

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
THURSDAY 4 MAY 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	Y			
Jo Sewell	CAFCASS	Y	Y	A	A	Y	D	A	A			
Penny Woodhead	Calderdale CCG	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	Y			
Paul Hutchison/ Julia Gray	Calderdale College	A	Y	Y	A	D	A	Y	A			
Raj Unsworth/ John Eccleston	Calderdale Govs Assoc.	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	-	A			
Pamela Ohadike	CHFT	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y			
Robin Tuddenham	Comms & Service Support	Y	D	A	N	Y	A	A	N			
Julia Caldwell	CSCB	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y			
Richard Burrows	CSCB Independent Chair	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			
Julie Jenkins	CYPS	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			
Stuart Smith	CYPS	A	A	A	A	Y	A	Y	A			
Julia Kirkbright	Democratic & Partnerships	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	D	Y			
Janette Pearce	Housing	Y	A	Y	A	D	Y	D	D			
Shaheen Khawaja	LAY Member	A	Y	A	Y	Y	A	A	A			
Jo Taylor	LAY Member	Y	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
Councillor Megan Swift	Lead Member (Participant observer)	Y	N	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y			
Maggie Smallridge/ Joanne Atkin	National Probation Service	Y	D	Y	Y	Y	D	D	A			

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

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

In Attendance for Apologies

Glen Plews (representing Janette Pearce)

In Attendance for Item 4.3

Jacque Hellowell (JH) – PMQA Officer

In Attendance for Item 4.6

Sarah Manfredi (SM) – Senior Commissioning Manager, CMBC

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person	Complete/Progress
<p>1 Welcome, Introductions, Apologies and Declarations of Interest</p>	<p>Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted.</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>		
<p>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (2 March 2017)</p>	<p>Minutes Page 6 <u>Review of Early Intervention</u> Action complete. JJ has circulated the report.</p> <p><u>Safeguarding Week</u> Action complete. Allison Waddell has received some response from links in agencies for Safeguarding Week.</p> <p>Page 8 <u>Section 11 Challenge Event</u> Action complete. Another Challenge Event was held on 24 March 2017.</p> <p>Page 10 <u>Communication and Engagement Strategy</u> Action complete. LT has taken this forward with colleague GPY and relevant staff.</p> <p>Page 11 <u>Communication and Engagement Strategy</u> Action complete. Rename to Communications Strategy and focus on delivering what's in it.</p> <p>Page 12 A formal proposal for the Development Day is coming to the next Board.</p>		

Page 16
Anti-Trafficking and Modern Day Slavery Duty to Inform – National Referral Mechanism
Action complete. Duty to Notify information sent with the minutes.

Page 18
Anti-Trafficking and Modern Day Slavery Duty to Inform – National Referral Mechanism
Action complete. JC is a member of and attending Modern Day Slavery Group.

Page 19
Forced Marriage and Honour Based Abuse Easter Campaign
Action complete. College had been contacted. Allison Waddell awaiting further response from PH.

Page 21
West Yorkshire Thematic Peer Challenge
Action partly complete. CSE Action Plan sent with minutes and Missing Action Plan to follow.

Partner Impact Statements – National Probation Service
Action complete. MS's replacement is Joanne Atkin.

Page 22
Youth Offending Team
Action complete. Funding for YOT has come in for 2017-18 with a 0.4% uplift. Not informed of any significant policy changes. Still working through the impact of possible court closures and changes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2017 were agreed.

	<p>accountable to their own organisations. It was noted that the budget is a standing agenda item and members will be updated on a regular basis/have the opportunity to scrutinise.</p> <p>BL challenged that there is no end of year budget statement this year so hard to comment. JC briefed members on how contributing partners have been asked for the same amount of money and these had been confirmed. JC felt current report for year ended March 2017 was reasonably accurate and therefore any changes were not likely to be significant.</p> <p>Action – JC to distribute a final position paper to members</p> <p>NH asked what Policy & Procedures covered and JC confirmed it was for Tri-X (Provider for West Yorkshire Joint Working Procedures) and how Calderdale invoice the other Local Authorities for their contribution to this and how this also covers Andrew Crabtree’s services (who co-ordinates the arrangement).</p> <p>BL suggested keeping the budgets separate (children and adults) and it was confirmed that contributors contribute separately to the CSCB and CSAB.</p> <p>It was agreed and supported that the CSCB and CSAB budgets should be kept separate as this was the first year of shared support and each Board had to meet different and specific objectives.</p> <p>The CSCB agreed to keep the CSCB and CSAB budgets separate.</p>	<p>JC</p>	
<p>3.2 CSCB Business Planning</p>	<p>Two papers received and presented by JC. RB reminded members that the business development process was now continuous and linked to the annual report and the subsequent Board development session.</p> <p>The CSCB have developed and continue to develop. The 5 priorities haven’t changed in the last 3 years as these reflected statutory functions and supported the more detailed implementation and monitoring arrangements. The current</p>		

plan is due for renewal in 2018.

PW asked about challenging ourselves around timescales and suggested adding milestone dates to the Business Plan.

Action – JC to add milestone dates to the Business Plan

JC

PW asked about the link with the PMQA and suggested that we add this to the Business Plan.

Action - JC to add the link with the PMQA to the Business Plan

JC

TB suggested adding key indicators from each Board (CSCB and CSAB) on a monthly basis which would save cross referring. RB thought that this is a helpful point.

It was suggested that the date on 3.4 is changed as it will be completed by March 2018.

JC explained that Multi-agency Audits are carried out as well as other agencies carrying out Single-agency Audits which inform the CSCB. It was suggested to reword Priority 3.

BL suggested rewording Priority 2.6 as it sounds like it is setting us up to fail.

PW thought that the Young Advisors make it sound like “top down” so suggested rewording. We have lost the engagement with young people to inform what we are trying to do.

AE informed members that her agency has the ability to use good wording and explained what it was. RB thought this was good and could take on board.

PW suggested that the Commissioners should be invited to contribute to Priority 5.6 not just the Business Group.

PW challenged CSCB members that they use this Business Plan within their organisation to identify linkages and common areas.

TB suggested linking in with the Section 11 work and to marry up with other Boards.

It was agreed that Section 11 continued to demonstrate potential and this could be considered.

AE confirmed that it is about the detail and how it is captured, and she felt that the plan was striking a balance.

Action – AE to liaise with JL and how to link in the VCS Forum so that awareness and contribution could be encouraged

AE

Summary

Support to stay with the framework as used before.

More attention to timescales.

How to link in with the PMQA.

Linking with Section 11 development,

Engagement with children & young people (Young Advisors).

Continued attention to use of language.

Members to appreciate and use the Business Plan in relation to their own organisations

It was agreed that CSCB members are happy that this is the structure and framework we use. Agreed that this is a formal endorsement.

Structures

JC reminded Board of the work done at the development day and the different options considered. The outcome of this was to retain main characteristics of present structure but apply some changes in terms of membership and how and what Sub-groups worked together.

BL and Rezina Kelly (Schools Safeguarding Advisor) are now members of the Business Group.

Rezina Kelly is Co-Chairing the Learning & Improvement Sub-group with JL

	<p>MAPLAG to sit under the Proactive & Responsive Sub-group and a paper will come to a future CSCB meeting.</p> <p>Considered joining the Performance Management Sub-group and the Multi-agency Audit Group (MAAG). After a number of conversations it has been decided the MAAG change to Quality Assurance group, and for now to retain separate groups as there is still development and delivery work to do and both agendas are very full.</p> <p>Still looking at suggestions from the Development Day and RB advised members that we should continue looking at being bolder.</p> <p>JC and RB are looking at the missing part of engagement of Young Advisors. The Business Group discuss the Business Plan/Structure at every meeting. It was agreed that CSCB members receive the final version of the Business Plan/Structure.</p> <p>Action – JC to update the CSCB in 6 months time</p>	JC	
<p>3.3 Child Death Overview Panel</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JC. RB reminded members of recent papers and developments, and of the Boards position.</p> <p>Calderdale and Kirklees already work together and Wakefield is separate. Board had supported in principle more of a shared approach across the 3 areas but there are a number of questions, e.g. differing levels of reviews and proportionate deployment of resources. The CDOP Panels had met to look at this in more detail and felt that for now a focus on sharing data and learning was the most appropriate way forward.</p> <p>RB noted that as a part of the reforms arising from the Children and Social Work Bill/Act CDOP has been handed to Public Health England and future intentions/directions will become clearer in the future.</p> <p>Members were conscious that the current remit is to look at all child deaths in Calderdale so that any learning can be applied.</p>		

	<p>It was agreed that the CSCB supports the direction of travel outline in the paper but would continue to retain the shared approach with Kirklees.</p>		
<p>3.4 Strategic Partnership Group</p>	<p>Two papers received and presented by JC. The Chief Executive asked how it can be made clearer about the roles and processes that are involved across the wider range of statutory and non statutory partnerships in Calderdale and this is why the Strategic Partnership Group came about. The Strategic Partnership Group is made up of Council Officers is mapping responsibilities, leads and priorities in order to establish where the lead for an issue/area sits and therefore if it is possible to align activities across other relevant partnerships. This it was hoped might make things easier to understand and result in reductions in duplication.</p> <p>For example the Proactive & Responsive Sub-group are the strategic lead for CSE in Calderdale, but other partnerships may be undertaking activities that would compliment this lead, so how this was reported, set and monitored could be an area for further discussion? PW asked what the risk is for the CSCB as she feels there is a potential disconnect around the statutory partners and senior leadership that can be reflected in the agendas and activities of different partnerships. PW challenged what the end game is and what wanting to achieve as it is not clear. JC confirmed what the Strategic Partnership Group is trying to achieve and the end game. The Strategic Partnership Group is for Councillors as well and this would inform of where to go and get the answers. It is trying to meet the needs of lot of groups of people. RB feels this is a good piece of work, but that it is complex and it is perhaps understandable that things are not as yet clear. It will be important he felt that when it reaches the point where as a Board we are required to commit and agree to things that we have clarity in order that we do not compromise our primary responsibilities and position.</p>		

Next Steps

IB suggested an off line conversation to reflect on the comments made as to different interests, types of partnerships.

BL thinks the mapping is not helpful in its present form.

AE would welcome something like this and suggested piloting different approaches in selected areas.

GPY said no one took ownership of the wider landscape and confirmed that this is why this process started.

JC pointed out that the yellow boxes haven't been agreed or discussed and if they were not agreed would need something else to take over.

JC feels this has been a useful exercise to date but there is more to look at.

JC is working on the mapping exercise and **PW challenged that there may be a risk that this is too complex an issue, so the outcomes of mapping may be limited.** VF feels this is a useful exercise and if it clarifies who does what, then that is a good thing.

Summary

RB thanked people for their contributions and noted that this was a positive development addressing a complex area. He felt that the desire for clarity in this area was a good thing, and that the suggestions and comments may help to steer the ongoing work. He felt there was clearly an intention to make things clearer and therefore as a result strengthen the links between the different types of partnerships.

RB endorsed on behalf of the Board continued support for these discussions and noted that any outcomes that had direct implications for the Board would need to be subject to further scrutiny and agreement.

NH thinks this is phase 1 and the respective objectives as represented by the wide range of interested parties needs to be established before carrying on. This was agreed.

	<p>It was agreed that the Board would continue to support work to look at improving the linkages across partnerships, in addition to the current initiatives, and will welcome further clarification and reports, prior to considering any formal proposals.</p>		
<p>4.1 Multi-agency Audit Group</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by BJ. BJ summarised contents of report and highlighted the following key areas: Ready for next step as a group with the inclusion of children & young people. To involve the Young Advisors more directly in the range of audit activity. Looking to say why we don't talk to young people rather than why we do. Having a more flexible approach using the Bulletins with front line staff so that we can improve relevance and application of learning from audit. It was confirmed that one off pieces of practice need to be taken up individually and not be put in the Action Plan, as this would allow the group to remain responsive to emerging issues. Looking to further develop the capacity and approach of the Multi-agency Audit Group (MAAG) and to work on Board members being part of Audits (to link with other groups to look at this). BJ felt that it was time to add dimensions to the current approach, to include more of a focus on the voice of the child, the view of practice across front line practitioners from all agencies and a better connect for the learning arising from audit.</p> <p>It was agreed that the proposals are seen as a good step forward.</p>		
<p>4.2 CSAB/CSCB Secretariat Merger</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JC. JC highlighted that the paper had been developed to address points raised in previous board discussions and to help members monitor and support changes. There is a level of detail paper that JC and the secretariat will be working at. The CSCB dataset will remain a priority and take precedence. It was confirmed that both Boards (CSCB and CSAB) and Business Groups are keeping an eye on this. It was felt that this paper is very helpful.</p> <p>It was agreed that regular reports will be taken by the Board.</p>		

**4.3
Performance Management
Quality Assurance
Arrangements**

Jacque Hellowell (JH) was welcomed to the meeting. JH explained that the paper summarised the outcomes from a number of discussions and ongoing work to adapt and develop baseline arrangements for how we collected, collated, monitored, managed and used the information that we as a Board judged key to being able to form a view as to the sufficiency of joint working arrangements to protect children.

Paper received.

JH confirmed that she is happy to supply any further detail if members require it. PW feels it is right that a slimmed down version is presented at the CSCB but would be interested in receiving further information on indicators such as those indicators being stepped up/down and the CSC indicators around CP Plans (neglect and indicators that are stable).

PW asked if the exception triggers have been agreed and JH confirmed that the data information will be kept and explained how she meets with Lead Officers on a regular basis. It is a belt and braces approach and this is also a standing agenda item for the Performance Management Sub-group.

PW is worried that we will lose sight and JC confirmed that the PMQA Framework will come to the Board.

It was noted and agreed that the Board needed to maintain a clear line of sight into and about key changes in what is looked at and what is not looked at and why. The Board was assured that there were a number of arrangements and processes in place, i.e. “belt and braces”, but felt these needed to have a high visibility and Board members should ensure they are clear about and endorse such recommendations.

JJ advised members that there are tolerances set and JJ assured members that JH and Graham Mozley (Performance Officer) meet regularly and flag up and issues.

JJ agreed with PW that this needs a Flow Chart.

JH briefed members on the thematic approach process to define each area and

JC advised members that the West Yorkshire Managers have also suggested a Neglect JTAI.

BJ confirmed that the JTAI process will look at pulling cases (7-15 year olds - 10 cases where positive outcomes and 10 cases where Youth Offending Team etc have been involved),

Each case will be looked at in detail (particularly schools involvement) and it is very important members attend the briefings.

Gavin Lee (who was in attendance with NH) briefed members on a JTAI he has previously been involved in and confirmed that preparation is the key.

JC advised members that on the 23 May feedback will be given on other JTAI's that have happened.

PW thought the JTAI is a really good idea and urged members to take up the offer to attend in JC's email.

RB noted that the JTAI process offered the potential for us to demonstrate and learn from how we worked together, especially given the involvement of the 4 inspectorates.

Peer Review

As a Board we have already taken part in a cross Board CSE Peer Review and received an evaluation. There is interest in and a proposal to repeat this exercise and RB asked members to consider this.

JJ thought that yes should have another Peer Review.

JC confirmed that we will still do self evaluation and develop Action Plans, which supports our taking part.

VF thought that we need to be pragmatic but he will make sure the Police are represented and a Peer Review will be fully support by the Police.

BL informed members of the challenges, e.g. the Commissioners shutting down.

RB wanted to be sure that we were able to identify and commit resources to taking part and that the learning from the previous exercise would be applied.

It was agreed to explore another shared peer review/challenge exercise.

**4.6
Disabled Children's Charter**

Sarah Manfredi (SM) was welcomed to the meeting. RB advised members that as a Board we had responded to recent research that indicated that there was more Boards could do to be assured that this vulnerable group of children were being protected. This item therefore provided the opportunity to consider where others were and where we were as a Board.

Paper received.

SM briefed members on why the Disabled Children's Charter was set up, e.g. failing to hear the voice of children & young people.

The Disabled Children's Charter it is felt would benefit from a further push.

Accountability rests with the HWBB and CYPPE

The local offer continues to develop and there is a planned live event in May for disabled young people and their families.

SM referred to page 8 on the paper:

JC indicated that it is intended that the Board set up a Task & Finish Group, and that this would also respond to any data issues and there will be an Audit that is a wider piece of work.

Questions

JK confirmed that Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding (DOLS) now applies to young people and more have been going through the Legal department. Don't usually deal with a lot of disabled children and LK asked if the Legal department could be doing more.

RB suggested that the audit arrangement might want to take account of Legal. VF thought that we need to test the plans and see if fit for purpose. He gave an example of work he has previously carried out in Bradford.

JC confirmed that questions have been added to the Neglect Self Assessment.

BL asked how we know whether the Disabled Children's Charter is working and SM advised that they could have made this report bigger and pulled out some of the key indicators.

	<p>VF advised members that there are 2 specialist children's homes in Calderdale so could maybe utilise them.</p>		
<p>4.8 Partner Impact Statements</p>	<p><u>BL</u> A representative from Locala will be joining the CSCB next time.</p> <p><u>NH</u> Halifax Probation has moved from Spring Hall Lane to Market Street in Halifax.</p> <p><u>VT</u> There is no more funding for the DV Hub. Haven't withdrawn the practitioner but this has an impact elsewhere in terms of overall safeguarding capacity.</p> <p><u>VF</u> The Police are seeking to improve their performance and therefore outcomes on domestic violence. VF has put more officers in safeguarding so will offer a better service.</p> <p><u>JJ</u> Met with Ofsted who have asked for Local Authority volunteers to look at the new framework pilot over the Summer (2 day inspection).</p>		
<p>4.9 Serious Case Review (SCR) Update</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by GPY.</p> <p><u>Child M</u> PW thinks there may be an issue for employers who have less than 250 staff in terms of recommendation to profile workforce and report on this. Agencies will need to make a judgement. Discussion followed around the ethnic mix of staff.</p> <p>Action - Members to provide their understanding of ethnic mix of staff and feedback to the Secretariat (this can then be discussed at the Case Review Sub-group)</p>	<p>ALL</p>	

	RB felt it was useful to consider repeating the Challenge Event as we did with Child J, as this seems to provide useful steer and indications of where we are in terms of implementing and embedding learning from reviews.		
4.10 CYPPE Feedback	Paper received. RB noted new format which was intended to highlight possible implications and opportunities arising from the CYPPE for the Board, so that the Business Group could scope these and act as required.		
4.11 Foundations of Life – First 1000 Days	<p>Paper received and presented by BL. BL explained that this was an important step to provide all with a steer for how pregnancy and the first 2 years of life are addressed and how important this can be in terms of individuals and agencies, as well as the longer term impacts on the community. Calderdale are now lower than the national average indicators in many areas and this is due to a number of people working together which is great.</p> <p>BL asked what the role of this group was for taking forward this report. BL challenged that the CSCB should be interested in this report and PW agreed and said there are some link with this report and the CSCB priorities. PW feels there is an issue that the CSCB could help with. BL confirmed that they are putting together an Action Plan which will be circulated round various agencies.</p> <p>It was agreed that this goes to the Business Group.</p> <p>Action – Members to feedback to BL if they feel they can do something when they have received the Action Plan</p> <p>AE challenged that Domestic Abuse isn't in the Report.</p> <p>VF is unsure of the health implications regarding teeth decay and other members agreed. He suggested there should be a plan and BL said there is a</p>	ALL	

	plan for work with education.		
5.1 Minutes from Other Partnerships/Boards and Sub-group Reports/Minutes	Minutes received from: Business Group (5 April 2017) Learning & Improvement (14 March 2017) Performance Management (21 March 2017) Scrutiny (5 April 2017) CYPPE (10 March 2017) Report from CSCB to CYPPE, re Notification Protocol for Inspections		
5.2 New Tools for Practitioners and Managers	Two links received.		
5.3 Emotional Health & Wellbeing	Paper received.		
6 Any Other Business	There was no other business.		
7 Rolling Reports/Future Agenda Items Items for July CSCB	Annual Learning & Improvement Report and Quarter 4 MAPLAG Annual Report and Protocol Revision First SAB/CSCB Secretariat Merger Report Locala CQC Report (if available) Development Day Plans Private Fostering School Safeguarding Advisor Annual Report Early Intervention Annual Report LADO Annual Report IRO Annual Report Child Protection Chair Annual Report		
8 Deferred Items for May 2017	No items were deferred.		
9 Date and Time of Next Meeting	Thursday 13 July 2017 (not 6 July as stated on the agenda) 2 pm – 5 pm - Shay Stadium, Halifax		