Specific Items:

Rezina Kelly (RK) for Items 3.4 – Safer Recruitment Training and 4.1 Schools Safeguarding Advisor
Cheryl Baxter (CB) for Item 4.4 – IRO Report

Observer:

Karen Tate (KT) – Acting Deputy Head – National Probation Service (Bradford & Calderdale)

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person	Timescale
1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence	Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted. A particular welcome was given to new members Wendy Moffat (previously a CSCB member) and Ben Leaman representing Public Health.		

<p>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (6 August 2015)</p>	<p>Page 3 <u>Action Plan Responses</u> Progress noted on action plan responses.</p> <p>Page 5 <u>British Transport Police Correspondence (Memorandum of Understanding)</u> The signed Memorandum of Understanding has been sent to the British Transport Police.</p> <p><u>Section 11</u> There is a Pilot Event in a couple of weeks and Section 11 is planned for a future CSCB meeting.</p> <p>Page 7 <u>Safeguarding Supervision Framework</u> It was felt that it is important that the School representative's voice was heard regarding the above.</p> <p>Action - JC to follow up with CSCB School representative's to ensure they are aware of the commitment by the Board and what this might mean for them.</p> <p>Page 12 <u>Multi-agency Learning and Improvement Programme Report</u> RB has met with the Chairs of the Learning and Improvement Sub-group and taken the step of offering formal advice re looked for outcomes.</p>	<p>JC</p>	
---	--	-----------	--

<p>Page 16 <u>Multi-agency Audit Group Report</u> Members were asked again to consider a representative from their agency to be involved in the multi-agency audits. It was confirmed that they would not be expected to be a member of the Multi-agency Audit Group.</p> <p>Action – LK to update on responses received</p> <p>Page 17 <u>Female Genital Mutilation</u> Mandatory reporting coming in today that needs to be incorporated into the Strategy. Further information from the police is expected. This will be ready to come back to the CSCB in December 2015.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 6 August 2015 were agreed.</p> <p>Action Sheet Members were advised that we are working towards a RAG Rating System and it was hoped this would be introduced soon as it was thought this would help members to assess progress.</p> <p><u>2.1 – Correspondence Received</u> Received responses from DW and SS. RB stated that he was assured that should there be any historical abuse investigations he and the Board would be informed and involved as appropriate. Thanks were given to SS and DW.</p> <p><u>3.2 – Safeguarding Supervision Framework</u> Members were reminded to advise their own organisations and ensure that principles are adopted/incorporated into existing</p>	<p>LK</p>	
---	------------------	--

	<p>arrangements and cascade the document and resources supplied. RB noted that this would be followed up in the next Section 11 so that members would have the opportunity to report their progress and assess impact of the framework.</p> <p>RB is hoping that we can move towards a more “action and RAG approach” for minutes.</p>		
<p>2.1 Correspondence received and sent</p>	<p><u>Report to the Minister of State for Children and Families</u> Copy with papers of RB’s fourth and hopefully last letter to the Minister. RB thanked those members who had been able to meet with him. He felt the exercise had been helpful and will be rolled into review of Annual Report and revision of Business Plan.</p>		
<p>2.2 Matters Arising</p>	<p>No further matters arising were raised.</p>		
<p>3.1 CSCB Annual Report</p>	<p>Paper received. RB apologised that the process and the report had not met the original timeline, this was because it had been necessary in the light of comparing best practice, to revise the approach this year and there had also been the need to meet the requirements of the DFE review.</p> <p>RB thanked members for their contributions and feedback and noted that some members were not happy with the process this year. The version presented is the report agreed in principle by the Board with further amendments as requested at the last meeting. As required the final printed version will be sent to all members and to the designated officers identified in Working Together.</p> <p>RB asked the Board to reflect on the importance of the report, and in particular the summary and assessment of the Board itself and of the safeguarding system.</p> <p>It is intended to produce a short Executive Summary which will be</p>		

	<p>produced to reflect learning. It was noted that we drew on Sheffield and Leeds reports and approach and RB has spoken to the Chairs of the both of these Boards.</p> <p>It was suggested to look at producing an Annual Report for young people and JC confirmed that the Young Advisors could look at a version for young people.</p> <p>Thanks were given to all that contributed to the Annual Report.</p>		
<p>3.2 Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP)</p>	<p>Two papers received and presented by BL.</p> <p>BL reminded members that in terms of statistical significance the numbers of child deaths were such that it was difficult to draw too many conclusions. It was hoped that nationally aggregated data may be produced again at some point in the future as this helped provide a wider context and gave additional substance to statistical analysis. The data and the report confirmed a view that we operate very efficiently compared to the national average, in terms of timeliness. Nevertheless the CDOP Panel is to look at what could have been done differently within the current approach. BL felt that members would want to be assured that the relationship between the arrangements for Serious Case Reviews (SCR) and review of child deaths were robust, and he felt the report confirmed this.</p> <p>BL demonstrated how learning from CDOP was informing wider public health enquiry and initiatives especially in respect of deaths where there was an indication of a genetic component, and this has fed through into the commissioning arrangements,</p> <p>BL explained that in order to make best use of the yearly figures to look at modifiable factors, figures and cases from the last 5 years were used so that there was a basis of local comparison and consideration of trends and patterns.</p>		

<p>RB asked about how parents and families were involved and how their experience had influenced the panel.</p> <p>JC confirmed that parents are always informed that the CDOP process is happening and 3 parents previously have been involved in the process through their choice. A member noted that Bradford CDOP has carried out a study about parental involvement and benefit.</p> <p>It has been proposed that there is a CDOP national database and in West Yorkshire there is going to be a group set up to look at sharing and coordinating the data but at the moment neither exists.</p> <p>A board member asked if the CDOP process looks at road traffic and train accidents, this was confirmed and report goes to Community Safety Partnership.</p> <p>BL felt that there was a good track record in Calderdale of identifying and responding to modifiable factors.</p> <p>No other comments were received from members and members confirmed they were happy with the report and the proposed developments for the coming year</p> <p>The CDOP Annual Report for 2014/15 was formally agreed and accepted.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Action Plan and update will come back to the December 2015 CSCB meeting.</p> <p><u>Publication</u></p> <p>This has been raised as it needs to be clarified, RB thought that if it was not to be published as appears to be the norm elsewhere, there would need to be clear and strong reasons for this.</p> <p>Discussion followed around the importance of being able to be sure</p>		
---	--	--

<p>that identifiable factors would not place individuals or families in a difficult position, and that caution needed to be exercised re the limitations of the data and the conclusions that can be drawn from this. Further discussion explored these issues and the meeting reached a conclusion that the CSCB CDOP Annual Report should be published.</p> <p>RB asked JC to appraise the Board of current discussions looking at; <u>Future of administration, Management arrangements and Governance arrangements (re shared function across 2 LSCB's)</u></p> <p>In Calderdale the CDOP process is managed by JC and her equivalent does this in Kirklees. Kirklees are proposing that Public Health manage their part of the CDOP process and members were asked what they thought about this for Calderdale. The reasons for the change at Kirklees were not clear other than staff vacancy management.</p> <p>Public Health takes the lead on CDOP in a number of areas, but there are a variety of arrangements across the country. The following points were explored in discussion; Arrangements to date appeared to have worked well, so what would be the impact of any change? Does this mean that we could or should look at alternative arrangements outside of the current shared LSCB approach? BL thought there were advantages to a joint approach.</p> <p>Action - Members to feedback their thoughts on the governance arrangements for Calderdale CDOP to JC or BL</p> <p>Action - An options paper to be prepared</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>JC/BL</p>	
--	---------------------------------------	--

3.3

Two papers received and presented by CS. RB thanked CS and

Savile Update

reminded members that this was a whole system issue, and it would be helpful if the Board could determine its position on supporting and assuring response to the learning from the Saville report(s). CS explained that NHS England has set a clear agenda and Calderdale CCG is monitoring the response to recommendations and their impact. There were a number of recommendations including:

To have visitor and VIP arrangements in place. It was noted that this has been a challenge for the Voluntary Sector. JC reminded Board Members that SWYPFT had introduced VIP visitor policy and Visiting Media policy which were kindly shared with the CSCB Communication and Engagement Sub group who have adapted so any organisation or group can download and personalise for their own use. These are on the website www.calderdale-scb.org.uk/home/local-procedures-and-guidance/ under 'V'. It was noted that it was important that all agencies/partners had attended to this issue. SS felt it was important to find the right balance as essentially the issue was one about unsupervised access. AE stated that DBS checks are also important and are monitored at the Health Safeguarding Forum.

RU felt response was both a cultural and educational issue. RB summarised that it seemed that the view of Board was members was that it is for individual partners/organisations to lead on implementation and learning, and that Section 11 would provide the opportunity to report on progress and learning. NHSE and the CCG would be in a position to inform and report to the Board progress and or areas of concern.

Action - It was agreed that the CSCB support organisations responses, ensure that Section 11 provided the opportunity to monitor and would ensure that the website reflected this

ALL

	<p>(It was noted that the Communication and Engagement Sub-group looked at SWYPFT good practice and it would be helpful to promote this learning).</p> <p>Action – LGS to include the link to these model policies in the minutes</p> <p>Action - NHS England/CCG to keep the CSCB updated</p>	<p>LGS</p> <p>CS/GPY</p>	
<p>3.4 Safer Recruitment Training</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by RK who was welcomed to the meeting. RK is a member (representative for the Calderdale Local Authority) of the Safer Recruitment Consortium which provides training materials for Safer Recruitment. RK explained the current arrangements were not felt to be robust as any provision could be used for this vital area of Safeguarding. RK proposed that only training assured by the Consortium should be used and that the CSCB should endorse this position. RB noted that the Board was not in a position to endorse any supplier, but could ensure that partners were aware of resources available to them.</p> <p>It was noted that ensuring that recruitment practices across the system were appropriate, proportional and safe was a Board role, which it currently addressed mainly through the Section 11 process, and other PMQA monitoring.</p> <p>It was noted that for schools, given changes in requirements this was now a more complicated matter, but locally it was understood that there was broad support to keep to the former requirements in respect of safer recruitment. JL asked if there is any learning we could have and WM said there definitely is and happy to open up.</p>		

	Action – Members were asked to reflect on the report and the wider issues and to raise any issues at the next meeting	ALL	
<p>4.1 Schools Safeguarding Advisor</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by RK. RB thanked her for an informative report and commented that this was a good example of how the LA was taking a proactive approach to supporting schools and safeguarding standards. The report outlined progress impact, fit and contribution to the LSCB and clear direction for the future. WM stated that RK’s role and the impact was felt to be invaluable by the sector. It was noted that RK will continue to support schools and the sector with section 11.</p> <p>RB asked members if the report and the opportunity to hear from RK had ensured they were informed and assured that the role was making an impact on the whole system and the fit with the LSCB objectives. This was agreed.</p> <p>Thanks were given to RK.</p>		
<p>4.2 Calderdale Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategic Board</p>	<p>Verbal update by SS. SS explained the changes to the commissioning and coordination arrangements for Domestic Abuse provision. This will result in a tendering process in the early part of 2016. SS is the Lead Officer for this. The intention is to build on the joined up approach and Together Housing and Calderdale CCG are actively contributing. Some external funding has been achieved and this will add value to and steer the current strategy and arrangements. SS thinks the shift will be more to preventative work.</p> <p>On the basis that the CSE Hub arrangements have been judged to be successful there is a proposal to have a Domestic Abuse Hub.</p>		

	<p>Further discussion is taking place and the outcome of this will be known shortly. It was noted that this may have implications for the current threshold/Joint working arrangements and also the Board's PMQA framework. SS felt that thematic multi agency audit may be useful in the future to better inform commissioning and impact of delivery.</p> <p>LK confirmed that Domestic Abuse is on the Multi-agency Audit Schedule. GPY noted that her service area is doing a pilot on women who are pregnant who have been involved in DA.</p> <p>RB thanked SS and members and noted the need to ensure that as a Board we needed to have a clear position and fit with the current and developing response to Domestic Abuse, and felt that this would be better articulated through the current work looking at the fit between strategic partnerships in addition to the points raised by members in relation to PMQA, Policies, Procedures and thresholds.</p>		
<p>4.3 Performance Management</p>	<p>Two papers received and presented by LK. RB thanked LK for assuming the sub group chair role, and noted the clear improvements to how the information was presented. LK reminded the Board that concurrent development of the Indicator Report and the Scorecard was developing and that this helped to manage and ensure that we were "horizon scanning" in order to select areas for further analysis and scrutiny. The recently introduced "traffic lights" was a way of reporting this relationship and provided members with the opportunity to a) oversee the process and b) undertake their own scrutiny.</p> <p>LK reported that the Indicator Report is continually improving, the Score Card came to the last CSCB meeting and data cleansing is ongoing. .</p> <p>LK highlighted areas of challenge as a result of current areas of scrutiny:</p>		

<p><u>Percentage of front line safeguarding staff who have had supervision within service and/or framework principles and standards</u></p> <p>This is amber is because it is an area where standards have recently been set there is still an issue in schools, as discussed earlier in the meeting. RK has formed a Working Party with schools. This will go green once implementation and reporting arrangements have been agreed subject to the quality and consistency of reported data and information.</p> <p>It was agreed that amber is an appropriate rag rating for now.</p> <p><u>GP Supervision</u></p> <p>There is no formal requirement for GP's to have set supervisions though it is understood they have guidance on this and that there are ad hoc arrangements. LK felt that this illustrated the relationship between the need to develop the framework and how to address issues around "fit" of concepts and principles across different parts of the system. This required further exploration, negotiation and clarification in order to be in position for the Board to be assured that GP's were meeting the principles of the framework.</p> <p>This work was ongoing and it was understood that they discuss cases on an individual basis and have meetings on a quarterly basis.</p> <p><u>Children with a Disability subject to a Child Protection Plan</u></p> <p>Following further interrogation of the data including a data cleansing exercise the number of children subject to a Child Protection Plan has not significantly risen. The performance sub group felt that this needed to be a longer piece of work undertaken through training in order for professionals to recognise disabilities as well as the vulnerability of children with disabilities. The performance sub group</p>		
--	--	--

felt that this area of challenge needed to be closed down and work through training was required. BL felt that as the numbers remained low that this area of challenge should remain open, LK felt that the performance sub group had analysed the data sufficiently and this needed to be addressed through training. The Business Group would also need to identify any implications for thresholds/Policies and Procedures.

LK felt that in this way we would be able to evidence any impact and improvement for safeguarding outcomes for children with a disability.

BL highlighted the issues around managing complex data and could see how the approach was moving forward but felt that he can't endorse the Indicator report until more information is received. RB thanked BL for this and felt it highlighted the need for all of us to be clearer about the framework, how it works and what this requires of members. RB also noted that whilst clearly a level of statistical and analytical rigorousness was important, it was also important that we did not let this prevent learning through doing, within the available resources.

Action – BL to assist and advise the Performance Management Sub-group

Percentage of Child Protection Conferences having Agency Attendance

LK explained the data and the approach and reminded members of why this was an important area for the Board to have a clear view of how standards were being met, and how this could impact on the lives of children, Discussion took place re the presentation of information, the need to be clearer as to who was required to attend and report and on what basis, the need to distinguish between

BL

	<p>Most of the data, which is good, has come in from CHFT. In Quarter 2 it is expected to see improvement from Locala and Donna Green is confident that will see improvement and Locala has been informed how important this is.</p> <p>LK informed the Board that the dataset and Score Card are being reviewed by Jacquie Hellowell (PMQA Officer) and will come to a Board in the near future. There is a responsible person (Lead Officer) for each of the indicators and they have been asked to see if they think their indicator should remain, be moved or taken off the Indicator Report or go to the Score Card.</p> <p>RB felt the direction of travel is good and felt that the Board would support this approach.</p> <p>It was agreed where items are completed, to have a formal arrangement at the CSCB to sign off.</p> <p>RB Thanked LK and the Sub-group for their work and felt at least from his point of view that we were continuing to make progress. He reminded members that the development of this area of work was likely to continue to assume a high priority</p>		
<p>4.4 IRO Annual Report 14/15</p>	<p>Two papers received and presented by CB who was welcomed to the meeting. CB highlighted the report which had also been to the Corporate Parenting Panel. Members were interested in feedback from children and parents and CB outlined how this had made a contribution which would be included in the revised Action Plan for the service.</p> <p>CB confirmed that the Corporate Parenting Panel were happy with the Report.</p> <p>CB reminded members that there was an open invitation to observe</p>		

	<p>conferences. RB felt this could be an important opportunity as it gives insight into the system.</p> <p>CB referred to page 17 (dispute resolution) and felt this was a significant albeit challenging development during the year. This meant that where there was disagreement about an aspect of or the outcome of a conference all parties were clear about how to progress this. This would help ensure the system was focused and healthy. RB reminded members of the CSCB part in this agreed earlier in the year.</p> <p>CB noted that 9 staff were employed to Chair meetings, all have different skills & backgrounds and recently remaining vacancies had been filled. CB was asked about quality assurance arrangements, and she highlighted the team approach, undertaking audits and improving performance management information.</p> <p>RB asked members if the report provided the necessary level of information and analysis for them to be assured that the service was effective, forward looking and improving. He asked members to note the particular responsibility the Board has in terms of oversight of the CP conference system and the multi-agency process.</p> <p>Members agreed that they were assured.</p> <p>Thanks were given to CB and her colleagues</p>		
<p>4.5 Agency Updates</p>	<p>Verbal updates received from: <u>Local Authority Budget Consultations (SS)</u> At this point in the budgetary cycle the Council will need to identify significant savings, but these are yet to be identified, though in comparison with some other authorities it was hoped that these would be containable. Some posts were not being replaced, and performance information suggested that early intervention was</p>		

helping to prevent escalation in numbers of looked after children. SS will update the Board as the budget process develops and the Spending Review allocations are known.

Youth Offending Team : Secure Estate Developments (JR)

RB was aware from other Boards of the impact of a negative inspection regarding Rainsbrook Secure Training Centre (STC). One of 3 such establishments in England. Delays by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) in informing YOT and LSCB's had meant that placing agencies were not in a position to exercise their safeguarding responsibilities. RB had written at the request of the other Boards he Chairs to the Chair of the YJB to seek assurance that this situation would not arise again. This has emphasised the need for the YOT to ensure that such matters were reported to the CSCB in a timely manner.

JR reported that Rainsbrook will be seeking to re-assure Local Authorities about their strategy by the end of October.

There is re-assurance but watch this space and there is an Action Plan that has been shared with YOT.

JR confirmed that no Calderdale young people were placed there in the period of this

JR noted the service was committed to £50,000 (11%) cut in budget. The budget cut will not hit front line practice but as a result the service is being reviewed.

Local Response to Refugee Situation (SS)

SS highlighted the pressures and safeguarding issues this situation presented and Calderdale had taken a number of unaccompanied minors from Kent. A further young person found their way to Calderdale and were placed either in foster care or supported lodgings.

	<p>Public Health is taking the lead on asylum seekers on behalf of the Council.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Board would need to be better sighted on these arrangements and any safeguarding learning or implications. It was agreed to ensure that this was given priority.</p>		
<p>4.6 DfE Peer Review</p>	<p>Verbal feedback from SS. He felt the review process had gone well and thanked those partners who had contributed. SS noted that his blog provided more detail and links to the self-assessment used. It is hoped that the Minister would make a decision in October.</p> <p>Action – the Board will revisit once the outcome is known re the implications for the Board role and the next stage in the improvement journey</p>	<p>CSCB</p>	
<p>4.7 Budget</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JC. This is for month 6 (September). JC reported that expenditure was on target, though further reviews may place a strain on the budget. RB noted that in the interests of transparency the figure against his remuneration was not accurate. JC said that this included last year's expenditure. RB sought to assure the Board that this part of its expenditure was on target and within budget.</p> <p>Action – Figures to be adjusted in next report</p> <p>BL questioned the projected spend for full year and the expected expenditure for full year being exactly the same figure. It would be helpful if CSCB members had a more detailed budget with spend on.</p> <p>It was agreed that at the next CSCB meeting, members would</p>	<p>JC</p>	

	<p>need further information and analysis especially as a decision would be needed in the near future re the current 12 month PMQA role.</p> <p>Action – To have Budget as a main agenda item at the December 2015 CSCB meeting</p>	<p>JC</p>	
<p>4.8 Serious Case Review Update</p>	<p>Verbal update by GPY.</p> <p><u>Child J</u> Wrote to the National Panel of Experts (NPE) and asked for a deferment in publication on the basis of consideration of the needs of a sibling. The Panel has agreed and this meant that the report would be published in Autumn 2016.</p> <p><u>Child K</u> Criminal proceedings have finished and the report is been shared with the family. Publication possible in November 2015 dependent on the family involvement.</p> <p>For both J and K, there are very few actions outstanding from the recommendations, however Challenge Events will be held to test the improvements.</p> <p>Two cases have been considered by the SCR Panel and recommended that they do not meet the threshold to carry out a serious case review. RB has agreed with these recommendations and these have been forwarded to the NPE who review all cases where the decision is not to undertake a serious case review.</p> <p>GPY is preparing the recommendation from the Panel for RB to</p>		

	<p>consider another three cases.</p> <p><u>Child M</u> Progressing to timescales and a further Panel meeting has been arranged. RB has met with Panel Chair and Independent Reviewer as part of the Board's quality assurance arrangements.</p> <p><u>Child D</u> The report was published in July 2015. There does not appear to have been any impact for the family and/or media coverage or enquires.</p>		
5.1 Minutes from Sub-groups	<p>Minutes received from: Business Group (16 September 2015) Performance Management (15 September 2015) Learning & Improvement (21 July 2015) Communication & Engagement (2 July 2015) Early Help & Prevention (14 September 2015) Proactive & Responsive (27 August 2015)</p>		
5.2 CSE National Working Group Gold Network	<p>Paper received. Members were reminded that the Board was a Gold member. This allows Board members access to a range of resources and if they contact Allison Waddell she will provide access details.</p> <p>Action – Website to be updated and further information to be circulated</p>	AW	
6 Any Other Business	<p><u>Guidance on Referral Process between Adults Services and Children's Services</u> Paper distributed. This development was as a result of a Serious Case Review recommendation. Members were asked to review this updating and</p>		

