

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD  
THURSDAY 2 MARCH 2017  
2 PM – 5 PM  
THE SHAY STADIUM, HALIFAX**

**2016/2017 Meeting Attendance**

Member	Agency	3.3.16	5.5.16	7.7.16	1.9.16	3.11.16	19.1.17	2.3.17	4.5.17	13.7.17	7.9.17	2.11.17
Iain Baines	Adults H&SC	A	Y	A	Y	A	A	Y				
Jo Sewell	CAFCASS	Y	Y	A	A	Y	D	A				
Penny Woodhead	Calderdale CCG	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D				
Paul Hutchison	Calderdale College	A	Y	Y	A	D	A	Y				
Raj Unsworth	Calderdale Govs Assoc.	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-	-
Pamela Ohadike	CHFT	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y				
Robin Tuddenham	Comms & Service Support	Y	D	A	N	Y	A	A				
Julia Caldwell	CSCB	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y				
Richard Burrows	CSCB Independent Chair	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Julie Jenkins	CYPS	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Stuart Smith	CYPS	A	A	A	A	Y	A	Y				
Julia Kirkbright	Democratic & Partnerships	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	D				
Janette Pearce	Housing	Y	A	Y	A	D	Y	D				
Shaheen Khawaja	LAY Member	A	Y	A	Y	Y	A	A				
Jo Taylor	LAY Member	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A				
Councillor Megan Swift	Lead Member (Participant observer)	Y	N	N	A	N	Y	Y				
Maggie Smallridge	National Probation Service	Y	D	Y	Y	Y	D	D				
Gill Poyser Young	NHS Commissioners	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	D				

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

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

**In Attendance for Apologies:**

Luke Turnbull (representing Penny Woodhead)  
 Ed Chesters (representing Vince Firth)  
 Sarah Booth (representing Gill Poyser Young)  
 Ruth Miller (representing Julia Kirkbright)  
 Lesley Bowyer (representing Primary Heads)  
 Glenn Plews (representing Janette Pearce)  
 Simone Burden (representing Maggie Smallridge/Nick Hawley)

**Observer:**

Julie Hartley – CSCB Business Support Co-ordinator

**In Attendance for Item 3.2:**

Jacque Hellowell – PMQA Officer

**In Attendance for Item 3.3:**

Gaynor Scholefield – Deputy Head of Health Improvement

**In Attendance for Item 4.4:**

Jo Richmond – Neighbourhoods and Cohesion Manager

**In Attendance for Item 4.5:**

Rachel Pickering – Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Project Manager

**In Attendance for Item 4.6:**

Sadia Hussain – Prevent Co-ordinator

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person	Complete/Progress
<p><b>1</b> <b>Welcome, Introductions, Apologies and Declarations of Interest</b></p>	<p>Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted.</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p> <p>It was noted that it is EC's last CSCB meeting as he is moving to Firearms Command from Monday. Thanks were given to him for his contribution to the CSCB and Sub-groups.</p> <p>It was also noted that John Eccleston will be attending future CSCB meetings to represent Calderdale Governors Association in place of RU. Formal thanks to RU will be shared.</p>		

**2  
Minutes of the Last Meeting  
and Matters Arising  
(19 January 2017)**

**Minutes**

It was pointed out that the Complete/Progress Column on the minutes is useful.

**Page 4**

Children with Disabilities Action Plan

Action complete.

**Page 5**

Letter to Sports Clubs

Action complete. Copy of the letter in Correspondence Sent item (2.1a).

**Page 6**

Training Video's

Action complete.

**Page 7**

Future Reports to include GP's instead of CCG Staff

Action complete.

**Page 8**

The Affects of Mental Health Training

Action complete.

Prevent Training

Prevent on today's agenda (Item 4.6)

**Page 9**

Underweight, Overweight and Obesity in Children & Young People :  
Safeguarding Pathway

Underweight, Overweight and Obesity : Safeguarding Pathway on today's agenda (Item 3.3).

**Page 11**

Business Plan

Action complete. 5.17a to be included in revised Business Plan.

**Page 12**

Budget

Action complete. Budget on today's agenda (Item 3.1).

PMQA Role

Action complete.

**Page 13**

Safeguarding Week

It has been agreed that the communications element only of Safeguarding Week will be co-ordinated on a West Yorkshire basis.

Other than the communications element, Calderdale will co-ordinate their own.

**Page 15**

CQC Inspection on Safeguarding and Children Looked After

Action complete.

**Page 17**

Performance Management Reports

RB has spoken to BL regarding the purpose of bringing these to the CSCB.

**Page 18**

Review of Early Intervention

Action complete. This is complete and the recommendations included:

Merge 4 Panels to 2 Panels.

Less of the reviewing at the Panels

There were recommendations around commissioning and ownership of the

	<p>Panels to stay with the Council.</p> <p><b>Action - JJ to circulate the report when it has been to CYPPE</b></p> <p><b>The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017 were agreed.</b></p> <p><b>Challenge Log</b> Members were asked to note the Challenge Log. The Challenge Log is being worked around the Business Plan (the impact of challenge).</p>	<b>JJ</b>	
<b>2.1 Correspondence Received and sent</b>	<p>4 papers received: Sports Training Letter. CAFCASS x 2 – this fits in with the ongoing work around children. PMQA Role. To note: Safeguarding Weeks recent correspondence. Members were reminded to please nominate someone for Safeguarding Week.</p> <p><b>Action – Members to please send Safeguarding Week nominations to Allison Waddell</b></p>	<b>ALL</b>	
<b>3.1 Budget</b>	<p>Two Papers received and presented by JC: Current Position (2016-17) and proposed 2017-18 Budget</p> <p>The carry forward figure was queried. JC projects £20,000 which will contribute to funding the PMQA post. Left with just under £10,000 contingency if there is a serious case review. Members raised a query as to the cost of a serious case review varies and JC gave examples of how much previous serious case reviews have cost. RB formally thanked the funding partners for confirming their financial contributions and all other partners for their time.</p> <p><b>The budget was agreed subject to final year end outturn figure.</b></p>		
<b>3.2</b>	Jacquie Hellowell – PMQA Officer was welcomed to the meeting.		



**Section 11**

Two Papers received providing feedback/analysis from Challenge Event and an overall summary of progress/next steps:

Jacque Hellowell highlighted key points from the Section 11 Challenge Event Report. Positive feedback was received about the Challenge Events (more than the last event) and she can put the Evaluations on the Extranet (Share Point). The CSCB were asked to support the recommendations and RB asked members for their comments.

JJ confirmed that she wants to support what Jacque has said and she feels the Challenge Events made her more aware and she felt she learnt a lot about other partners, e.g. CHFT.

JC thought the Challenge Event she attended was a great event and gave an example of how agencies scrutinised each other.

JH attended a spring School Safeguarding Networking meeting and trying to pull an event together for schools to challenge which Primary and Secondary Heads could facilitate. LB/AT confirmed they would support this.

The Young Advisors really enjoyed the opportunity to attend the Challenge Events and they felt they got the same out of it as the attendees (Young Advisors report on page 10).

**Luke Turnbull on behalf of the CCG asked about actions from partners and how will these be followed up? JH confirmed that ongoing analysis would result in key issues being followed up in the next round. RB noted that partners were able to track and assess own progress.**

Recommendations & Proposals for Year 4

The Board endorsed the proposals on the basis that take up remained strong, there was evidence of continued progress in respect of the voluntary sector, there would be continuing dialogue with commissioners and other partners with a large footprint, in order to try and ensure a local focus and impact.

The plan for year 4 is very similar to year 3 and this was felt to be in keeping with the long term approach the board has adopted.

IB asked how it would be known if the recommendations had been carried out and Jacquie Hellowell confirmed that it would be evident when the results are analysed. To some extent the audit relies on self assessment within partners own QA and governance arrangements. Analysis charts progress year on year, issues flagged by respondents and those identified previously. Significant variation and or gaps trigger a dialogue between Jacquie and the relevant board member.

RB reminded members that the Section 11 process is “strategic” and intends to highlight themes to inform the Boards “line of sight”. It is not a test. The analysis, Challenge Events and Board guidance as to next steps relied on and were intended to support increased local accountability and responsibility for partners using Section 11.

Jacquie Hellowell explained that to date there is no Action Plan but she will monitor through PMQA information and the planning/development process.

VT confirmed that evidence is asked for. RB felt that this was a looser, not a tighter approach in terms of the things the board requires from partners, but alongside the other forms of scrutiny, the board could if it wished change the emphasis it places on learning from Section 11. RB felt that if colleagues can talk about things then there is a value and impact in this.

Another date is being set for the 5 partners who could not attend the last Challenge Event. (It was noted that some of those who were not able to attend were statutory partners). Members were urged to respond to Jacquie Hellowell.

**Action – Members who have not responded to the Challenge Event request, please respond to Jacquie Hellowell**

RB summarised Section 11 remains a major commitment for the CSCB and there has been incredible commitment from the partners. Section 11 is now an integral part of our PMQA arrangements providing and adding to how we understand each other and informing our scrutiny, assurance and challenge.

ALL



	<p>This success brings its own challenge, and he asked members to support the approach adopted and noted the significant learning from and support for challenge events.</p> <p><b>The CSCB agreed the direction of travel for Section 11.</b></p> <p>Thanks were given to Jacquie Hellowell.</p>		
<p><b>3.3 Underweight, Overweight and Obesity : Safeguarding Pathway</b></p>	<p>Gaynor Scholefield – Deputy Head of Health Improvement was welcomed to the meeting. RB reminded members that as a result of challenges raised when this was last presented, a number of partners had agreed to go away and look at the points raised. Paper received.</p> <p>Gaynor Scholefield highlighted the changes to Pathway and is today seeking approval so the Pathway can be included in the joint working procedures. (It was confirmed that the process was clarified with GP’s for overweight and underweight and also asked for clarification from CAMHS. JC confirmed that significant concerns should be referred to MAST and maybe an additional arrow could be added going both ways. Gaynor Scholefield is sharing this wider with the Regional Obesity Group, as it was felt it might have a wider application.</p> <p>The further points were noted and it was agreed changes would be incorporated. The Board therefore agreed that the Pathway should formally be included in the Joint Working Procedures and that all partners and practitioners would be made aware of this.</p> <p><b>Sign off will be via the Board Chair and Business Group</b> Thanks were given to Gaynor Scholefield.</p>		
<p><b>3.4 Annual Report for 2016/17</b></p>	<p>Presented by RB. RB reminded members that Safeguarding Children Boards are required to produce an Annual Report and that as in previous years the Board needed to</p>		

	<p>formally commission the report. RB summarised progress year on year, and that the last Annual Report was included in a national analysis and was felt to be a positive example. However he asked members for any views or suggestions as to what could be changed/ improved. RB asked members for any comments and none were received. It was proposed that a final working draft of the Annual Report will be completed prior to July 2017 which is best practice standards. Aiming for the final Annual Report to go to the July 2017 CSCB. SS noted the need for the Annual Report to go to the Council's Scrutiny Committee at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>The CSCB agreed to commission the Annual Report.</b></p> <p><b>Action - Members to share any thoughts or suggestions for approach and content</b></p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>	
<p><b>3.5 Communication and Engagement Strategy</b></p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JL. JL explained that this has been a difficult process and had taken longer than hoped. RB pointed out that not having a Communication and Engagement Strategy has not prevented the CSCB from communicating and engaging. Luke Turnbull on behalf of the CCG (PW) felt this was more of a Communication Strategy (not Communication and Engagement Strategy) and offered CCG colleagues to assist.</p> <p><b>Action - JL to pick up with Luke Turnbull outside of the meeting regarding the CCG offer of assistance</b></p> <p><b>RB noted that perhaps the board ought to consider whether the linking of the 2 important areas of activity was essential?</b></p> <p>JL pointed out that she had worked with the Council Communication Lead on Section 5 and a lot of time was considered on this.</p>	<p><b>JL/ Luke Turnbull</b></p>	

	<p>It has been time well spent conveying what the CSCB do for young people. The Communication and Engagement Strategy needs to be linked to the PMQA Framework (need to be stronger links with this document).</p> <p>JR asked who owns the Communication and Engagement Strategy, where does it sit and who is going to drive the messages? RB felt that the CSCB owns it and to review on a regular basis.</p> <p>JC referred to Page 5 (Document Distribution Codes) of the Communication and Engagement Strategy. <b>RB asked members if the Communication and Engagement Strategy helps and it was agreed that it does.</b> RB felt that it was helpful and easy to read.</p> <p><b>To consider whether a Communication Strategy or a Communication and Engagement Strategy</b></p> <p><b>Action - RB/JC to follow up in planning for the Board</b></p> <p><b>The CSCB agreed the Communication and Engagement Strategy to support present delivery and development.</b></p> <p>Thanks were given to JL and colleagues involved in producing the Communication and Engagement Strategy. It was felt this would produce some helpful guidance and measures for making our communications more effective.</p>	<p>RB/JC/JL</p> <p>RB/JC</p>	
<p><b>4.1 Learning from Annual Report/Development Day</b></p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JC. RB asked members for comments and observations, noting that the current Business Plan ran until 2018 and that our approach to development was incremental and lead by the learning from and through the Annual Report/Development Day, other wider learning/response to the changing environment and pressures on partners.</p>		

	<p>BJ asked about Children In Need and wondered how we would develop and what we are trying to measure.          JC responded by saying there is a bit of a gap on the dataset for Children in Need as it is not currently collected in the Dataset, so this would be considered          Jacquie Hellowell is doing some work on this with Graham Mozley (Performance Officer for CMBC).</p> <p>JC highlighted the key themes and related this to the exercise held on the Development Day. These were intended to guide the direction of activity over and above and informed by the discharge of our statutory responsibilities such as PMQA. We were currently discussing how to ensure a proportionate response to each theme and relating this to discussions around future structures and how the Sub-groups/Business Group worked together. The dataset is being revised at the moment and due to go to the Performance Management Sub-group.          It was noted that under the paragraph Young Carers - Board members are actively involved and committed.</p> <p><b>Summary</b>          RB noted that this report is intended to update members on developments and some of the key issues, choices and risks. The approach was one of continuity and incremental steps designed to maintain our continued trajectory of improvement. There was still a need to ensure that the Board met its commitments in respect of the post DfE intervention environment.</p> <p>It was intended that a more formal proposal will be coming to the May 2017 CSCB and will be trialled with members prior to this.</p>		
<p><b>4.2 Proposed CSCB and SAB Secretariat Merger</b></p>	<p>Paper received and presented by RB. RB outlined that the purpose of the report was to share with members the product of discussions to date, the basis for these and the intention to consult with members across both partnerships.</p>		

Members were asked to comment:

SS

The CSCB have a budget of approximately £200,000 and the SAB has approximately half of that budget and no permanent staff.

SS cited his experience of similar arrangements, and that a result of the recent merger of children's and adults services from the Councils perspective it seemed sensible to explore this option, to put the staff together and make the best of the resources.

IB

Confirmed the Adult contributions/budget and that the SAB was now being driven by its Business Plan. IB felt it was important to recognise the different way the CSCB and SAB are established.

CMS

Confirmed that she doesn't want the CSCB and the SAB Boards to merge and gave her reasons why. RB noted that as he understood the proposals they were not for a merger of the 2 Boards but to locate the business support under one team to service both Boards which would retain their own identity and Chairs.

CCG

The CCG are supportive and wants it recognising that both Boards are not starting from the same place. The CSCB is more established and need to be clear about the functions and the commitments these represent.

JWS agreed with CCG's comment.

RB felt there were some key areas we needed to be clear about in respect of where partner contributions are spent, any risks to current performance of the Board and whether or not identified efficiencies or reliance on IT would be deliverable. He also felt Board members would want to seek assurance on the



	<p>basis of best and worst case scenarios. He felt further consultation is needed particularly with the funding partners. RB has spoken to other Boards who have or who are thinking about this kind of shared approach, so there was practice we could draw on.</p> <p>RB summarised that a more detailed paper outlining proposals and implications identified would be circulated for comment and this would result in a formal proposal in respect of how the Local Authority organised the staff and resources on behalf of both Boards.</p>		
<p><b>4.3 Performance Management Report</b></p>	<p>Five papers received and presented by JJ: Performance Management Sub-group Report Overview Early Help Indicators 1.1 – 1.10 Overview Child Protection Indicators 2.1 – 2.12 Overview Children Looked After and Adoption Indicators 3.1 – 3.8 Overview Leadership and Governance Indicators 4.1 – 4.5</p> <p>JJ briefed new members on the Performance Management Sub-group and advised all members that the Indicator Report is always available as this provides evidence of the wider monitoring and can be helpful for members in understanding their and the Boards role. JJ noted that the current form of reporting was now bedding in and continued to improve as a result of member feedback. JJ confirmed that she is confident with the direction of travel in regard to how the Sub-group and the dataset were developing.</p> <p>JJ noted that the CSCB need to keep a careful eye on attendance at meetings and receiving health information, as there had been changes in some areas of delivery (School Nurses) and this remained an important part of the child's journey.</p> <p>Jacquie Hellowell has set up a Focus/Task and Finish Group that will focus on the information that is missing.</p> <p>IB advised members that there is an A&amp;E Delivery Board and they are keen to deliver more dataset and VT is happy to link in and join a Task &amp; Finish Group.</p>		



	<p><b>Action – IB to share the A&amp;E Delivery Board information with JJ</b></p> <p>RB confirmed that requesting information is the only statutory power of the Board so he would want to be clear as to when there were significant difficulties in the Board being provided with the information it needs to do its job. JJ reassured members that the health issue has been escalated and PW and BL are aware of the situation. The continued support from agencies was noted.</p> <p><u>JWS challenge:</u> <u>Early Help Indicators (1.1 – 1.10)</u> JWS asked about the waiting times and informed members that this data is available and asked where the CSCB have got the information from. She advised that this information should come from a Central Point and JJ confirmed where the information comes from. More information is on page 16 of the full Indicator Report.</p> <p><b>Action – JWS to speak to JJ outside of this meeting regarding the waiting times data in order to ensure supply and application is where it needs to be</b></p> <p><u>Children Looked After and Adoption Indicators (3.1 – 3.8)</u> JWS asked why assessments been out of timescale and a risk was green. JJ explained why it is green and said that maybe this is one to watch. JC confirmed that this is being looked at and may have to be amber or red.</p> <p><b>Action – JJ to discuss assessments been out of timescale with Jacquie Hellowell and noted wider possible learning re application of risk ratings</b></p> <p><u>Child Protection Indicators (2.1 – 2.12)</u> The CSE data was confirmed and JC advised members that the performance</p>	<p><b>IB</b></p> <p><b>JWS/JJ</b></p> <p><b>JJ</b></p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>indicators to be strengthened around CSE as a result of peer challenge learning.</p> <p>It was confirmed that CSCB members have access to the indicator set which shows what is going up and down and why. Variations and developments in this high level information helped identify what the Sub-group looked at in detail, as did members raising questions and other sources of evidence through the PMQA and learning frameworks.</p> <p>RB summarised that the reports had provided Board members with a good range of summarised information that had resulted in a number of questions, challenges and agreements to follow up. He noted that the current arrangement was being reviewed as planned.</p>		
<p><b>4.4 Anti-Trafficking and Modern Day Slavery Duty to Inform – National Referral Mechanism</b></p>	<p>Jo Richmond – Neighbourhoods and Cohesion Manager was welcomed to the meeting.</p> <p>RB explained that this was an opportunity for the Board to hear about strategic developments in order to inform and review any implications for the Board.</p> <p>Three papers received: Modern Day Slavery Update Appendix 1 – NRM Stats 2015 Modern Slavery Draft Strategic Action Plan 2015/2017</p> <p>These reports have previously gone to the Proactive &amp; Responsive Sub-group. The NRM Pilot has come to an end. It has gone back to the old referring process. The Panel is not accepting any more referrals but there are still Panel meetings booked in for a couple of weeks to get rid of the backlog.</p> <p>JR gave an example of the Trafficking figures. There is a Duty to Notify and Jo can provide members with details on Duty to Notify.</p> <p><b>Action – LGS to send the Duty to Notify information out with the minutes</b></p>	<p><b>LGS</b></p>	<p><b>Complete – Duty to Notify information sent with the minutes</b></p>

Training has been delivered and hoping to continue with the training next year. Statistics are on the National Crime Agency Website.

JJ asked about the statistics and whether decisions are taking longer. Jo Richmond feels that yes they are and this will come out as one of the purposes of the Pilot.

JJ also asked if there was a limit on how far the families are moved to (e.g. miles) and Jo confirmed that there is no mileage limit.

It was felt that a briefing would be good for Schools.

VT challenged that because the Calderdale figures are high, do we understand why this is and are we missing something? Jo Richmond felt that there may be under-reporting.

Jo Richmond advised members that there will be awareness raising over the next few months and EC pointed out that a lot of work has been done but there is still work to do. JC confirmed that the CSCB will continue to link in with the training.

**It was agreed that this is an area the CSCB needs to monitor and would look to be provided with information as to children. It was noted that the issue of consent was a difficult one in dealing with this issue, but we should all remember that the position in regard to under 18's was clearer.**

CS agreed that we need to raise awareness around Modern Slavery and pull the strands together. It was suggested that things need to be put on hospital websites.

RB summarised and felt it was a useful update and that the changes in arrangements needed to be communicated clearly, so that all partners were more aware of the issues, what was required from them and how things worked. The ongoing provision of training was felt to be important and he highlighted the possible need for the Board to be clearer about and assured as to how the

	<p>specific needs and risks around children and young people were being addressed and learned from.</p> <p><b>Action – JC to work with relevant partnerships and leads to ensure Board is sighted on and assured as to arrangements and impact</b></p> <p><b>Action – All members to note statutory reporting requirements</b></p> <p>Thanks were given to Jo Richmond.</p>	<p><b>JC</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p>	
<p><b>4.5 Forced Marriage and Honour Based Abuse Easter Campaign</b></p>	<p>Rachel Pickering – Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Project Manager was welcomed to the meeting.</p> <p>RB advised members that as with the previous item it was intended that we could achieve an updated strategic view of this key issue and how it impacts on vulnerable children/young people so as to be assured that joint working arrangements reflect this.</p> <p>Rachel Pickering explained there is a specific Task Group for the Forced Marriage and Honour Based Abuse Easter Campaign. The focus is on preventative work in Schools leading up to Easter and Summer. The Task Group has lots of expertise and offers advice on what the law is and provides help and support.</p> <p>The key issues have been agreed and there is a Free App.</p> <p>The Police have commissioned 4 sessions (including Todmorden and Sowerby Bridge) from the specialists (Karma and Novana).</p> <p>Need to target the higher leave groups who will be leaving School early.</p> <p>The School Safeguarding Advisor is involved and getting the message out</p> <p><b>CSCB Members agreed to support and promote the Forced Marriage and Honour Based Abuse Easter Campaign.</b></p> <p>PH asked Rachel Pickering if Calderdale College are involved and she confirmed that they are not at the moment but looking at involving them in the lead up to Summer.</p>		

	<p><b>Action – Rachel Pickering to email PH after this meeting regarding Calderdale College being involved in the Forced Marriage and Honour Based Abuse Easter Campaign</b></p> <p>JC confirmed that the West Yorkshire Procedures are up-to-date and this has resulted in training in conjunction with Rachel Pickering. Rachel is working closely with the Voice and Influence Team (Fixers) and looking at ways to engage with young people.</p> <p>RB summarised that members would actively support and promote the campaign and that joint working procedures were up to date.</p> <p>Thanks were given to Rachel Pickering.</p>	<p><b>Rachel Pickering</b></p>	
<p><b>4.6 Prevent</b></p>	<p>Sadia Hussain – Prevent Co-ordinator was welcomed to the meeting. Paper received.</p> <p>RB noted previous reports into the Board and welcomed this chance to catch up with progress and learning.</p> <p>Prevent has been a priority area for the CSP for the last 15 months and as a result has become more proactive as opposed to reactive. Work is being carried out through community projects. Local interventions are the most successful projects and doing projects in the Mixenden and Illingworth communities.</p> <p>Sadia confirmed that the Protocol issues have been worked through and a group has been set up for the issue with Home Education (leaving School and turning up at airports). This it is hoped will lead to increased levels of assurance that children and cases are being picked up.</p> <p>In the next financial year going to offer more in-depth WRAP training. Free audit visits have been offered to Schools. 25 Schools have taken up the audits and hoping to offer on an annual basis.</p>		

	<p>The pilot will finish in April 2017 and Sadia is happy to come back to the CSCB and report on the findings.</p> <p>Members were directed to page 6 of the report and what the CSCB were asked to consider.</p> <p><u>Bullet Point 1</u>  <b>CSCB members agreed to being part of the PREVENT Audit once the Schools pilot had been completed or complete the PREVENT Self-Assessment Form which covers the duty of all specified authorities.</b></p> <p><u>Bullet Point 2</u>  <b>Sadia Hussain will make sure the CSCB can access the PREVENT Project List when it is out. CS confirmed that she gets some money for Prevent.</b></p> <p><u>Bullet point 3</u>  <b>CSCB members agreed that PREVENT be part of the Section 11 Audit as it will help measure impact.</b></p> <p>The next update for the West Yorkshire Procedures is May 2017 and will include the PREVENT Pathways.</p> <p>RB summarised noting formal support for specific measures and agreed it would be helpful to look at the wider learning from the proactive and the responsive areas of the initiative. He reminded members of the previous discussions, re primacy of Prevent duty and primacy of full disclosure in regard to Child Protection tension, and hoped that we would return to this.</p> <p>Thanks were given to Sadia Hussain.</p>		
<p><b>4.7 West Yorkshire Thematic Peer Challenge</b></p>	<p>Presentation received and presented by JC.  This presentation set out the rationale, methodology and learning based on external analysis.</p>		



	<p>JJ stated that it is nice to see the tangibles. It was noted that it can be difficult to identify specific impact from dialogue based processes but that the Action Plan and the presentation identified some direct changes locally as a result. Members were encouraged to look at the post review Action Plan. AF felt future events should be called “challenge and support”. Members discussed whether if there were future events we would want to take part.</p> <p><b>It was agreed that further evidence of impact to come back to the CSCB before a decision is made to participate in any future events.</b></p> <p><b>Action - JC to provide CSCB members with the CSE and Missing Action Plans</b></p>	JC	Partly Complete – CSE Action Plan sent with minutes and Missing Action Plan to follow
<p><b>4.8 Independent Inquiry in Child Sexual Abuse</b></p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JJ. RB reminded members that we had taken previous items charting the development of this inquiry and potential implications for the Board. JJ explained that under the new Chair the Inquiry was gathering pace. This has a large research cohort and The Truth Project provides access to and support for victims to come forward. It was confirmed that if members receive disclosures they should act on them and the identified victims should be getting access to services. This is very victim focussed but JJ confirmed that there is a very strong research team and feels Perpetrators will be looked at in the future.</p> <p>RB summarised that as a Board we needed to be aware of and up to date, re the Inquiry and as JJ had highlighted ensure that any local victims are supported.</p>		
<p><b>4.9 Partner Impact Statements</b></p>	<p><u>National Probation Service (SB)</u> MS is moving on from the National Probation Service.</p> <p><b>Action - LGS to get MS’s replacement details off Simon Burden</b></p>	LGS	Complete – LGS has received the replacement

			<b>details</b>
	<p><u>Youth Offending Team (JR)</u> The current Chair of the Youth Justice Board is stepping down and a new Chair has been appointed.</p> <p><b>Action - JR to update CSCB members on the Youth Justice Board and Youth justice developments as they may impact on the protection of vulnerable children and or the role of the Board at a future meeting</b></p>	<b>JR</b>	
<b>4.10 Serious Case Review (SCR) Update</b>	<p>Presented by JC. One case is currently under consideration. More information has been requested from another LA. Also require Toxicology Reports and another hospital is involved. RB noted that this was a complex case to consider, and as a result it was taking longer than hoped, but the further information when received would enable an outcome.</p>		
<b>4.11 CYPPE Feedback</b>	The next meeting is on 12 March 2017.		
<b>5.1 Minutes from other Partnerships/Boards and Sub-group Reports/Minutes</b>	<p>Two papers received: Business Group Minutes – 8 February 2017 Multi-agency Audit Group (MAAG) Minutes – 14 February 2017</p>		
<b>5.2 Performance Management Dataset</b>	<p>Three papers received (Scorecard and Indicators to support Item 4.5): Indicator Report Scorecard Context Report Scorecard Report</p>		
<b>6 Any Other Business</b>	There was no other business.		
<b>7 Rolling Reports/Future Agenda Items</b>	Not discussed.		
<b>8 Deferred Items for May 2017</b>	There were no deferred items for the May 2017 meeting.		



<b>Date and Time of Next Meeting</b>	Thursday 4 May 2017 2 pm – 5 pm Shay Stadium, Halifax		
--------------------------------------	---	--	--