

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
THURSDAY 2 OCTOBER 2014
2 PM – 5 PM
THE CROSSLEY HEATH SCHOOL**

PRESENT:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|---|--|
| Richard Burrows (Chair) | RB | - | CSCB Independent Chair |
| Julia Caldwell | JC | - | CSCB Business & QA Manager |
| Jo Sewell | JS | - | Service Manager - CAF/CASS |
| Chris Jones | CJ | - | Principal – Calderdale College |
| Jeff Rafter | JR | - | Service Manager – Youth Offending Team/Upper Valley Early Intervention |
| Julie Lodge | JL | - | Named Nurse - SWYPFT |
| Gill Poyser Young | GPY | - | Designated Nurse – NHS Commissioners |
| Steve Blackman | SB | - | Safeguarding Lead – North Bank Forum |
| Kevin Ball | KB | - | Head of service (Bradford & Calderdale) – West Yorkshire CRC (Probation) |
| Councillor Colin Raistrick | CR | - | Lead Member – Children & Young People, CMBC |
| Beate Wagner | BW | - | Head of Early Intervention & Safeguarding – CMBC |
| Angela Everson | AE | - | Joint Chief Executive - WomenCentre |
| Laura Knights | LK | - | Service Manager – Safeguarding & Quality Assurance Service |
| Jacquie Hellowell | JH | - | CSCB Lay Member |
| Chief Superintendent | | | |
| Angela Williams | CSAW | - | West Yorkshire Police |
| Maggie Smallridge | MS | - | Head of Service, Bradford & Calderdale – West Yorkshire Probation |
| Stuart Smith | SS | - | Director – Children & Young People’s Services - CMBC |
| Jill Farrington | JF | - | Consultant in Public Health Medicine – CMBC |
| Ian Currell | IC | - | Director of Finance – NHS England |
| Lisa Golding-Smith | LGS | - | CSCB Business Support Co-ordinator (minute taker) |

APOLOGIES:

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---|---|
| Robin Tuddenham | RT | - | Director for Communities and Business Change |
| Tim Breedon | TB | - | Director of Nursing, Clinical Governance & Safety – SWYPFT |
| Bev Maybury | BM | - | Director, Adults Health & Social Care – Well Being and Social Care |
| Penny Woodhead | PW | - | Head of Quality – Calderdale CCG |
| Karen Hemsworth | KH | - | Associate Director/Safeguarding – CHFT (represented by Julie Warburton) |
| Martyn Greenwood | MG | - | West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service |
| Leona Binner | LB | - | Head Teacher – St Augustine’s School (Primary Heads representative) |
| Janette Pearce | JP | - | Head of Pennine Housing/Together Housing Group (represented by Darren Burton) |
| Dr Pamela Ohadike | PO | - | Designated Paediatrician - CHFT |

IN ATTENDANCE:

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------|---|---|
| Darren Burton | DB | - | ASB & Interventions Manager – Pennine Housing (Together Housing Group) (representing Janette Pearce) |
| Julie Warburton | JW | - | Safeguarding Nurse – CHFT (representing Karen Hemsworth) |
| Angela Windle | AWi | - | Case Lead Intervention - DfE |
| Allison Waddell | AW | - | CSCB Learning & Improvement Officer (for Item 3.12) |

| Item No | Subject | Discussion and Agreed | Responsible Person | Timescale |
|---------|---|--|--------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence | Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted. AWi thanked the Board for the opportunity for her to attend and observe. RB confirmed that we are still looking for appropriate meeting rooms to hold CSCB meetings, so offers of and feedback about venues would be welcome. The intention was to identify and settle on a number of suitable venues | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|------------|--|
| | | <p><u>Page 15</u> It was agreed that the minutes had captured the discussion on the Strengthening Families item.</p> <p><u>Page 19</u> Private Fostering arrangements are on the CCG website. It is important that members check out where they are with the dissemination of information re. private fostering. JH confirmed that there is a meeting on 16 October 2014 to progress the Private Fostering campaign.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 7 August 2014 were agreed.</p> | ALL | |
| 3.1 | Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) Annual Report 2013/14 – CP and CLA | <p>Report received and presented by LK. RB thanked LK for the report and on the basis that members had been able to read the report before the meeting suggested that we take questions and comments from members.</p> <p>RB advised members that the IRO service has an important relationship with the CSCB, both in terms of its role, independence and the provision of chairs for Initial and Review Child Protection Conferences. This makes a critical contribution to joint working.</p> <p>It was agreed that this is a very comprehensive report that gave a good overview of what is going on.</p> <p>AE referred to page 5 (The core purpose of the IRO role with regard to children is to ensure that the care plan fully reflects the child’s needs and to ensure that each child’s wishes and feelings are given full and due consideration. The appointment by the Local Authority of an IRO is a legal requirement) and said it should be looked at as the Chair should have a really clear focus of what’s going on.</p> <p>It was noted that there seemed to be strong admin support for the CP</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------|---|-------|--|
| | | <p>improvement. Members did not feel there was a need to bring to the attention of the service any further points than those addressed in the report in respect of CLA.</p> <p>In respect of CP it was felt that further detail and analysis in the future would be helpful. Members did note that this part of the service appeared to be sufficiently resourced and supported.</p> <p>There were some direct points raised about the accuracy of the data used and it was agreed that this would be looked into and clarified where necessary.</p> <p>Action - RB to talk to LK outside this meeting regarding the above and confirm future frequency of reporting which should be an annual report (in time to contribute to the CSCB Annual Report, and further reports in between either as a core element of the PMQA reporting or in response to any issue or area of concern raised either by the service or the Board.</p> <p>(RB suggested that where reports were prepared for or shared with other audiences, this should be made clear and that reports from all members needed to make sure that they addressed the specific remit, function and requirements of the CSCB wherever possible and appropriate).</p> | RB/LK | |
| 3.2 | CLA Report | <p>Report received and presented by LK. RB reminded members that this was the second report for the Board this year and that the intention behind this report was to help the Board focus in on and identify the key areas/measures it could look at to maintain an appropriate level of scrutiny on the joint working arrangements for CLA.</p> <p>LK noted that the report flags up the ethnic minority issue in terms of the profile of the `CLA population and the population profile.</p> <p>It was confirmed that there is a formal complaints procedure and as noted in the IRO report progress is being made in improving the</p> | | |

“Dispute Resolution procedures” (This is where the chair of a meeting is either not satisfied that people have done what they said they would and/or does not feel that the plan is appropriate).

RB asked members if they feel they have a take on what the provision for and trends are for CLA from the 2 reports and from the IRO Annual Report. Members felt they had sufficient information to form views where necessary.

SS provided further context in that numbers of CLA in Calderdale were relatively stable, and that nationally there were some signs that the recent increase in numbers was slowing. He noted that CLA provision accounts for a significant part of the Authorities budget and partnerships were committed both to high quality arrangements and if possible maintaining more children safely in their own families and communities. Any reduction in numbers of CLA would release resources for early intervention and help.

Discussion followed as to how best to prioritise our future focus on CLA, the following was noted;

- Routine consideration of reports from parallel processes such as Corporate Parenting and scrutiny arrangements within the Council.
- CYPPE focus on priorities and wider preventative and health/Education indicators that focus on CLA.
- Reports from the IRO service.
- Making sure that PMQA monitoring and scrutiny reflects key indicators re CLA especially children’s placements and children who go missing.
- It was felt that this was one area in terms of overall trends where is was felt to be helpful to include regional and national comparisons.

| | | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within PMQA the development of an understanding of the relationship between numbers of children subject to CP and EH plans and who become looked after. - A better understanding of the levels of children who are looked after from EMC's. - A clear view of how the LSCB is assured that CLA is protected and their voice is heard. - Section 11 audit provides an opportunity to check out how CLA are protected. <p>It was agreed that the Business Group be asked to address the above points and ensure that all Board arrangements reflect an effective level of scrutiny of the joint working arrangements for CLA.</p> <p>Action - RB to discuss with JC and Business Group any implications for the current and future Business Plans</p> | <p>Business Group</p> <p>RB</p> | |
| 3.3 | Performance Management Update | <p>Paper received and presented by BW.</p> <p>BW outlined progress and confirmed that Quarter 2 figures and analysis will be presented at the next CSCB meeting. BW made an appeal for members to let her know about any other data they collect that fits with the new framework</p> <p>RB confirmed that a further CSCB Development Day is being planned and that this would provide an opportunity for members to further address the implementation of the analysis and scrutiny if performance information.</p> <p>Members noted progress and thanked BW and the Sub-group</p> | ALL | |
| 3.4 | Rotherham Report (Alexis Jay) and implications (Child Sexual Exploitation) | <p>RB advised members that this item was an opportunity in the light of the Rotherham Report to share and take stock of respective partner positions and the joint response as a whole.</p> <p>A number of papers had been circulated.</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------|--|
| | | <p>SS advised the meeting of the Councils' response and confirmed that it is OK for CSCB members to see his Scrutiny Report.</p> <p>Action - To be circulated to all members</p> <p>This report summarises both the historical and present position locally both from a strategic and an operational point of view, it also advises the Council and partners as to areas where further consideration or action may be required.</p> <p>Regionally there is a strategic CSE Safeguarding Group and high level liaison between DCS's, the PCC and LSCB chairs, these were existing arrangements.</p> <p>JC outlined from the paper the current summary of the Boards' position. She confirmed that the Proactive & Responsive Sub-group will be the lead on the Partnership Response and the Action Plan, which are presently being reviewed and updated.</p> <p>GPY confirmed that she will share an Action Plan/response being developed within the Health system.</p> <p>SS said that from the Council's perspective, there are a number of strands of activity.</p> <p>A historical look at arrangements drawing on a study commissioned by and reported to the Board covering 2006 – 2010. This provided the opportunity to look at the detailed responses of partners to children who were felt to be or who were victims of CSE in this period. An initial look at this seemed to present a positive and a proactive approach by partners</p> <p>This may result in the need for some further retrospective analysis, especially as wider developments were highlighting the need for partners to be sure that children who were victims had not been missed or that the scale of the issue had not been responded to proportionally.</p> <p>The Police and Crime Commissioner have already called a meeting</p> | <p>SS</p> | |
|--|--|--|------------------|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------|--|
| | | <p>and there is another meeting scheduled in October.</p> <p>SS felt that this would provide opportunity to strengthen cross boundary work, how to improve awareness raising and to improve how we involved all areas of the community especially in the light of the fact that much of the known CSE involves men from Asian British communities. For a period 2006 – 2010 the CSCB invested in a CSE post and it had clearly made a positive contribution both strategically and operationally. It was felt that we needed to be sure and clear about the period 2010 – 2012 when different arrangements from the current ones were in place.</p> <p>CSAW confirmed that from the Police point of view, that this would be sensible. The present understanding is that partners felt that a different and more integrated approach should be adopted as the development phase led by the CSCB had reached a point whereby there was a good understanding of the problem and operational responses were effective.</p> <p>There was she felt a need to establish a similar level of data based analysis as we have now and had from 2006 – 2010 as well as a better understanding of the narrative and rationale for developments in this period.</p> <p>SS noted that in 2012 the continuing financial commitment of the Council to CSE was allocated to reflect further objectives and developments in keeping with those elsewhere and the learning from local and national reports.</p> <p>CSAW feels that Calderdale are in a reasonable place now. She said that colleagues should look at 2014 cases with 2014 glasses on but apply a clear terms of reference for the review of historical cases and arrangements.</p> <p>RB thanked each for their briefing and suggested that each member would want to consider and be assured that their own organisations were looking at the Rotherham report and identifying any issues or</p> | <p>ALL</p> | |
|--|--|--|-------------------|--|

matters they would wish to share with the CSCB
CSAW briefed members of how many young people are on the CSE matrix and the arrests that have taken place and the number of individuals on bail in reference to Operation Harehill. There are also 6 other investigations ongoing.

The Proactive & Responsive Sub-group have a key role and it was confirmed that there is appropriate representation at this Sub-group. Probation confirmed that they are reviewing there current and past response in the light of their role with convicted offenders. RB thanked members and for the open and transparent debate and contributions.

He felt that there was a difficult balance to be found between focusing on what we are doing now, and how we know this is effective and what we have done in the past. Over the coming weeks he was assured that partners would be working closely to progress this.

In particular he drew members attention to:

- Members to take away and look at the Rotherham Report and reflect this within their own agencies reporting back to the Board.
- Members to provide feedback on the current drafts of the Response and the Action Plan
- Relevant members to ensure that their agencies fully cooperate with and contribute to the review of past arrangements to ensure that victims were identified and responded to
- Members to note current and proposed developments nationally, regionally and locally so as to assure that the Board and its partners are proactive.
- It was agreed to complete the NWG questionnaire.

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Action – Members to send comments to DCI Darren Minton and JC regarding the Calderdale Districts Partnership Response to CSE Document</p> <p>Action – JC to speak to JF, SB and JR outside this meeting, re, data and evidence</p> <p>Action – JC to speak to SS outside this meeting about the external report and GPY’s report</p> <p>Action – JC to send out the Calderdale Districts Partnership Response to CSE Document and Partnership Response electronically.</p> <p>N.B. In September, there was a HMI inspection of YOT and HMIC inspection of the Police and a positive statement received was the work around CSE and how a targeted approach was taken.</p> <p>Action - JR and CSAW to ensure this learning is fed through</p> | <p>ALL</p> <p>JC/JF/SB/JR</p> <p>JC/SS/GPY</p> <p>JC</p> <p>JR/CSAW</p> | |
| 3.5 | Internal Governance | <p>Paper received and presented by RB. RB explained that this was an agreed action in the Business Plan and the Inspection readiness assessment. He apologised for the late circulation of the report. Other Boards have adopted a constitution and there are 3 links on the paper for members to look at. These are a range of approaches and there are others.</p> <p>RB outlined that the process of creating a constitution provided an opportunity to address a range of issues and areas, strengthen the role of members and identity of the Board and set some clear standards and measures for “how we do things” and for evaluating our effectiveness. These would also reflect how others evaluated and</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>measured the LSCB and the contributions members made. RB also noted that the paper contained a report and analysis of the responses from members to the survey and also the last review day, both of which addressed future internal governance arrangements. BW raised that the Business Group have had discussions about how they could make the CSCB meetings run more effectively and RB said that he felt this would helpfully contribute to an approach which looked at the wider implications of governance. GPY agreed that a lot of things that come to CSCB meetings that the Business Group could deal with. RB felt that the development of a constitution could provide an outcome focused way of addressing any differences of opinions there might be</p> <p>Members raised a number of points regarding the current terms of reference and their experience of internal governance in other LSCB's. RB observed that we can become too focussed on process and agreed we needed to reduce any duplication. RB confirmed that by month 8 we should be reviewing the Sub-groups and he has meetings set up with the Sub-group Chairs as part of his preparation for the Minister Letter due to be submitted by the end of October.</p> <p>It was agreed to develop a draft constitution for the CSCB to consider by the next CSCB meeting.</p> <p>Action – Business Group and RB to bring a draft constitution to the CSCB</p> <p>Members agreed that they would need to look at what a constitution looks like from the 3 links provided.</p> | <p>RB</p> <p>Business Group/RB</p> | |
| 3.6 | Rolling Report | Paper received and presented by JC. JC reminded members that the purpose was to map out and schedule in all reports that the Board was required to consider. This would assist those preparing and submitting | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>reports and members in being able to account for this level of scrutiny. BW raised that an earlier version had included some views as to the role Business Group in supporting the Board in this task. JC explained that in light of the chairs recommendation re item he felt the focus of consideration should be about have we got all the areas covered and what thoughts people had re priority. There would also need to be consideration of the routes reports followed and the level of pre Board scrutiny they might require.</p> <p>This paper will be looked at next time along with the constitution. Need to have a clear, forward looking schedule.</p> <p>CR questioned the timescales for the CSE quarterly report. RB confirmed that the CSCB can ask for additional Reports as and when needed.</p> <p>This is work in progress and the Business Group will clarify priority timescales and reduce any duplication.</p> <p>Action – JC to add rationale for each reporting area</p> <p>Action – JC to add the Health Annual Report from GPY and Business Group to note the need from any other formal reports from partners.</p> <p>Action – Members to send comments to JC</p> | <p>JC</p> <p>JC</p> <p>ALL</p> | |
| 3.7 | Board Capacity Paper | <p>Three papers received and presented by JC. JC explained that this item was a follow up and progress report on previous Board meeting discussions and decisions.</p> <p>JC noted and brought members attention to the Risk Assessment on Page 1.</p> <p>There was some indication that the oversight of Policy & Procedures that currently sits with the Learning & Improvement Sub-group may need additional input and this has been escalated to the Business</p> | | |

Group to consider a sub strategy.
 The risk assessment also highlighted other areas where progress may be judged not to be meeting demand and the expected pace, this included the analysis and scrutiny of performance information and quality as measured by case file audits.
 JC recommended that the Board consider a specialist post, should partners be able to identify the additional resources.

It was agreed that it is a good idea to have a 1 year fixed term post which can be reviewed.

It was confirmed that CCG have agreed to give their contribution to the CSCB and can't put any more money in the pot. On a recurrent basis. It was also noted that other partners had made additional contributions in the course of this year, CMBC had identified an additional £15,000, the CCG had provided and resourced external support, WYP had made available additional administration and SWYPFT had provided specialist technical support for the Section 11. In addition many members had prioritised additional attendance at extra meetings and had supported the increased demand as a result of the SCR's being undertaken.

Members agreed with the risks identified, which are very much around process and development, required for the Board to respond to the Directions Notice. It was noted that whilst these were primary risks associated with business process, they should not be seen as concluding that this meant that joint working arrangements were not protecting children, though this was clearly the overarching risk that the Board needed to manage.

JC confirmed that it would be money well spent to focus on the key

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--|-------|--|
| | | <p>points in her view as the Board's Business Manager. RB felt that by some measures we are 9 months into the year and he was not aware that members had directly engaged in the scrutiny of case file audits and identified themes and actions. Though he was aware that considerable work had been undertaken to review past audit activity and current single agency audit activity. JC has arranged meetings to discuss how we further bring together the more effective use of the resources we have to match demand. Some members noted that other Boards have this type of post in place.</p> <p>It was agreed that we need to think about a contingency plan.</p> <p>It was confirmed that it has worked well when we have out-sourced things within partner's resources and specialisms. There was more of a mixed experience in using external specialists and suppliers.</p> <p>Members agreed to JC's proposal but to think how we are going to fund it.</p> <p>Action – RB to have discussions with SS (CMBC) outside of this meeting</p> | RB/SS | |
| 3.8 | Ofsted Readiness | <p>Paper received and presented by JC. JC noted that this was an indicative and subjective snap shot of out current progress based on the available evidence. Members were concerned that it may not be a full and accurate assessment. RB reminded members that this had been flagged as a priority exercise some months ago and that it directly related to members being in a position to "know their board". The Annual Report and other ongoing exercises will continue to inform the assessment</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>It was agreed that all Board members would prioritise readiness preparations.</p> <p>The Business Group will prioritise the development of the self assessment in conjunction with the Business Plan. Progress to be considered at each Board and as when required in between meetings.</p> | <p>ALL</p> <p>Business Group</p> | |
| 3.9 | Annual Report | <p>RB apologised to members that the Annual Report is still in draft form. The reasons for this are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been more difficult that expected to draw out evidence from the past year and measure the impact activity has had. It was clearly a difficult year. • The other demands in terms of CSE and SCR's have impacted on capacity to progress the report. <p>JC and RB are meeting next week so will have a draft Annual Report ready to present. This will be done via email and RB will write to members after the meeting to make a formal request for members to check, endorse and add any further examples of impact. RB also noted that efforts have been made to make the report as accessible as possible and to reflect the ways in which external audiences form their judgements as to the effectiveness of the LSCB. It was also hoped but not at present a priority (for the above reasons) to produce a version that would be more accessible for young people.</p> <p>Members agreed that we need to focus in and move on.</p> <p>Action – To take to tomorrow's Business Group meeting as a priority</p> | <p>JC</p> | |
| 3.10 | Registering of Children's Home | <p>Already discussed in first item.</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|------|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| 3.11 | Improvement Board Preparation | <p>The next Improvement Board meeting is on 4 November 2014 which is exclusively dedicated to the LSCB.</p> <p>RB is taking the Annual Report, update on Business Plan and letter to Minister.</p> <p>RB is sending an email out tomorrow to ask for member's feedback by 13 October 2014. JC will co-ordinate with members their contributions and those members who attend the IB will be asked to present to the IB their perspectives.</p> | <p>RB</p> <p>JC</p> | |
| 3.12 | Multi-agency Training Programme Update | <p>Paper received and presented by AW. RB thanked AW for her report and advised that we would take questions and comments from members on the basis they were familiar with the contents of the report.</p> <p>Cancellation Rates - AW noted that a number of courses/events had been cancelled. Members felt this was of concern and AW highlighted the list of cancellations. Members were concerned to establish the reasons for this, and the report highlighted a number of possible contributory factors.</p> <p>Members considered the potential impact of cancellations on the capacity of partners to fulfil their obligations and targets for example in ensuring that designated safeguarding leads were trained and how this was self assessed through the Section 11. The cancellation of any course had potentially wide knock on effects especially for those who had planned to attend. It was therefore important that course cancellations were kept to a minimum.</p> <p>JC confirmed that the cancellation rate is on the Business Group agenda and that the Learning and Improvement Sub-group are seeking from member's suggestions and explanations.</p> <p>We have an improved database and a letter will be sent about attendance and non attendance. This will start from now. This will improve capacity to respond to and reduce cancellation rates.</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------|--|
| | | <p>Action - Members to ensure that if there are reasons for non-attendance, then to feedback to AW as this will help us understand the reason for the drop in figures</p> <p>The Learning & Improvement Sub-group have asked for “barrier information” but agencies have not supplied this as of yet.</p> <p>RB reminded members of the level of risk we have attached to this key function and therefore encouraged each member to prioritise their response and engagement.</p> <p>Members agreed that the CSCB are managing and understand the risks identified in AW’s report.</p> <p>The meeting turned to the proposal to introduce a charging policy for non-attendance.</p> <p>Having a charging policy is common practice elsewhere. JL and GPY said in their experience charging is good and has worked but the Police have had a different experience for charging internally as it had by one measure reduced the level of training. RB felt that it was a sensible move, but the introduction needed careful consideration and that if other peoples experience was looked at it might be that the proposal as outlined would in its final form have a little more detail and some evidence of how it would be implemented and reviewed. He noted from his own experience that where this was successful attendance levels increased, it helped to rationalise programmes and produced a valuable income stream, as some partners were prepared to pay for when they needed to prioritise operational commitments over commitments to workforce development and were unable to supply a substitute.</p> | <p>ALL</p> | |
|--|--|--|-------------------|--|

| | | | | |
|------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Members agreed to the charging policy subject to the comments and observations made.</p> <p>Action – Members to feedback any comments to AW</p> <p>Action – Business Group to finalise policy and implementation plan for the Chair to sign off</p> | <p>ALL</p> <p>Business Group</p> | |
| 3.13 | Sexually Harmful Behaviour | <p>Three papers received and presented by AW. PW had commented that any guidance/policy should be understandable and owned by all partners, in the light of recent learning from Case Review. RB endorsed this as criteria for member’s consideration of the proposal.</p> <p>RB also asked members if they had had opportunity to scrutinise this in their own organisations and that they were aware of and prepared to address any implications for current priorities and practice. Members indicated that they had and were.</p> <p>Members endorsed this and will commit to take back to their own organisations.</p> <p>Action - JC to ensure that CSCB policies and procedures are updated, that the Board is in a position to review and evaluate impact within current PMQA and business plan arrangements and to schedule review reporting point</p> | <p>ALL</p> <p>JC</p> | |
| 4.1 | Serious Case Review Updates | <p>JC updated members on the current progress re the 3 SCR’s and following the extraordinary Board meetings, members had been formally advised of this and asked for feedback re the process.</p> <p>The Case Review Sub group has met to consider whether a case meets the criteria for a SCR and recommended to the Chair that it does. RB has agreed with this recommendation and has had his</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------|--|
| | | <p>decision peer reviewed. The National Panel are being notified and the Sub Group will meet shortly to commission a SCR Panel, begin to develop terms of reference, methodology and commissioning proposals for RB to agree.</p> <p>RB was aware that this case has a wider context and potential implications and has already had some discussions with a number of partners.</p> <p>Action - JC to keep Board members advised</p> | <p>JC</p> | |
| <p>4.2</p> | <p>Young Advisors</p> | <p>Two papers received. RB thanked AW and reminded members that they had been invited to a meeting with Young Advisors to explore what they felt they could offer.</p> <p>AE felt that other organisations may have something to offer in terms of their experience of working with children and young people, alongside the capacity and systems the LA has in place, and that this might be important given the multi agency context of the Board.</p> <p>It was agreed to collect and reflect what other organisations do for the Storyboard.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the Childs Voice & Influence is a standing item at the Communication & Engagement Sub-group and that this would give further shape and direction.</p> <p>RB felt it was important to be able to listen to what young people had to say, and to be clear as to how we work with them and on what basis. He felt there was a separate issue in terms of whether or not the Board would wish to include young people in its governance arrangements. He was also concerned that any relationship the Board formed with young people was respectful.</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>Action - To continue to explore ways in which young people may wish to help the Board and to develop the suggestions contained in the paper into clear proposals</p> <p>Action - RB to meet with the Young Advisors</p> | <p>AW</p> <p>RB</p> | |
| 4.3 | Single Assessment | <p>Four papers received and presented by BW. RB thanked BW and reminded members that this was an important development and one that we had previously acknowledged we needed to actively review and support.</p> <p>BW confirmed that implementation was still at an early stage so it was not yet fully clear as to how the intended benefits and identified risks were working out, but that the data and analysis of this would be available in more detail shortly.</p> <p>JH recently attended a training course and noted that some people were taking about the old process.</p> <p>BW drew attention to the Assessment Protocol, and in particular the requirements placed on the LA and the LSCB by Working Together 2013. She noted that this was the LA's proposal.</p> <p>It was confirmed that partners have worked with the LA to develop the local protocol. RB felt that it was a clear and a good example of such protocols. He felt that members might want to be sure that they were or would be in a position to be able to evidence that the standards set out were being worked to and how as a Board we would monitor and measure impact.</p> <p>Discussion followed and it was agreed that:</p> <p>The Board endorsed and formally accepted the Assessment Protocol.</p> <p>That this would be the benchmark and measure for all members participation and contribution to single assessment</p> <p>That these standards and requirements were also likely to apply to Early Help assessments.</p> <p>That the Business Group should ensure that effective measures are in</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>place and reported on to the Board That members should be clear as to the intended benefits as well as the risks in the context of improved outcomes for children, young people and their families and that this will require all members to be able to know what these are.</p> <p>It was agreed that members would have a week to check out that their agencies and systems were ready form the above</p> <p>Action – Members to feedback within 1 week and if don’t hear anything, the Single Assessment will be adopted</p> <p>Action - Business Group to take forward formal endorsement and address points raised above</p> <p>Action - To put on the website</p> | <p>ALL</p> <p>Business Group</p> <p>AW</p> | |
| 4.4 | CAFCASS Report | <p>Presentation received and presented by JS. RB thanked JS and reminded members that changes in other parts of the system have a clear link to the parts of the system the Board monitors and scrutinises. Calderdale are meeting targets (24 weeks) which is a good thing for CAFCASS and Social Workers as timely decisions can be made. Members noted that the information was clear and concisely presented and recognised the fit with the earlier report re CLA.</p> | | |
| 4.5 | Budget | <p>Paper received. Looking to be overspent and the LA are putting in an additional £15,000. It was noted that there is still a need to identify a budget reporting format that CSCB members can understand.</p> <p>Action – JC to take to the Business Group</p> | <p>JC</p> | |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|-----|--|
| 4.6 | Partner Impact Statements | <p>JL is leaving SWYPFT in January 2015. JL Chairs the Learning & Improvement Sub-group, so a suitable replacement will have to be found. RB has already spoken to JL's Manager to explore intentions</p> <p>CJ is leaving his post at College at Christmas.</p> <p>Action – RB to arrange feedback from members who are leaving</p> <p>NHS England as they are moving from West Yorkshire to Yorkshire and Humber as a part of a national rationalisation and reorganisation, implications for the LSCB are as yet unclear.</p> | RB | |
| 4.7 | CSCB Storyboard | <p>Paper received to update members on progress and to help brief members.</p> | | |
| 4.8 | Sub-group Minutes | <p>Minutes received from: Case Review (2 September 2014) Multi-agency (19 August 2014) Performance Management (29 July 2014) Learning & Improvement (12 May 2014) Communication & Engagement (14 August 2014) Early Help & Prevention (September 2014) – RB flagged that this is a good report and thanks were given to JR and JP. RB noted that it would be helpful if we agreed some consistency in terms of the desirability of regular headline reports from Sub-groups or whether we rely on the submission of minutes and for members to scrutinise these and raise issues/enquiries. Proactive & Response (28 July 2014)</p> <p>Action: JC to consider reporting issues and include in constitution/internal governance development</p> | JC | |
| 5 | Any Other Business | Action - To add Item Numbers to papers and page numbers | LGS | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------|--|
| 6 | Deferred and Future Items for December 2014 Meeting | No deferred items. | | |
| 7 | Date of Next Meeting | Thursday 4 December 2014 2 pm – 5 pm The Crossley Heath School | | |
| 8 | 2015 Meeting Dates | Paper on proposed dates received. Action – To send out electronic calendar invites | LGS | |