

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
THURSDAY 1 SEPTEMBER 2016 – 2 PM – 5 PM
SHAY STADIUM, HALIFAX**

2015/2016 Meeting Attendance

Member	Agency	2.4.15	4.6.15	6.8.15	1.10.15	3.12.15	3.3.16	5.5.16	7.7.16	1.9.16	3.11.16
Iain Baines	Adults H&SC	D	A	Y	N	Y	A	Y	A	Y	
Jo Sewell	CAFCASS	D	D	Y	D	A	Y	Y	A	A	
Penny Woodhead	Calderdale CCG	Y	Y	A	D	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Howard Browes	Calderdale College	Y	N	A	A	Y	A	Y	Y	A	
Raj Unsworth	Calderdale Govs Assoc.	-	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	A	Y	
Pamela Ohadike	CHFT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Robin Tuddenham	Comms & Service Support	Y	D	Y	A	A	Y	D	A	N	
Julia Caldwell	CSCB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	
Richard Burrows	CSCB Independent Chair	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Julie Jenkins	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	
Stuart Smith	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	D	-	A	A	A	A	
Ian Hughes	Democratic & Partnerships	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	-	-	-	-
Julia Kirkbright	Democratic & Partnerships	-	-	-	-	A	Y	Y	Y	N	
Janette Pearce	Housing	N	Y	D	N	N	Y	A	Y	A	
Shaheen Khawaja	LAY Member	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	
Jo Taylor	LAY Member	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	A	A	A	
Councillor Megan Swift	Lead Member (Participant observer)	Y	A	N	Y	A	Y	N	N	A	
Maggie Smallridge	National Probation Service	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	D	Y	Y	
Gill Poyser Young	NHS Commissioners	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	

Chris Stoddart	NHS England	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	D	Y	Y	
Vicky Thersby	NHS Trust	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	
Lesley Bowyer	Primary Heads	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	A	Y	
Laura Newcombe	Primary Heads	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	D	Y	D	
Nick Hawley	Probation CRC	A	Y	A	D	Y	A	D	D	Y	
Ben Leaman	Public Health	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Laura Knights	Safeguarding & QA Service	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	
Andrew Fisher	Secondary Heads	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	
Tim Breedon	SWYPFT	Y	D	A	Y	Y	A	N	D	Y	
Jayne Leech	Voluntary Sector	Y	Y	D	D	Y	A	Y	Y	A	
Martyn Greenwood	West Yorkshire Fire	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	y	N	
Dickie Whitehead	West Yorkshire Police	A	N	A	Y	A	D	Y	D	Y	
Angela Everson	Women's Centre	Y	Y	Y	D	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	
Jeff Rafter	YOT/Early Intervention	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	

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

In Attendance for Item 4.7 – Safeguarding Week - Allison Waddell – CSCB Learning & Improvement Officer

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person	Complete/Progress
1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence	Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted.		
Declarations of Interest	There were no declarations of interest.		
2 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (7 July 2016)	Page 3 <u>Appropriate LA representation</u> RB has had discussions and JJ explained the reasons for non attendance (Conference that all Senior managers attended). RB has		

<p>received assurances that this shouldn't happen again.</p> <p>RB understood that SS had explored lead member attendance with the lead member.</p> <p>Page 5 All actions complete.</p> <p>Page 6 <u>Action Log</u> LGS explained how the Updated Actions Column will work and how members will be sent an email reminder 2 week's before CSCB meetings to provide an update on actions.</p> <p><u>Challenge Logs</u> LGS explained how she is starting to compile a Challenge Log for each Sub-group for JC. Jacquie Hellowell already produces a Challenge Log for the Performance Management Sub-group.</p> <p>It was suggested to put Challenges in red on the CSCB minutes and this was agreed.</p> <p>Action – LGS to put Challenges in red</p> <p>Page 7 RB hasn't yet managed to check out regarding Public Health's involvement in discussions.</p> <p>Page 15 <u>Child Friendly Calderdale Cabinet Report</u> Unsure if the report went to Cabinet in August 2016 but JJ has received positive feedback from the Corporate Management Team.</p>	<p>LGS</p>	<p>COMPLETE</p>
---	-------------------	------------------------

<p>It was agreed we wouldn't want to lose the focus we have made and would want to run in tandem with the improvements we have made.</p> <p>Action - JJ to feedback CSCB comments to SS</p> <p>Action - LK to update the CSCB at the next meeting</p> <p>Page 16 <u>CSCB Annual Report</u> First 2 actions complete.</p> <p>Page 21 Action complete.</p> <p>Page 24 <u>Budget</u> First action complete.</p> <p>Page 26 <u>Updated Assessment of Neglect Toolkit and Introduction of Thresholds Tool</u> First two actions complete.</p> <p>Page 27 The minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2016 were agreed.</p> <p>CSCB members were reminded that JJ had challenged a child death information request. JJ explained her reasoning around timing and the availability of cause of death information, and was concerned that the sensitivities for staff involved were taken into account. Various discussions had ensued resulting escalation to the chair, who had</p>	<p>JJ</p> <p>LK</p>	
--	-----------------------------------	--

sent	Action – JC/RB to circulate the CAFCASS correspondence to CSCB members	JC/RB	
<p>3.1 Learning from the Annual Report 2015-2016</p>	<p>Two papers received. Members were asked if they had any suggestions on what we do with the learning from the Annual Report. JC has suggested that we focus on the Annual Report at the CSCB Development Day. Other suggested items to for a Development Day include Learning from Section 11 and where we are up to in the Business Plan. There will be a Timeline to assist and the proposal is to have an updated Business Plan signed off for the 1st April 2017.</p> <p>It was felt and agreed that there was good logic to JC's suggestion. PW suggested that all Sub-group members (as this had worked well previously) are invited to the CSCB Development Day. PW's challenged if it was doable to achieve everything we want to achieve on the Development Day. It was agreed that the Business Group look at the agenda for the Development Day.</p> <p>RB is having dialogue with JC and working on pulling out detail, e.g. do we need all Sub-groups and the direction of travel for the Early Help & Prevention Sub-group, re the strategic messages and learning from the report.</p> <p>It was agreed to hold the Development Day in December 2016.</p> <p>RB confirmed in response to a question that the Annual Report will formally be sent to the Police & Crime Commissioner, Elected Members (Councillors) and the Chief Executive. LGS confirmed that Probation (Probation and CRC) CSCB meeting attendance has been separated in the Annual Report.</p>	<p>Business Group</p>	

	RB confirmed that there is a short window for accuracy comments.		
<p>3.2 Private Fostering</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JJ. There were a number of points raised; RB wondered why as a Board we had not been able to follow through on an action highlighted in the report? It was felt this would need to be clarified by JC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was noted that the report showed how the LA was benchmarking against minimum national standards and there had been developments against some of these. - Concerns were expressed re the challenges of raising awareness and the difficulty in knowing what the real level of need/demand is. JJ felt there was always a concern of underreporting, but that it was also important that the LA was measured against its response to reported cases. It was agreed that is about getting the message across and for the partnership to support this. It was pointed out that nobody has done any benchmarking and there is no evidence to say that Calderdale is under reporting and this needs to be acknowledged. - PW suggested that we should have assurance that this is addressed (evidence based) in Multi-agency and Single-agency training. It was felt that this is addressed in Section 11. - JJ advised members that visits to timescales have been checked and they have happened. This will be in future reports. PW asked about the learning and said is there something to do in our preventative work? - JJ gave examples of how private fostering can be really positive and it is not always negative. - Other members gave examples and RB suggested that we could consider a more positive approach to promotion and awareness raising. JJ said it is also about being alert to arrangements. - JR asked about timescales (challenge) and JJ agreed that 		

	<p>timescales could be added. This would enable the Board to better assess LA performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RB suggested after board discussion that making information available in different forms and languages should be achieved within 3 months (subject to JC agreeing). - PW doesn't want to be critical of the Board and to be clear we are supporting the recommendation in the report. - All agreed there was a need to make information available to people in different forms, in order to better evidence our commitment to diversity and equality. <p>It was agreed that we will act quickly to promote Private Fostering. It was agreed on the basis of the report and scrutiny to keep the report as annual.</p> <p>It was agreed that it is a positive that we are maintaining a consistent focus on private fostering.</p> <p>GPY confirmed that there is definite progress in Private Fostering.</p>		
<p>4.1 Partner notification of organisational review or inspection – impending or received</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by PW. Members were asked to flag up if their service had an inspection and if there was any learning. It was felt important that members were comfortable sharing in this way.</p> <p>Members comments: <u>LB – Primary Heads</u> A good idea but not all schools sign up to Calderdale Primary Heads forum so there may be communication issues. It was felt that the practicable way forward is that the Board should look to the LA as well as education board members to implement alerts and sharing of outcomes when these had relevance to safeguarding and joint working arrangements.</p>		

	<p><u>BL – Public Health</u> A good idea but not always Calderdale specific. It was noted that this was sometimes an issue for some inspections and partners, so there may be additional requirements to share Calderdale specific information, (this had been a recent challenge raised at a board meeting).</p> <p><u>NH – Probation CRC</u> West Yorkshire specific not Calderdale specific.</p> <p><u>DW – West Yorkshire Police</u> Need to know where to strike the balance and bar and sometimes it is about getting your own house in order. RB felt this was an important point and that there was a distinction between “we are expecting/have been notified of an inspection” and “this is the outcome”. RB felt that partners could be expected to exercise discretion and judgment in respect of the latter on the basis of the partnership and transparency.</p> <p>It was agreed that it is about what you share and how you share it.</p> <p>The Board agreed to the proposal subject to receiving further guidance that would reflect the points raised.</p>		
<p>4.2 Partner Impact Statements</p>	<p><u>RB explained that this item would incorporate some of the points raised above, but it was also an opportunity for partners to share significant issues/proposals/events that may impact on their capacity to contribute to joint working (whether positive or if they represented some level of risk).</u></p> <p><u>TB – SWYPFT</u> Had a CQC inspection and have a public version of what doing next. Positive comments in the report, re safeguarding.</p> <p><u>AE – Women’s Centre</u> There is an ongoing DV homicide and there will be some initial feedback given to the DA Strategic Board.</p>		

<p>4.3 Reporting and Acting on Child Abuse and Neglect: Consultation</p>	<p>RB asked members to ensure that this consultation was considered within all partner's organisations. The CSCB are submitting their own response and will circulate to members for comments. RB felt that this was a well thought through consultation and noted that it reflected important whole system considerations.</p> <p>JJ is having a more formal consultation with Social Workers as some of the proposals have direct implications for their role and accountabilities and BJ has gathered some initial views. JJ shared some of her staff's views which included:</p> <p>They think it may lead to more unnecessary referrals and that this would impact on the need to spend more of their time filtering these. Most professionals have control over registration, but the current government proposal is to make social work as a profession directly accountable to the Dept for Education. Many felt that the proposals were an unhelpful diversion and did not take into account the progress they and partners had made. There was a feeling that the result may be that professionals will be looking over their shoulder and that this could negatively impact on recruitment and retention.</p> <p>JJ felt that this should be challenged by the CSCB and RB said we will certainly take into account the Social Workers perspective.</p> <p>It was agreed that members should consider their own response and share their thoughts to inform the Board response The deadline is 14 September 2016 for thoughts from Board members</p> <p>Action – RB to send the draft response to CSCB members</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>RB</p>	
<p>4.4 Care Quality Commission (CQC) Document: 'Not Seen, Not Heard'</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by GPY. GPY outlined that this report collected the learning from a number of CQC inspections and presented some challenges for health services and professionals.</p> <p>IB agreed this provided some challenges and there was a need to better</p>		

	<p>understand some of the implications as well as the wording used.</p> <p>PW suggested that it would be useful to pull this into the Development Day. From the CCG perspective as they were still waiting for the CQC report, their view was to wait for this before formulating a local response.</p> <p>RB noted that this is the first time the partnership and the “system” has had this kind of overview and it potentially adds to the picture we gain from Ofsted inspections. RB felt that this kind of feedback has an important role in informing our view and the form our assurance takes. It was also noted that there was learning around the need to make sure the vulnerable young people access the correct services as well as how medical professionals listen to and understand children.</p> <p>Action – Report and learning to be subject to further consideration through the CCG and the boards arrangements with a view to identifying key themes for partners and board objectives. This is to be incorporated into the development day revision of business plan.</p>		
<p>4.5 Jay (Goddard) Enquiry & Historical Abuse</p>	<p>Two papers received and presented by GPY, one paper related to learning from a high profile national case and offered evidence of the local response, whilst identifying potential further learning for partners. The other provided an update on the national enquiry into child abuse. Members were asked if they had any additional comments and there were none.</p> <p>There has been no direct impact on Calderdale at present as a result of the national enquiry.</p> <p>It was agreed that CSCB members would continue to be briefed on any issues.</p> <p>CHFT are going to share learning with SWYPFT re learning from national case. GPY confirmed that there is a Chaperoning Procedure in place and that any learning can be shared. Practitioners need to be</p>	<p>GPY</p>	

	<p>supported and encouraged to challenge, it was noted this was reflected in the learning from the CSCB annual report i.e. that we needed to consider whether there are things we can do to increase the confidence of practitioners to challenge and raise concerns with each other and with the system/process. It was agreed that this should be developed. RB thanked GPY for the briefings.</p>		
<p>4.6 Child Sexual Assault Assessment Service (CSAAS)/ Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC)</p>	<p>Presented by CS, as NHSE are the commissioners of this regional service. CS understood SWYPFT are to continue to supply a complete service but TB stated that he was not sure that this was the case. CS understood that there is a meeting on 8 September 2016 to clarify present and future arrangements and there is also a meeting today to see if improved pathways are to continue.</p> <p>Action – CS to check regarding SWYPFT involvement</p> <p>Discussion followed, which sought to clarify the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important service for children where sexual abuse is suspected and a medical is needed – because the level of incidents is difficult to predict and can be small numbers, and medicals are needed at any time, there are challenges in resourcing this service in terms of cost and availability of expertise. There is also a need to minimise distress to children and avoid the need for them to have to travel considerable distances. - Previous arrangements have been subject to appraisal with a view to re-commissioning through NHSE on a Yorkshire and Humber footprint. This has not been an altogether smooth process and has resulted in the need for some interim arrangements. Within West Yorkshire and given the wide range of stakeholders and interested parties the Police and Crime Commissioner has worked with LSCB Chairs and partners to look for a local solution. Parallel discussions are taking place in 	<p>CS</p>	

	<p>other parts of the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was clear from the discussion that there was not a shared understanding of either the present arrangements or the current negotiations and it was felt that this was unsatisfactory. It was also noted that there were concerns that those partners tasked with operational delivery of the child protection process were not fully aware. - There was also discussion regarding the role of local commissioners such as Public Health. <p>The following was therefore agreed;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CS to establish and share current position with CSCB and partners. 2. CSCB to clarify present arrangements for medicals to ensure operational arrangements is understood. 3. CCG and Public Health to liaise with NHSE and PCC to ensure joined up approach to consideration of future options and arrangements. 4. CSCB to be advised and informed of the above. 5. It was also noted that PMQA arrangements may need to consider whether this is an activity that is monitored. JC 	<p>CS</p> <p>JC/PW/BL</p> <p>PW/BL</p> <p>JC</p>	
<p>4.7 Safeguarding Week</p>	<p>Allison Waddell was welcomed to the meeting. Safeguarding Week Brochures were available for members at the meeting. All planning as far as possible has been completed. Just need to fine tune the launch. There are some minor mistakes in the Brochure (due to it being printed in time) but the website will be updated.</p> <p>AW is happy with the events and CSCB members were asked to signpost to events.</p> <p>Action – CSCB members to encourage attendance at the</p>	<p>ALL</p>	

	<p>Appraisal and the key outcomes</p> <p>RB and PW explained the process of the Appraisal and the role of the Independent Chair. PW suggested that in future we might want to step it up a bit in terms of transparency. RU asked about having an independent person involved in the Appraisal process and she shared the Appraisal process in a School context. AE confirmed that she would like to be involved in a future Appraisal for the CSCB Independent Chair.</p> <p>It was agreed to speak to SS and the Chief Executive about the future format/approach for the CSCB Independent Chair Appraisal.</p> <p>RB thanked members for their continued support and assured them that he would continue to be responsive to feedback and challenge.</p>	<p>PW/JC</p>	
<p>4.10 LSCBs Protecting Children with Disabilities</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by RB. RB explained that a recent publication had raised the question of where we were with regard to this “vulnerable group” as a partnership. In keeping with current discussions and developments post Peer Challenge it was also felt that this might be an opportunity to develop new ways of scoping and considering certain issues in terms of assurance and the need to consider any additional steps/actions.</p> <p>Members agreed that they supported this approach. AE suggested that there should be “real people” for the Task & Finish Group.</p> <p>It was agreed to get the right level of representation at the Task & Finish Group. PW questioned if we had the capacity to do this.</p> <p><i>Further discussion took place including the following member challenges and points</i></p> <p><i><u>JR – Youth Offending Team</u></i></p> <p><i>We should be mindful of where we are drawing the lines (what’s in and</i></p>		

	<p>what's out). Terms of reference needed to be as clear as possible <u>IB - Adults H&SC</u> There is a sequence issue for him as it highlighted the cross over between adult and children's service <u>BL – Public Health</u> Felt this could represent additional work because it's not on the Business Plan and it's about prioritisation.</p> <p>Action - Board confirmed continued development of new ways of scoping and assessing issues and it was agreed that RB/PW/JC to have more thought about the Task & Finish Group approach, noting the comments made by members to bring forward revised proposal so as to ensure that the potential issues around this vulnerable group were not lost sight of on the basis of the need to refine Board process.</p>	RB/PW	
4.11 Updates from Sub-groups/Business Group	<p>RB noted that there were no formal reports, but that this was an opportunity for members and or chairs of sub groups to raise or highlight any issues either in relation to circulated minutes or for general interest. There was nothing to report.</p>		
4.12 Serious Case Review (SCR) Update	<p>Paper received and presented by GPY. GPY outlined present position in relation to reviews and developments. Members noted and endorsed the report.</p>		
4.13 Budget	<p>Paper received. BL felt that this paper gave him no indication of future spend and could have added value if presented differently. BL offered to sit down with JC to make the budget paper add more value.</p> <p>Action – BL to liaise with JC about assisting her with the Budget Paper</p>	BL	

	<p>It was agreed to continue to develop and present a Budget Paper to the CSCB as members wanted to monitor budget and risk. In response to the specific points raised in the report the following was agreed:</p> <p>It was agreed that members try and provide free or part cost venues for meetings/training.</p> <p>Action – JC to clarify what meeting rooms are required (size)</p> <p>Action – PO to look at the Learning & Development Centre at the hospital for rooms</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>JC</p> <p>PO</p>	
5.1 Minutes from other Partnerships/Boards and Sub-group Reports/Minutes	<p>Minutes received: Extra-ordinary CSCB – 29 July 2016 Business Group – 27 July 2016 Performance Management – 2 August 2016 Learning & Improvement – 9 August 2016 Communication & Engagement – 14 July 2016 Early Help & Prevention – 18 July 2016 Proactive & Responsive – 21 July 2016 Multi-agency Audit Group – 16 August 2016</p>		
5.2 Children at Risk of Radicalisation	<p>Link received.</p>		
5.3 Assessment of Neglect Toolkit	<p>Link received.</p>		
5.4 Consultation on the Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategy	<p>Paper received. This is going to the DA Strategic Board on Tuesday 6 September 2016, Members asked to note and comment as appropriate</p>		
6	<p><u>Youth Offending Team</u></p>		

<p>Any Other Business</p>	<p>JR informed members of the NICE website.</p> <p><u>West Yorkshire Police</u> DW explained that he had spoken with RB and that he was looking to improve his chain of command and areas of responsibility and has recently appointed Superintendent Vince Firth, who is joining from Bradford where he has considerable experience of providing lead for safeguarding and working with Boards. He will therefore represent DW on the Board (DCI Ed Chesters will continue to be the CSCB deputy).</p> <p>RB thanked DW not only for his continued commitment to and prioritisation of safeguarding and the board, but also for negotiating this change. RB felt that this was within the constitution and reflected the need to ensure that the board benefited from members who had authority and time to be a part of what was an active and robust partnership.</p> <p>RB noted that there was a clear understanding that when such arrangements were negotiated that the senior officer would ensure that he/she was briefed and briefing his attendee, and that there was also a clear line of communication with the chair. So he would expect to see DW at some meetings and events where this was appropriate. DW agreed this was appropriate.</p>		
<p>7 Rolling Reports/Future Agenda Items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent Reviewing Officer and Child Protection Chair Annual Report • Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) Proposal for possible changes to current structure • Children Looked After : Learning from PMQA • CQC Report : High level messages and responses from the separate health organisations including SWYPFT, CHFT, CCG, Locala, YAS and 111 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments around the mental and emotional health of Children & Young People from the Transformation Plan 		
8 Deferred Items for November 2016 Meeting	LADO Annual Report		
9 Date and Time of Next Meeting	Thursday 3 November 2016 2 pm – 5 pm Shay Stadium, Halifax		