

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD  
THURSDAY 4 JUNE 2015 – 2 PM – 5 PM  
SHAY STADIUM, HALIFAX**

**PRESENT:**

Richard Burrows (Chair)	<b>RB</b>	-	CSCB Independent Chair
Julia Caldwell	<b>JC</b>	-	CSCB Business & QA Manager
Chris Stoddart	<b>CS</b>	-	Safeguarding Advisor, Regional Prevent Co-ordinator – NHS England
Jeff Rafter	<b>JR</b>	-	Service Manager – Youth Offending Team/Upper Valley Early Intervention
Jeanne Wats	<b>JW</b>	-	Chair – Calderdale Secondary Heads (representing DL)
Penny Woodhead	<b>PW</b>	-	Head of Quality – Calderdale CCG
Laura Newcombe	<b>LN</b>	-	Head Teacher – Lee Mount Primary School (Primary Heads Representative)
Janette Pearce	<b>JP</b>	-	Head of Pennine Housing/Together Housing Group
Raj Unsworth	<b>RU</b>	-	Calderdale Governors Association (VC)
Lesley Bowyer	<b>LB</b>	-	Head Teacher - Halifax Academy (Primary Heads Representative)
Dickie Whitehead	<b>DW</b>	-	District Commander - West Yorkshire Police
Ian Hughes	<b>IH</b>	-	Head of Democratic & Partnership Services – Democratic & Partnership Services
Robin Tuddenham	<b>RT</b>	-	Director for Communities and Service Support
Angela Everson	<b>AE</b>	-	Joint Chief Executive – WomenCentre
Vicky Thersby	<b>VT</b>	-	Safeguarding Lead – NHS Trust
Tim Breedon	<b>TB</b>	-	Director of Nursing - SWYPFT
Andrea Walters	<b>AW</b>	-	Enhanced Practitioner – CAF/CASS (representing JS)
Beate Wagner	<b>BW</b>	-	Head of Early Intervention & Safeguarding – CMBC
Laura Knights	<b>LK</b>	-	Service Manager – Safeguarding & Quality Assurance Service
Jayne Leech	<b>JL</b>	-	VCS Strategic Partnerships – North Bank Forum
Maggie Smallridge	<b>MS</b>	-	Head of service (Bradford & Calderdale) – WY National Probation Service
Stuart Smith	<b>SS</b>	-	Director, Children & Young People's Service – CMBC
Lisa Golding-Smith	<b>LGS</b>	-	CSCB Business Support Co-ordinator (minute taker)

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Keith Watson                      **KW** - Local Authority Designated Officer (**For Item 4.1**)  
 Jamiila Sims                      **JS** - Service Manager, FRT & MAST – CYPS (**For Item 4.6**)

**APOLOGIES:**

Nick Hawley                      **NH** - Head of Bradford & Calderdale Probation Community Rehabilitation Co Ltd (CRC)  
 Jo Taylor                          **JT** - CSCB Lay Member  
 David Lord                        **DL** - Head Teacher – Ryburn Valley High School (Secondary Heads Representative)  
 Caron Walker                      **CW** - Consultant in Public Health  
 Gill Poyser Young                **GPY** - Designated Nurse – NHS Commissioners  
 DCI Darren Minton               **DM** - West Yorkshire Police  
 Shaheen Khawaja                **SK** - CSCB Lay Member  
 Iain Baines                        **IB** - Head of Safeguarding & Quality Assurance, Adults Health & Social Care - CMBC  
 Councillor Megan Swift         **MS** - Lead Member, Children & Young People – CMBC  
 Jo Sewell                          **JS** - Service Manager – CAFCASS

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person	Timescale
<p><b>1</b>  <b>Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence</b></p>	<p>Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted.            New members were welcomed to the CSCB.</p> <p><b>It was agreed that RB formally write to Janet Youd, Chief Superintendent Angela Williams and Councillor Colin Raistrick to thank them for their contribution to the CSCB.</b></p> <p>JC proposed that JL become the Chair of the Communication &amp; Engagement Sub-group.</p>	<p><b>RB</b></p>	

	<p><b>Members agreed the proposal.</b></p> <p>CSCB Feedback Forms will be collated in the Annual Report.</p>		
<p><b>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (2 April 2015)</b></p>	<p><b>Page 4</b> JC checked the minutes of the 12 December 2014 Meeting which had agreed to publish the Child J Overview Report with minimum redaction.</p> <p><b>Page 9</b> No private fostering suggestions had been received. The private fostering report is part of the rolling reports.</p> <p><b>Page 11</b> Hard audits are carried out through the Multi-agency Audit Group and soft audits through the Performance Management Sub-group.</p> <p><b>Page 14</b> Various transition meetings have been arranged.</p> <p><b>The minutes of the meeting held on 2 April 2015 were agreed.</b></p>		
<p><b>2.1 Correspondence Received</b></p>	<p>No correspondence.</p>		
<p><b>2.2 Matters Arising</b></p>	<p>No matters arising.</p>		
<p><b>3.1 Business Plan</b></p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JC who highlighted the 5 priorities. Thanks were given to colleagues who have put in the work on the Business Plan.</p> <p>It is evidence that we have refined our understanding of the LSCB role and that our goals are current. Subject to agreement today then the Business Plan will supersede the current one and is for a 3 year period.</p>		



	<p>looking for?</p> <p>LN said that targets need to be more identifiable and balanced with timescales</p> <p>TB said the progress key needs to recognise the do-ability. <b>It was agreed to reflect the above in the ongoing review of the plan. Members agreed that they are happy and committed to the Business Plan.</b> <b>Agreed 6 monthly updates to the Board on a formal basis.</b></p> <p><b>The CSCB formally agreed the Business Plan.</b></p>		
<p><b>3.2 Performance Management Quality Assurance Officer Role and Report</b></p>	<p>Paper received and presented by JC. RB suggested as the report was concise and clear that members should raise views and ask questions.</p> <p><b>JC responded to a question re the main elements of the role/post and explained that</b> the development of the Performance Management Data Set is only a part of the Performance Management Quality Assurance Officer's role. The role is also supporting the Business Plan and the metrics around this. PW feels that there may be a task for Jacquie Hellowell is to advise authors on the reports they submit to the CSCB and future proofing. (Needs to track back to the Framework).</p> <p>Jacquie Hellowell is currently looking at what data should be collected and looking at the gaps. This will be fed back to the Performance Management Sub-group. BW confirmed that the aim is to get all the data in one place.</p> <p>SS advised that it would be helpful to attend to data streams relating</p>		

to other areas of activity such as Domestic Abuse, in order that analysis streams are complimentary and do not result in duplication. RB asked members if they felt the report provided them with sufficient evidence to fulfil their oversight role. He added that he felt that it was important to be in a position as a Board to address any sustainability and proposals to extend the role beyond the agreed 12 months. SS noted that there was some local funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner focused on CSE that may contribute to an extension.

**Members, agreed that the Performance Management Quality Assurance Officer Role is high priority, that the report was helpful and that future reports come to every other CSCB meeting.**

**3.3  
Section 11**

Paper received and presented by JC. JC apologised as the sentence on page 3 (XXXXXX) shouldn't be there. The purpose of the report was to advise members of progress being made, what would be expected and to reflect Business Group discussion as to how to manage "growth" (as per agreed strategy) with "resources"

There will be 154 responses this year so it is likely that this will place a strain on capacity to analysis and challenge. JC reported that analysis would be targeted, and there would be a focus on sharing the learning and challenge.

AE raised the issue of the role of commissioners in regard to analysis of Sect 11, and the potential for duplication. SS felt it was important for specifications and process to be clear about this. It was agreed that JC would clarify RB reported that this was a key learning area, as last year the support of commissioners of services had been very constructive.

	<p>It was noted that the Schools Safeguarding Officer will be sending out new timescales/advice for Schools.</p> <p>PW said the linkage with CHFT and for example the ambulance service needs to be made clear, and where this may apply for other partner organisations. She also noted that links with the Adult Board should be as clear as possible.</p> <p>JC noted that forward planning would ensure that points raised today would be incorporated wherever possible.</p> <p>RB thanked JC and members, and asked if members were in a position to continue to support the role out and development of the Section 11 audit?</p> <p><b>Members confirmed that this was the case and agreed for this year the present format and schedule.</b></p>		
<p><b>4.1 Local Authority Designated Officer Annual Report</b></p>	<p>Two Papers received and presented by KW who was welcomed to the meeting by RB. RB reminded members that “the management of allegations against adults who work with children” was a specific area of oversight and a critical element of joint working arrangements. That we currently take an annual report from the Local Authority Designated Officer. (LADO)</p> <p>KW provided a brief summary of recent changes as a result of the revision of Working Together 2015 and some history and context.</p> <p><b>Members were asked for their views and questions.</b></p> <p>KW explained the difference between unfounded and unsubstantiated which was: Unfounded – confident that there is no basis to the allegation</p>		

<p>Unsubstantiated – can't be proved (no evidence) but the allegation is still there.</p> <p>Members were asked if they thought their colleagues are clear about KW's role and are we doing enough to promote the Local Authority Designated Officer?</p> <p><b>Challenge:</b></p> <p>RU said the Rotherham cases were first classed as unsubstantiated. KW confirmed that unsubstantiated in Calderdale means that do not have sufficient evidence. This reminded Board members of the need to monitor all aspects of the information.</p> <p>KW expressed the view that recording of the outcome is less important than the case itself being investigated on a consistent and thorough basis and DW agreed.</p> <p>KW noted that there had been a low number of CSE LADO cases in Calderdale as the current categorisation produces a majority of physical abuse. KW felt that the categories won't alter significantly in the future and it is very difficult how cases are recorded. The broader point was that members sought to understand both the categorisation, the process followed and the outcomes this led to, in the context of the report before them. Members also noted on the above scrutiny and challenge that checking out current trends such as CSE was an important part of the report.</p> <p>The Regional Group of LADO's are looking at improving aspects of record retention, capture and analysis and the CSCB will need to be updated.</p> <p>RB noted that he had not been able to identify anything on the CSCB website about the LADO process and past reports?</p>		
---	--	--

	<p><b>Action – JC and RB to look at the website issue (above)</b></p> <p>The question was raised as to cover for LADO as KW worked part time. It was confirmed that KW and Rezina Kelly cover for each other. LK and Cheryl Baxter are also available.</p> <p>JL asked if there was any data regarding social media (Face Book) cases and KW confirmed that he can break this data down and bring it back to the CSCB.</p> <p>SS has told new qualified staff (e.g. Social Workers and School staff) to delete their Face Book pages. RB noted that other partners may have similar measures in place</p> <p>RB suggested on the basis of the discussion that future reports to the board could usefully draw on this issue, and that it would also be helpful to learn about the training KW and colleagues get in the year and as with all reports to the board it is always helpful to have issues highlighted that the Board members may wish to focus on.</p> <p><b>The annual report was formally accepted and the actions noted (above) were agreed.</b></p> <p>Thanks were given to KW.</p>	<p>JC/RB</p>	
<p><b>4.2 Performance Management Report</b></p>	<p>Four papers received and presented by BW, RB Thanked BW and the sub group and said that he felt the progress being made was significant. BW said this is a very well attended Sub-group and members were encouraged to speak to their representative for this Sub-group to gain more of an understanding. Members were advised to familiarise themselves with the Indicator Report.</p>		

BW explained why indicators have been rag rated as they have, this was agreed as helpful.  
 Populating the Score Card which will put the Performance Management Sub-group in a better position to monitor and analysis the wider safeguarding horizon as well as concentrating on the dataset that has a narrower focus. Especially as the Board would need to oversee the transition of issues across the Score card and the dataset.

PW asked about the dental questionnaires.

**Action - GPY to look at the above**

Page 66 – 4.1 & Page 72 – 4.3  
 Members raised some queries around detail and principles, especially as to how standards were determined. BW felt the report showed this, as this was critical to how it should work, as the tables will show how these are being met across partners and collectively.

PW’s challenge is that she can only really talk confidentially about the data she is familiar with and that this was probably true for all. RB felt this was a helpful point and underlined the need for board members to fully understand the process, the reports and the work of the sub group.

LK confirmed that there is a lot of challenge at the Performance Management Sub-group, e.g. notifications from A&E and it has been agreed to carry out an audit. BW confirmed that this is a central activity for the sub group.

Page 69 - 4.2 – Meeting Attendance.  
 There is a low level of attendance (O’s) at the Early Help &

**GPY**

<p>Prevention Sub Group. This illustrated the way in which Board members should be using the reports and information. Discussion followed as to how this might impact on the development of the data set, as progress in evaluating the impact and effectiveness of early help was a priority.</p> <p><b>Action - CSCB members to look into up their agencies attendance at the Early Help &amp; Prevention Sub-group</b></p> <p>Traffic light system – BW highlighted this aspect of the report and explained that this was an attempt to help the sub group and the Board monitor information and progress re analysis and scrutiny. LK has spoken to Jacquie Hellowell who is the lead for the Traffic Light System and Jacquie is trying to reduce the number of pages.</p> <p>DW agreed with PW’s challenge about members being familiar in their own areas but not others.</p> <p><b>RB invited suggestions of how to manage own capacity to manage the key areas?</b></p> <p>TB suggested identifying triggers and thresholds for reporting to the CSCB and for members to raise questions. E.g. a top five however this would need to address any risk that priorities and or important variances/exceptions were overlooked.</p> <p>PW suggested Development Sessions.</p> <p>JW felt it was unrealistic to scrutinise everything and maybe to have Groups to scrutinise relevant sections. It was agreed that this would make it more manageable.</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>	
---	-------------------	--

	<p>Due to timescales the Indicator Report would probably not be able to be distributed to the CSCB any earlier. MS asked if the CSCB can have headlines</p> <p>BW confirmed that headlines and accuracy are key areas that the Performance Management Sub-group is looking at.</p> <p>Action: Sub group and JC/JH to consider the above suggestions with a view to informing development and the bringing forward of further suggestions as to how better Board members can clarify their role.</p> <p><b>The report was accepted and members would note the above and details of the actions being progressed within the reports.</b></p>		
<p><b>4.3 Strengthening Families Report</b></p>	<p>Three papers received and presented by LK. RB felt this was a helpful and clear report and directed members to raise comments and questions. The feedback BW has received from children has been very positive. AE asked about cancelled meetings and does this and non-attendance have an impact on families? LK explained that Each Conference is looked at individually and if there are any risks if the Conference is re-arranged. LK confirmed that one of the reasons for cancelling a Conference is they might not be quorate (e.g. for an unborn) but they are always re-arranged within timescales. The numbers of cancelled conferences was therefore an important indicator. Reports need to be sent in 3 days prior to the Conference so members can and form and be fully aware of the issues before the Conference this was also an important benchmark. Before the Strengthening Families model, reports were brought on</p>		

the day of the Conference and this was less than ideal. The question was raised that if reports are late, does the Conference stand down? AE asked if reports are late, is this due to a capacity issue?

It was felt that standing down Conferences could have an impact on future engagement with the family. LK agreed that clarity around this would be helpful.

RB reminded members that as a Board we have a direct responsibility to ensure that the meetings system meets the standards we set for it and that the outcomes are in the best interests of children. He asked if members felt they were in a position to be assured of this and whether or not SSF was making a positive impact in this respect?

LK explained the Strengthening Families process and how it takes away some of the formality that can act as a barrier to participation. LK confirmed that a log is kept of any stood down Conferences.

Progress noted in the Report

There is no evidence of deterioration in the meeting of current standards and outcomes.

There is an early indication of improvements against some of the key measures.

Outcomes for children is very positive from the feedback.

There is an ongoing discussion going on with the police regarding attendance.

A question was asked if Video Conference Facilities would help address performance. LK said that if there is a very difficult meeting, to have a “stand back” approach would be difficult using video conference facilities and would be reliant on professionals to fully contribute.

	<p>RB summarised that the report appeared to demonstrate that the approach was providing some benefits, and that risks were being monitored. However he also felt that it highlighted the need for the Board to be able to more closely monitor how this key part of the process was working and that we should be clear as to the standards and measures we were using as a Board. He felt that work across the sub groups and the PMQA should provide us with a focus for this as well as reports into the board.</p> <p><b>Action - The CSCB agreed to continue to support the Strengthening Families Model.</b></p> <p><b>Further integration of information and performance reporting to be progressed so that Board members can be assured that meetings convened to protect children are effective and meeting standards.</b></p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>LK</b></p>	
<p><b>4.4 Young Advisors Report from Sub-group</b></p>	<p>Three Papers received and presented by JC.</p> <p>RB clarified that the Young Advisors had been asked to help us do some of the initial thinking around how we might help ensure that services and strategies were focused especially in regard to the lessons from the recent SCR.</p> <p>Copies of the survey and the responses were circulated. One of the key messages and challenges was where young people looked for information about services and what form this would most usefully take.</p> <p>LN suggested that we could ask Schools to have a common link. It was noted that there was a Council dedicated web site for young people, and that many partners including the Board also had web site content aimed at young people. It was agreed that in principle it</p>		

	<p>would be better if there were more direct linkages and consistency re format of information. There is a Secondary Heads Conference in a few weeks looking at Well Being and JW will bring this up at the Conference.</p> <p><b>Action – JW to bring up the young people website at the Secondary Heads Conference</b></p> <p><b>Action – JC and JL to talk outside this meeting to see what the Communication &amp; Engagement Sub-group could do in formulating a partnership response to the points raised by the Young Advisor’s and the challenges this raised</b></p> <p>Interested if there are any national organisations that interact but it was confirmed that there are none locally.</p> <p><b>Action – The Communication &amp; Engagement Sub-group to take on the principle points of the Report and have further dialogue with the Young Advisors</b></p> <p>JC was asked to give thanks to the Young Advisors.</p>	<p><b>JW</b></p> <p><b>JC/JL</b></p> <p><b>C&amp;E SUB-GROUP (JL)</b></p>	
<p><b>4.5 Child Sexual Exploitation</b></p>	<p>Two papers received and presented by LK (DCI Darren Minton’s Reports from Proactive &amp; Responsive Sub-group). RB reminded members that the sub group had been asked to consider in the context of the current strategy and action plan the specifically commissioned review of information relating to partnership response to CSE cases over a period in time. SS explained that after the Rotherham case, the ACPC contracted Nicki O’Keefe (NOK) to update the 5 year Report, to make it in a 10 Year Report. NOK counted how may police prosecutions there were during this</p>		

<p>period and work has developed The report highlighted how some of the challenges are being put into practice. Discussions are robust, are being taken seriously and are not complacent and the report cross references with the current Action Plan. PW wondered that because we are refreshing the Action Plan we might miss something and should the CSCB see the Action Plan?</p> <p>It was noted that Calderdale have been shortlisted for a Good Practice Award and the Report highlighted a long history of agencies involvement and support. This included examples of identifying areas for improvement such as not liaising very well with over boundaries and this has now improved. Work has been carried out with taxi firms and B&amp;B's. Although it was felt that Calderdale are now in a very robust position it was agreed that a characteristic of this was to be able to learn from past experience and to be responsive to new developments, thus reducing the risk of any complacency</p> <p>The Action and Strategic Plans are being updated on a regular and if anyone would like to know anything, they can ask. There is also a close tie in with regional arrangements and the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner.</p> <p>RB noted CSCB will be required to do an annual assessment of the CSE arrangements, although the details for this were not yet known. This would emphasise the need for Board members to be on top of the strategy and action plan, as well as ensuring that the PMQA framework was providing robust data.</p> <p>RB drew members attention to the variation in numbers of cases</p>		
---	--	--

	<p>identified over a 3 year period (page 6 O’Keefe Report) and asked whether or not the Report to the Board provided an understanding of this? SS said it is because the data wasn’t collected as well in this period.</p> <p>RB felt that it would be sensible to ensure that any potential implications of under reporting/poor data collection were further considered with a view to identifying any mitigation and or retrospective actions.</p> <p><b>Action – Proactive &amp; Responsive Sub group to look into the above and produce a further report</b></p>	<p><b>P&amp;R SUB-GROUP (Darren Minton)</b></p>	
<p><b>4.6 Children &amp; Young People’s Service Update on Referral Mechanisms</b></p>	<p>Four papers received and presented by JS. RB noted that there were a number of reports, but suggested that that the main issues related to a whole system proposal. He thanked JS for her report and reflected that this was clearly a potentially complex matter. So he suggested members ask specific questions and we would take the report a step at a time.</p> <p>He asked members if they were in agreement and supportive of the principle of one referral form. They were. RB then advised members that they may wish to be clear about the implications and any risks in relation to the other changes.</p> <p>RB felt it would be helpful if members were clear as to whether they were being consulted or informed? JS felt that there had been consultation and the CSCB are asked to consider the risks. PW asked if stake holders been consulted? JS said that work has been carried out by the Early Intervention Panels. It seems sensible to have one Referral Form but health staff (PW) felt that they hadn’t been consulted.</p>		

JS noted that the Form hasn't changed much (very similar and only slight changes). Soft Audits carried out by CSC showed that this is not a duplication of effort. This journey started 18 months ago and stakeholders across the Directorate have been involved. It is about streamlining the support that is identified.

RB reflected that this seemed a sensible proposition but he was concerned that Board members did not appear to be aware of the consultation that had been reported. He would expect this to be the case.

PW asked what do these changes mean for GP's and JR confirmed the process of going through the Early Intervention Panel.

SS reminded members that the Signature of Risk came out about a year ago and this links in.

AE confirmed that she is committed to this but concerned about the capacity of the Early Intervention Panels dealing with what could potentially be a significant increase in requests and referrals?

JS said that all the Early Intervention Service Managers have supported this development, are aware of the increased level of volume and have no issues. RB suggested that it might be helpful to see some modelling of increased impact of referrals on EIP's and MAAST.

JR felt another part of this is a culture shift and this is the message that will be shared when launched, but also noted that there would be a requirement for agencies to have completed more information and assessment prior to referral into CSC under certain circumstances. This would mean that there would be a need to get the timescales right. He felt we were talking about the same number of vulnerable children and partners need to allocate the resources to the most vulnerable families.

JL questioned the data and she felt that the messages are getting out and people are more aware, but wondered whether the

<p>implications of these changes were fully understood, especially as the board needs to ensure that information is shared and acted upon quickly when a child may be at risk.</p> <p>PW felt that the CSCB need and assurance that any changes will be phased and before these can be endorsed and she can't commit to an engagement conversation with Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS) before 6 July for example.</p> <p>JS confirmed that there are a lot of longer term aims.</p> <p>LN felt that schools would rather have the brutal information and will still need the training.</p> <p>JS confirmed the dates for the Single Assessment.</p> <p><b>Actions –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LGS to send the dates for the Single Assessment change and roll out to CSCB members, and ask Allison Waddell to put on the website</b></li> <li>• <b>Board members to make sure they are briefed and are aware of details and potential implications</b></li> <li>• <b>Early Help &amp; Prevention Sub-group and Performance Management Sub-Group to ensure that impact of change is monitored and measured from CSCB point of view especially in context of impact and threshold management</b></li> <li>• <b>Progress reports to be presented to the Board by CSC in addition to CSCB PMQA reporting</b></li> </ul> <p><b>RB concluded by noting that the Board fully supported the</b></p>	<p><b>LGS</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>EHP (JR/JP) AND PM (BW) SUB-GROUPS</b></p> <p><b>CSC</b></p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b>move to a single Referral Form and felt this was a welcome step.</b></p> <p>RB did feel that there had been a missed opportunity in respect of the other changes in terms of consultation with the Board at an earlier stage. Given the Board role especially in relation to ensuring that joint working arrangements were effective that there was a need to look to the above actions being taken forward by both Board members and CSC. He also wondered if this highlighted the important role the respective Sub-groups had in ensuring we are in a position to advice and then support such changes on the basis of independent monitoring and reporting.</p> <p>Thanks were given to JS.</p>		
<b>5.1 Systematic Practice</b>	<p>Paper received. Information Item.</p> <p><b>Action - RB to request summary paper as to what it is and implications for Board members and partners</b></p>	<b>RB</b>	
<b>5.2 Budget</b>	<p>Paper received and noted</p>		
<b>5.3 Case Review Update including Serious Case Reviews</b>	<p>Three Papers received and presented by JC. Progress and update. Publication for the 3 SCR's that the SC has considered.</p> <p><u>Child D</u> The Report can be published.</p> <p><u>Child K</u> Sharing and taking advice on the Report with the national panel of experts, publication date expected shortly</p>		

	<p><u>Child J</u> Under consideration of whether a deferred publication date. This will require a view from the national panel of experts.</p> <p><u>Child M</u> Have received the first draft of the Report and meeting again all day next week (mid-way through the process).</p> <p><b>Action – To provide members with updates on a regular basis</b></p>	JC	
<b>5.4 Minutes from other Partnerships/Boards and Sub- group Reports/Minutes</b>	<p>Papers received: Business Group (22 April 2015) Case Review (23 April 2015) Multi-agency Audit Group (21 April 2015) + Report Performance Management (17 March 2015) Learning &amp; Improvement (20 April 2015) Communication &amp; Engagement (13 May 2015) Early Help &amp; Prevention (18 May 2015) Proactive &amp; Responsive (30 April 2015)</p>		
<b>6 Any Other Business</b>	<p>Survey Monkey for CSCB Members, re communication.</p> <p><b>Action – JC to send members details on the above</b></p>	JC	
<b>7 Rolling Report</b>	Paper received.		
<b>8 Deferred Items for August 2015 Meeting</b>	None		
<b>Date and Time of Next Meeting</b>	<p>Thursday 6 August 2015 2 pm – 5 pm Shay Stadium</p>		