

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
THURSDAY 3 MARCH 2016 – 2 PM – 5 PM
THE 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				
Jo Sewell	CAFCASS	D	D	Y	D	A	Y				
Penny Woodhead	Calderdale CCG	Y	Y	A	D	Y	Y				
Howard Browes	Calderdale College	Y	N	A	A	Y	A				
Raj Unsworth	Calderdale Govs Assoc.	-	Y	A	Y	A	Y				
Pamela Ohadike	CHFT	Y	-	-	-	-	Y				
Robin Tuddenham	Comms & Service Support	Y	D	Y	A	A	Y				
Julia Caldwell	CSCB	D	Y	Y	N	Y	Y				
Richard Burrows	CSCB Independent Chair	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Julie Jenkins	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Stuart Smith	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	D	-	A				
Ian Hughes	Democratic & Partnerships	-	-	-	-	Y	D	-	-	-	-
Julia Kirkbright	Democratic & Partnerships	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y				
Janette Pearce	Housing	N	Y	D	N	N	Y				
Shaheen Khawaja	LAY Member	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	A				
Jo Taylor	LAY Member	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y				
Councillor Megan Swift	Lead Member (Participant observer)	Y	A	N	Y	A	Y				
Maggie Smallridge	National Probation Service	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y				
Gill Poyser Young	NHS Commissioners	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Chris Stoddart	NHS England	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A				
Vicky Thersby	NHS Trust	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y				

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

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

Present for Item 4.3:

Parveen Akhtar (PA) - Early Intervention Service Manager- Lower Valley

Present for Item 5.3:

Jamiila Sims (JS) - Service Manager - Children's Social Care

Present for Items 3.4 and 3.6:

Allison Waddell (AW) – CSCB Learning & Improvement Officer

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person
1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for	Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted. There were no declarations of Interest known in advance. CSCB members were reminded that the Secretariat could facilitate the process if they would like to observe a CP meeting or go to look around A&E for example.	

<p>Absence Declaration of Interests</p>	<p>Members were asked that if they do arrange anything themselves, then to inform the Secretariat so an Evidence Log can be kept.</p> <p>Action – Members to email LGS if anything is arranged</p> <p>Action - LGS to keep an Evidence Log</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>LGS</p>
<p>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (3 December 2015)</p>	<p>Page 3 <u>CDOP</u> The 14/15 CDOP Report is published. Discussions are on hold as a national review is going on.</p> <p>Page 4 <u>Multi-agency Audit Group</u> Viable Pool of Auditors is within LK’s report.</p> <p>Page 5 <u>CSE</u> No resolution as yet.</p> <p>Page 6 <u>Current Obstacles</u> DM has now moved on so couldn’t debrief.</p> <p>Page 12 <u>Performance Management Quality Assurance Post Review</u> On today’s agenda – Item 3.3.</p> <p>Page 15 <u>Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Strategic Response.</u> Conference has been re arranged for Safeguarding week. FGM Task & Finish Group in place to embed strategic response and</p>	

	<p>Maintain pace.</p> <p>Page 18 <u>Children Looked After (CLA) Report</u> Work to embed action areas for LSCB being considered as part of the review of business plan. CMS is the Chair of the Corporate Parenting Group.</p> <p>Action – RB to explore links between CPG and LSCB</p> <p>Page 20 <u>Prevent Co-ordinator Report</u> JC has met with Sadia Hussain and she will bring a report to a future CSCB further detailing links and implications for LSCB. Minimum standard agreed is annual report. Into Board from Community Safety Partnerships SH is rewriting the CSCB webpage.</p> <p>Page 22 <u>Mental Health & Emotional Wellbeing Position Paper</u> The Business Group has reviewed position and will ensure that Board will be updated on developments and notified via rolling report programme. The minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2015 were agreed.</p> <p>RB asked for approval for the following Chairs of CSCB Sub-groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julie Jenkins to be Chair of the Performance Management Sub-group • Ed Chesters to be Chair of the Proactive & Responsive Sub-group • Lisa Handley to be Chair of the Multi-agency Audit Group. <p>There were no objections to the proposed Chairs and the new Chairs were thanked for stepping up.</p>	<p>RB/LK</p>
<p>2.1 Correspondence received and sent</p>	<p>Received. <u>DfE LSCB Review</u></p>	

	<p>Including Terms of Reference <u>NHSE Letter</u> RB noted the welcome maintenance of commitment to the LSCB. <u>DfE Consultation, re Stat Guidance for Schools</u> Outcome by the end of March 2016. Implications will need to be considered <u>DfE/HO Consultation, re CSE Definition</u> The CSCB are collating responses. RB noted that the Board had received a number of representations of concern re changes to the services relating to medicals for children who had been sexually abused. As a result the 5 LSCB's were meeting with the commissioners of the service.</p>	
<p>3.1 CSCB Business Plan 2015-2018</p>	<p>Two papers received. Paper set out a number of elements that were being reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback from Development Day - Feedback from Chairs of Sub-groups - Review and assessment of progress against objectives and RAG assessment. <p>This also includes addressing some issues around how this is managed, and how best to respond to drift or under achievement, It was noted that we will be able to backdate the figures for 2.5. AE stated that she was taken aback at the last Proactive & Responsive Sub-group that 2.5 is not progressing as hoped. The next step is a meeting, which has been arranged between Ed Chesters and Jacquie Hellowell. It was hoped this would result in progress. Discussion followed about some of the wider issues around how best to manage, monitor and review the business plan so as to ensure that things are picked up and the Board is made aware of any such areas.</p> <p>The following was agreed and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the end of Sub-groups and Business Group minutes to add things that need to be alerted to the CSCB. • All participants have a role to monitor, scrutinise and challenge any concern re lack of progress or significant learning. 	

- To add to Report's a clear reference to "exception" and "risk" reporting.

JK thought that monitoring and clear response was important if we don't want to be criticised later on. At the end of 2.2 it was felt that this was an example.

It was agreed that Sub-groups and the Business Group would look at this, as it would help fine tune how we coordinated and integrated work in general and issues/exceptions.

JC highlighted the Ideas that came out of the Development Day.

PW said it would be helpful to know the process for moving from a long list to final recommendations.

RB felt this was an important point, as we needed to manage overall breadth and size of the plan, as well as the need to agree when to sign off (and archive) an action. He hoped it might be possible to reduce the number of priorities as well as the need to categorise and filter the different suggestions that had arisen from both the learning from the Annual Report and the development day. RB suggested that given the pending Peer Review it might be sensible to complete this work for the next Board.

On this basis the following was agreed:

- **Recommendations 3 & 4 – it was agreed it was not appropriate to agree these**
- **Business Group to consider feedback from Board members in order to further develop rationale for managing and reporting "exceptions/RAG", prioritisation and reporting.**
- **Further consideration learning from development day and sub groups in order to prioritise recommendations for any revision to the Business Plan, work streams and priorities/objectives**
- **Members were invited to contribute further to the above.**
- **Formal Board sign off for completed/archived actions/achievements etc.**
- **Revised plan and protocols to come to next Board which would provide the opportunity to address learning from Peer Review**

<p>3.2 Budget</p>	<p>Two papers received. RB reminded members that we need as Board to be clear about how we oversee and direct the resources made available to us, on the basis of clear information, regular reporting and long term planning. In respect to 15/16 Members also need to be assured that the money has been used appropriately. The Chair asked for questions or comments.</p> <p>It was felt that the budget paper was really straightforward and thanks were given to JC and LK for providing the information that members can understand and supported their role. Confirmation of partnership contributions for 16/17 had not been finalised yet. Letters to be written to after the meeting. The assumptions used for 16/17 is matching of 15/16 contributions.</p> <p>It was noted that planning for 17/18 would start now with a view to approaching members in the autumn re 17/18 requirements and budget contributions.</p> <p>JC drew attention to a number of lines: There are reduced training costs compared to last year. Carrying out joint training with Adult. Room hire costs are the same due to not having yet moved into Princess Buildings, which may produce a saving dependant on date of move. There is a contingency in the budget for Serious Case Reviews and it is a standard amount for E-Learning and Website costs (we have received an extra £3000 funding to carry out some more work on the website).</p> <p>A number of further queries were raised and responded to.</p> <p>RB suggested that the meeting look at the position re the proposal to extend the PMQA post before formally agreeing to set the budget.</p> <p><u>PMQA Post</u> RB reminded members of the history and previous discussions and that they had been updated on progress in between meetings.</p>	
------------------------------	--	--

Two partners (Local Authority and Police) have confirmed their willingness to make an additional contribution, but as yet have to confirm this.

RB briefed members, that having confirmed at the last meeting that the post had made a significant contribution to progress and to extend for a further 12 months, there now appeared to be 3 scenarios:

1. Additional funding from the 2 partners is confirmed leaving 1/3rd to be funded from Board under spend/carry over. This would result in the post being extended on a full time basis for a further 12 months. (NB members had been advised on one of termination costs).
2. That only 1 of the 2 additional partner contributions became available and the LSCB 1/3rd was used (as (1)). This would result in the post being extended on a part time basis for 12 months.
3. That none of the additional partner contributions became available, leaving either the use of the 1/3rd LSCB funding and or the possible increase of this. This would result in the post continuing for 12 months on a basis of less that (1) and (2) in terms of hours (NB it was understood that this may not be feasible for the current post holder

The need to retain a contingency element was felt to be important as the known variable was the SCR function and this could incur significant unplanned expenditure.

RB invited comment and discussion:

JP Her agency had been able to make an additional contribution last year but not in a position to commit this year, but feels we should still keep the PMQA post as there a significant risk if we don't.

JC briefed members on other Boards and how they fund their PMQA post. E.g. larger Boards have always had sufficient partners to contribute but smaller Boards struggle.

The overall level of partner contributions was challenged by RT.

PW confirmed that the CCG fund the CSCB £80,000 and there is no additional funding. JJ thinks we should use the contingency as outlined and JP's service might have the money after April.

There is such a focus on PMQA and have come on leaps and bounds.

	<p>RB asked the meeting to agree the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 To note the projected out turn for 15/16 2. To agree subject to confirmation of partner contributions the budget for 16/17 3. To agree to continue the PMQA post on the basis of the scenarios outlined, and that the current budget would allow a 3 month window (April – May) on basis of the 3rd scenario i.e. additional partner contributions do not materialise, and that in this event the Chair and the Board were to be alerted with a view to determining any other options 4. Budget reports to continue to come to Board meetings to enable members to monitor and risk manage. 5. Budget and member contributions to be addressed in the autumn for 17/18 <p>Members agreed the above.</p>	
<p>3.3 Performance Management Quality Assurance Officer Post</p>	<p>As above.</p>	
<p>3.4 Safeguarding Week</p>	<p>AW was welcomed to the meeting. Three papers received showing the evaluation of the last event, and proposals for an event in October 2016. Members felt the evaluation was helpful and thanks were given to AW. It was noted that The Adult Board have accepted the proposal and are eager to go. RB felt it was important to determine how this event would contribute to the LSCB's current priorities and to identify any costs/risks. AW said cost was projected at between £2500 and £3000 which will be split 50/50 with the Adult Board. (JC confirmed this could be accommodated within the budget)</p> <p>The respective Board Sub-groups would work together and the Challenge was raised "Will this pull colleagues away from the day to day business?" AW explained the process and how partners who want to be involved, offer their own workshops etc. RU challenged why there was a Safeguarding Week when safeguarding should always be embedded. JR thought that Safeguarding Week is a great opportunity to reassure the public that Calderdale is a safe place</p>	

	<p>to be and an opportunity for awareness and community/public engagement. RT suggested looking at what else is going on in Calderdale in that week. AW confirmed that last year if the information was received in time, it went into the Brochure/programme. Kirklees, Bradford and Calderdale are suggesting week commencing 17 October 2016 and it was felt this would offer further potential for cross over. It was confirmed that Voluntary Sector representatives are on board with Safeguarding Week. It was noted that last year WYP had hosted an opening conference and AW said it was intended to run the planned FGM conference as a part of the week.</p> <p>RB asked members to agree to support Safeguarding week and that this would mean their active commitment,</p> <p>This was agreed.</p> <p>Actions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AW to take up offer from Board legal advisor to check out any wider implications re the week - Sub-group to reflect on and consider views expressed by board members including wider focus and engagement - Board to be advised prior to October of progress and any significant issues/risks. 	<p>AW</p> <p>AW</p> <p>AW</p>
<p>3.5 Section 11</p>	<p>Two papers received from Jacquie Hellowell (JH) and presented by JC. These contained a summary of the learning from the 14/15 exercise (including the challenge events) with one focusing on schools.</p> <p>RB suggested that we focus firstly on the schools report and noted that a he was meeting with education board members on a termly basis in part to support the ongoing implementation of Section 11 standards.</p> <p>JJ informed members that the LA meets with the Primary and secondary Clusters and it is a good forum to get the information out.</p>	

There is also a Safeguarding Network Forum.

JC highlighted the data is due to new Section 11 from 1 additional school (79 out of 107 schools - 73.8%).

Significantly more schools have responded so felt that this is not disappointing. (It was noted that future reports should avoid the use of subjective adjectives such as disappointing and that members would prefer more evidence based terms and descriptors.)

AF noted his School was not included although it was an early completer. Apologies were offered and it was noted that accuracy was important.

There was discussion as to the learning and analysis of this, in that more “partially met” could represent an improved awareness of and learning from the process, especially from those who had completed for the second time. Some Board members therefore expressed caution as to not using simplistic measures such as “fully met” Equally though there was still a significant number of non-completers, there were more schools taking part in this year than the year before.

It was noted that Section 11 cross-referenced with Ofsted standards/results. Members concluded that there was potential for further learning to be drawn out. Triangulated and shared.

RB raised the issue of what to do about those who had not taken part; he understood that the letters that had been sent to schools at various parts in the process were not included in the papers.

Action – JH to provide members with the copies of the letters that were sent

RB reminded members that Section 11 formed a key part of the LSCB Annual Report and its sufficiency/assurance statement, and he wondered whether on the available evidence what level of assurance in respect of schools the Board could reach?

Views were shared as to whether or not naming and listing those who completed and those

JH

who did not in the annual report was the best way forward? LN felt that Schools would not comply next year if they are named and shamed. It was agreed that this year (subject to a check on the wording of the letters sent to head teachers and governing bodies) that it would be best to focus on the positives (list those who completed with overall statistics and learning) and address those who did not through other measures. It was also felt to be important that learning was shared and the 15/16 exercise should be promoted.

Given that this information had now been shared it was agreed that the LA should make their own enquiries if there are non-returns if they felt this was appropriate.

Action – RB to check if the letter said that returns will be noted and published (named and shamed)

RB

It was agreed to start the Section 11 process earlier (start in April 16 and return in May). It was agreed that there is never a good time (exams etc).

JH

Action – JH to fine tune the process and reflect the above advice and actions.

JC was asked to address the other paper outlining the learning from those partners who had contributed.

JC

This was also felt to be a good news story. Within increasing rates of return (noting that the 3 year plan increases targets year on year)

It was noted that once the Section 11 has been completed the first time, it require less work as in effect if seen as a live document it can be updated.

PW felt that the actions identified in the report are not accurate for her service in this report and that members who attended Challenge Events should have had a review of the Challenge Events before it went into the Report.

This was agreed.

The report however represented our first attempt to pull out learning and promote challenge on

<p>top of the statistical and trend analysis. It was noted that there had been some significant slippage in terms of timings and delay, and members felt this should be addressed in the coming programme.</p> <p>RB asked the board as to whether or not the reports in their present form provided sufficient indication and detail for agreement of the exercise in relation to the year 15/16? Members felt that this was not presently the case.</p> <p>Discussion followed and the following points and actions were identified</p> <p>Actions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC to circulate a summary report from the Challenge Events is sent out for those members to take part to agree. • JC to send proposed changes to the current format to CSCB members (themes, resolution to issues and a more detailed Action Plan – see below) • JH to have more conversation with the Education Board members and the LA re more effective explanation and promotion • JH to provide learning and recommendations for GP involvement • JH to include Early Intervention • JH to capture Together/Pennine Housing involvement • JH to produce a Strategic Summary of the Section 11 process, with detailed action plan for Year 3 • JH to produce a rationale for the 25% posed for the Voluntary Sector (as members had challenged this as being too low) • JH to meet with BL to discuss how the returns from his services had not been challenged (expectations, timeliness etc) <p>It was noted that The Multi-agency Audit Group leads on the Section 11 process.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Section 11 Report to go back for revision but not to be circulated. RB will sign off via email (subject to members having seen plan etc) in order to meet</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>JC</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>
--	---

<p>3.6 2016-2017 Multi-agency Training Programme</p>	<p>deadline for April 16</p> <p>Three papers received. RB reminded members that MAT currently represented a significant investment, and was an activity that continued to carry a level of risk and was subject to increasing levels of expectation and scrutiny. Members had received quarter 3 report and evaluation at a previous meeting and the programme had been looked at by the Business group.</p> <p>Members noted that the Training Programme appeared robust and would help support them to ensure that delivery and attendance was maintained. It was also felt that the rationale for inclusion and attendance was helpful. It was noted that there were some areas not covered and there appeared to be a risk area in respect of training and events earmarked as “subject to demand”. AW explained that in some instances this was because the set up costs were high. It was felt that if it turned out there was not demand what did this tell us about the use of our TNA and judgement? Members felt this would need close scrutiny.</p> <p>A query was raised as to why the programme only covered 6 months? AW explained that the sub group were still looking at the wider picture, as well as focusing on take up/promotion/cancellation and charging, and that there was still a need to balance between the different types of events. So it was felt to be helpful to once the full analysis of the last year was completed to publish the programme in 2 phases.</p> <p>Members understood this but felt there might be certain risks and asked that the sub group consider these and address them.</p> <p>Action – BL to speak to AW outside of this meeting re support for evaluation and other issues</p> <p>Action - Sub-group to prepare timely presentation to Board of second part of the year programme and to consider points raised by members.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Front Cover should say April – September (Part 1).</p> <p>Action - AW to amend the Front Cover</p>	<p>BL/AW</p> <p>L&I sg</p> <p>AW</p>
---	---	---

	<p>Further attention to be paid to courses that were “subject to demand”.</p> <p>It was noted that for some partners (e.g. schools) on site delivery might mean better takes up. AW agreed to follow this up and also to consider whether this applied to other partners and or ways of holding events.</p> <p>Action - AW to take to Sub-group issues around income generation</p> <p>Action - AW ask that the Sub-group note board member points re “demand” led items in the programme re potential risks.</p> <p>It was noted that Harmful Sexual Behaviour was the desired term not Sexual Harmful Behaviour.</p> <p>RB asked members to agree the programme for April to September 16.</p> <p>The Training Programme was agreed by the CSCB who will actively support.</p> <p>Thanks were given to AW.</p>	<p>AW</p> <p>AW</p> <p>AW</p>
<p>3.7 Burns Bruises and Scalds Protocol</p>	<p>Paper received.</p> <p>Members were assured that this has been through the multi-agency process. The Protocol was developed after a Serious Case Review and then the document was made more localised. This sits within the West Yorkshire procedures and has been tested in Kirklees and Wakefield.</p> <p>RB advised members that the Board needed to formally agree any new or significantly changed joint working policies, procedures, protocols and guidance that were developed under the West Yorkshire Consortium arrangements. The Board could also consider whether any additional local amendments were needed or reflected in such policies etc.</p> <p>From discussion the following was noted and agreed:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was a need to make sure that Commissioners and the commissioning chain were aware. - JJ on behalf of the LA supports the protocol. - Legal input in the drafting stage needs to be clarified to ensure that this is reflected in future development. - Where a policy etc has been tested it would be helpful to know what the learning was. <p>Action – JC to see if the Protocol has been tested and if it was OK</p> <p>Action – JC to report back to the CSCB on the above points</p> <p>RB asked the Board to confirm their agreement and support for the implementation of the protocol This was agreed.</p> <p>Action - The Burns Bruises and Scalds Protocol will go on the website</p> <p>Action - Members to take back and make the linkages</p> <p>Action – JC/JH to lead on Police and Procedures if her post is extended</p> <p>Members would like Legal involvement before any Policies and Procedures are signed off.</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>JC</p> <p>AW</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>JC/JH</p>
<p>3.8 Annual Report for 15/16</p>	<p>RB proposed that the Annual Report is commissioned and signed off at the July 2016 CSCB meeting. RB advised that it was proposed to follow the LSCB Chair Association template and draw on best practice.</p> <p>The LSCB Chairs Association review Annual Reports on a regular basis and Calderdale’s Report was included and it likely to be cited as having several areas of good. Further information would be available to LSCB’s who support the Association</p>	

Members agreed that they are happy to commission the 15/16 Annual Report for sign off at the July Board

**4.1
Performance
Management**

Two papers received.
JJ advised that development of the data and indicator set remained a priority, as does the application of the current data and indicators. Board members will recall recent reports.

JJ reminded members that she had written to partners re a range of specific issues relating to the non-availability of data and some issues around quality and timeliness. She had received a positive response, which would help progress matters.
RB thanked JJ as he felt this was an appropriate form of challenge and would help members to better understand the process and its importance.

JJ highlighted the following:
2.3 – Percentage of Child Protection Plans lasting 2 Years or more ceasing during the Year
The sub group were closely monitoring this as current trend was in the wrong direction, and could mean that partners would need to look at what was contributing to this.

3.1 – Number of Children being placed in Adoptive Families
This is improving and suggests that current measures are working, though figures are still distorted by legacy issues. Board wants to be assured that system is ensuring that when a permanency decision is made for a child this is achieved in a timely way

RB asked members if they had based on the information available to them any other observations or comments.

JJ said that the CSCB would want to be assured where we are at the year-end and that the next report will seek to capture this. JJ felt we have an improving Indicator Set and a well lead Sub-group.
Don't have every angle of health at the Performance Management Sub-group and PW asked if there is anything that she can escalate.
BL challenged the Rag Rating and LK confirmed that work is going on around the Rag Rating

	<p>to make it more structured. JJ confirmed that there are actions to improve. BL would like to see a summary of the red indicators and the reason why they are red. It would be nice to have this information in advance.</p> <p><u>PMQA Framework</u> Agreed a good idea to include trigger points. We need to be clearer about the rationale about judgements. JR questioned what “risky” means (Probation Indicator).</p> <p>JJ noted that she had met with RB to discuss further enhancements and developments especially around Children Missing from home/education/care and the implications of past Board decisions e.g. FGM , Prevent</p> <p>Actions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direction of travel and pace to be maintained - Board members to continue to have access to data set and improved presentation/risk assessment - Further detail and proposals to be refined re management of data/indicator set including Board member role - Regular reporting and analysis of areas of enquiry and continued refinement of “triggers and thresholds” for these 	<p>JJ</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>JJ</p> <p>JJ</p>
<p>4.2 Multi-agency Audit</p>	<p>Three papers received and presented by LK. RB sought clarification that the report suggested there were attachments and had these been circulated. LK confirmed that this was an oversight and they had not been, but would be.</p> <p>A sample of a new form of communication to convey the outcomes and impact from audit was circulated. This was positively received It was noted as to whether or not this approach would work with “bad news”. It was agreed to explore this</p> <p>Action – LK to send members the Schedule and Action Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Board members to scrutinise this at the next board 	<p>LK</p>

LK advised members that they are going to target the audits via the CSCB board members, as so far the request to ask partners to identify a pool of auditors had not produced a sufficient response. RB felt this was a sensible move in that it would strengthen the link for Board members being accountable for progress in terms of audit, as this remained a risk area and an area critical to the overall effectiveness of the Board and its approach to PMQA

PW was concerned about drift and agreed that we needed to evidence progress in terms of audits, auditors and impact.

RB summarised, that we needed to be surer that we were making progress in terms of developing our overall approach to audit (single agency, multi agency and case file audits), the methodologies we use, how partners support this and then how we analyse and report.

It was agreed that at the next meeting there would be further scrutiny of progress and impact.

**4.3
Children Missing
Education**
(This Item was taken at approximately 2.30 pm due to extenuating circumstances)

Paper received. PA was welcomed to the meeting. PA presented the updated Annual Report. The report detailed the numbers of children missing from education and the local response. CA felt that this continued to reflect learning and improvement though the trends and issues were fluid.

Members challenged some aspects of the figures in relation to live and closed cases, and were assured that there was a process and time frame in place.

The LA has clear expectations in respect of schools re reporting, policies and procedures and reported good levels of cooperation and joint working to address the issues.

PA explained the process and how there were some limitations as to what could be achieved re current statutory framework and duties.

RB summarised as follows:

This and the previous reports taken by the Board evidence that the LA and schools take a proactive approach to this issue, and are able to evidence an effective approach to sharing and responding to information about children who are missing from education.

	<p>The report this year highlights some settling trends and improved information sharing across boundaries, though there remains a concern that there may be some “missed children”, but this is not down to the systems and approach in place.</p> <p>RB hoped that in the coming year the LSCB would improve its focus on missing children and in this sense it was fortunate to be able to draw on the good practice outlined in the report.</p> <p>The following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Governor board member would ensure that the report and the wider issues were considered by the Association - The LSCB will note issues re children who cannot be found and tie into its emerging focus on this in the coming year - The Board will continue to take annual reports from the LA <p>Thanks were given to PA.</p>	
<p>4.4 Peer Challenge Preparation</p>	<p>Paper received. Information has been circulated and Invites will be sent imminently. There is ongoing dialogue with all those concerned and colleagues will be briefed and prepared for their sessions.</p> <p>RB invited 2 or more CSCB members (one being a Lay member) to be involved in the Feedback Session.</p> <p>RB also informed the meeting that In principle a CSE Peer Challenge has been arranged with Wakefield. For June and that the chair of the Proactive and Responsive sub group was supportive of this. This would inform the annual report requirement to report on CSE and give impetus and direction to our refresh</p> <p>RT has a name of a colleague who could assist in the Peer Challenge.</p>	
<p>4.5 Serious Case Review Update</p>	<p>Paper received.</p> <p>There has been a Child J meeting this morning and it has been agreed to bring the date of publication forward. End of the Summer term.</p> <p>The current SCR is nearing completion and it is likely that a Board EM will be required prior to</p>	

	<p>June There are a number of cases being considered and members will be informed when decisions have been made.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the Briefing Sessions appear to work really well and that further evaluation will be brought forward</p>	
<p>4.6 Partner Impact Statements</p>	<p><u>PW informed that there will Changes to Paediatric Services</u> Calderdale and Greater Huddersfield CCGs have launched formal public consultation in relation to Hospital and community services, this involves significant change to local paediatric services.</p> <p><u>LA Budget</u> Budget agreed on Monday night. Council Tax rise but nothing specific. There is continued pressure with budgets. Further information will be made available</p> <p><u>New member of the CSCB</u> It was agreed for Julia Kirkbright (JK) to be a member of the CSCB as the Legal representative.</p> <p>Action – LGS to add JK to the CSCB membership list - COMPLETE</p>	<p>LGS</p>
<p>5.1 Performance Management Quality Assurance Framework Revisions</p>	<p>Link received.</p>	
<p>5.2 CDOP Annual Report</p>	<p>Link received.</p>	

	<p>Communication & Engagement (2 February 2016) Early Help & Prevention (18 January 2016) Proactive & Responsive (28 January 2016) Multi-agency Audit Group (15 December 2015)</p>	
6 Any Other Business	There was no other business.	
7 Rolling Report/Future Agenda Items	<p>Early Intervention Panel Presentation in May 2016. Current Rolling Report Programme attached and revised version to be circulated following the meeting.</p>	
8 Deferred Items for May 2016 Meeting	As above.	
Date and Time of Next Meeting	<p>Thursday 5 May 2016 2 pm – 5 pm Shay Stadium, Halifax</p>	