

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
THURSDAY 5 JUNE 2014
2 PM – 5.30 PM
WAINHOUSE/HARDCASTLE ROOMS, DEAN CLOUGH**

PRESENT:

Richard Burrows	RB	-	CSCB Independent Chair
Julia Caldwell	JC	-	CSCB Business & QA Manager
Gill Poyser Young	GPY	-	Designated Nurse Safeguarding – NHS Commissioners
Geraldine Sands	GS	-	Assistant Director of Patient Experience – NHS England, West Yorkshire
Alison Edwards	AEd	-	Named Nurse for Safeguarding Children – CHFT (deputising for Karen Hemsworth)
Iain Baines	IB	-	Head of Safeguarding & Quality Assurance, Adults, Health & Social Care - CMBC
Martyn Greenwood	MG	-	West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service
Beate Wagner	BW	-	Head of Early Intervention & Safeguarding – CMBC
Sureya Hussain	SH	-	Senior Solicitor, Legal – CMBC
Chris Jones	CJ	-	Principal – Calderdale College
Robin Tuddenham	RT	-	Director for Communities and Business Change
Veronica Mellor	VM	-	Service Manager – Safeguarding & QA
Jeff Rafter	JR	-	Service Manager – Youth Offending Team (Upper Valley Early Intervention)
Allison Waddell	AW	-	CSCB Multi-agency Trainer
Julie Lodge	JL	-	Named Nurse - SWYPFT
Tim Breedon	TB	-	Director of Nursing, Clinical Governance & Safety – SWYPFT
Penny Woodhead	PW	-	Head of Quality – Calderdale CCG
Angela Everson	AE	-	Joint Chief Executive – WomenCentre
Jacquie Hellowell	JH	-	CSCB Lay Member
Cllor Megan Swift	CMS	-	Lead Member – Children & Young People, Calderdale
Jill Farrington	JF	-	Consultant in Public Health Medicine – CMBC
Chief Superintendent Angela Williams	CSAW	-	West Yorkshire Police

Stuart Smith **SS** - Director – Children & Young People’s Services
 Lisa Golding-Smith **LGS** - CSCB Business Support Co-ordinator (minute taker)

APOLOGIES:

Steve Blackman **SB** - Safeguarding Lead – North Bank Forum
 Dr Pamela Ohadike **PO** - Designated Doctor - CHFT
 Bev Maybury **BM** - Director, Adults Health and Social Care – Well Being and Social Care
 Dr Steven Cleasby **SC** - Assistant Clinical Chair – Calderdale CCG
 Leona Binner **LB** - Head Teacher – St Augustine’s School (Primary Heads representative)
 Jo Sewell **JS** - Service Manager - CAFCASS

IN ATTENDANCE

Claire Burgess **CB** - Improvement Board Chair
 Parveen Akhtar **PA** - Early Intervention Service Manager, Lower Valley - Early Intervention (For Item 3.4)

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person	Timescale
1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence	Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted. Formal thanks were noted for Ian Hillas for his contribution as CSCB Lay member RB noted that it is a full agenda today as the CSCB are still in catch up and part way into the process of further development and improvement. It was noted that the continued participation and contribution of members remains crucial. RB asked members to confirm that the pace and level of contribution was ok, and they confirmed this was the case. The Review day was confirmed for 19 June 2014.		
2	<u>Page 3</u>		

**Minutes of the Last Meeting
and Matters Arising (3 April
2014)**

All actions completed.

Page 4

Action 1 completed.

Action 2 is on the Business Group agenda for tomorrow's meeting.

Page 6

Single Assessment is in process of being rolled out and will start in the Early Intervention Services. The Single Assessment will replace the CAF.

The 2nd part was implemented in April and is progressing very well. Keeping a close eye on because it is early days.

The new Form, as well as the old one, is on the CSCB website

Page 9

PW confirmed that a gap in the health arrangements has now been resolved.

LAC is on the Business Plan and VM has been asked for 6 monthly reports.

PW is happy to feed in the Health performance data to the PM Sub-group.

GPY and BW will feed into the new performance data set.

Page 12

It is hoped that by using the Strengthening Families Model it will prevent the need for children to be on a plan for the 2nd time.

Page 14

VM raised a concern about the Board discussion and outcome from the last meeting requesting that the pilot be extended for 5 months. VM concerned about the possible mismatch as the Strengthening

Families model is not being used all the time and currently there are 2 systems running.

RB agreed that the conclusion of the discussion at the last meeting may not have been clear, but that some members felt that there was not sufficient evidence or information to reach conclusions about rolling out the pilot at this stage, hence the request that the pilot be extended.

VM confirmed that she has received a lot of positive feedback about Strengthening Families and has also received good feedback from parents and her view was that we should be brave enough to use it now.

RB reflected, given the wide range of risk the Board currently faced, there was a need in his view to be cautious about implementing new ways of doing things without a full evidence base and the full support of partners who in turn were able to assess the implications for their workforce and the wider effectiveness of joint working arrangements.

AE said that early signs were encouraging but thought the CSCB had asked for more information down the line.

AW thought when children were going to be de-escalated then to use the old model but new cases to use Strengthening Families model.

Members thought that there was not enough robust information to make a decision.

It was noted that the Chair and members needed to try and be clearer re the outcomes of discussion at meetings. It was agreed that clarification would be helpful if practitioners were not to become confused.

The following was agreed:

- **The CSCB wants the pilot extending so partners can**

	<p>appreciate the implications, costs and establish fit with other changes such as single assessment to the core joint working arrangements around the child's journey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time frames are needed to be agreed by the Business Group so that at the next Board there can be a proposal to extend the pilot and for there to be clear benchmarks, intended benefits and implementation plans should the Board agree to implement the changes. <p>Page 18 - 4.7 – HMIC Police Inspection Letter. Action – CSAW to get an update and report back</p>		
<p>3.1 Performance Management Report and Member Scrutiny</p>	<p>6 papers received. BW explained that the sub group was re forming and re focusing in the light of the agreed priority and risks for the Board around the scrutiny of performance information from partners around joint working and the child's journey. The first job of this Sub-group is to pull together the data we already use and although the information presented is not the dataset that we want, it is a first step. BW intends to bring to the August CSCB meeting further indications of the future dataset and what may be required from partners. There will be fewer items and very much around partnership contribution and effectiveness, and more of a story behind it. In the meantime, building on the work that the previous Sub-group worked on and one of the key themes is the work with children on a CP plan for 2 years or more.</p> <p>Action – AE to speak to BW outside this meeting about the MARAC figures</p> <p>CJ confirmed that he would find the measure of effectiveness of process and definitions helpful.</p>	<p>CSAW</p> <p>AE</p>	

JH said a key for the acronyms and some sort of pre-amble to give background is needed.
Both RB and BW supported the view that both the dataset and the process of scrutiny needs to be clear and as accessible as possible.

BW asked for the CSCB's endorsement to use this approach as a way forward and members agreed.

BW highlighted to members some indicators on the Performance data papers that were distributed.

It was agreed that the sub group should continue to work on these to provide further analysis and investigation that will come back to the Board.

Members also considered how this information would be benchmarked against local/past, regional and national comparators, to help inform judgements.

SS said that being clear as to whether the information indicates a good or less than good level of performance and being able to see this in the context of each agency's contribution and the overall impact was important and a challenge.

BW confirmed that this is work in progress and she felt it was a robust start.

Members agreed that:

- **The CSCB are assured that we heading in the right direction and will take a lead role in scrutinising and analysing information the sub group presents to meetings.**
- **The CSCB will be further assured that it will be able to move into the next steps around engaging with reports and progressing the multi-agency data set in August.**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSCB endorsed the direction of travel and asked BW to bring back further developments to the August meeting. 		
<p>3.2 Multi-agency Training Programme</p>	<p>2 papers received. RB outlined that the MAT had been flagged as a risk and reminded members of previous discussions and requests. Current position is that delivery is taking place pending submission of programme and evaluation/impact methodology requested by the Board.</p> <p>AW circulated a new Training Programme for 14/15 this seeks to reflect the understanding of areas of poor take up last year, shortfalls in evidence of impact and the need to integrate revised Board priorities and focus on improvement</p> <p>The development of the new recording system and proposals for revised evaluation of impact on practice. JC confirmed that this is being looked at</p> <p>AW is already carrying out assessments which consist of a series of questions before and after the training.</p> <p>Members comments regarding evaluation: Helpful if aims and fit of courses are clear, expectations of participants with a focus on impact on their practice. Members felt that qualitative evaluation should be manageable and complement quantitative evaluation.</p> <p>The following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principle that the programme as a whole and each element should be fully evaluated and followed up had to 	<p>JC</p>	

be at the heart of the 14/15 delivery, in order that the Board could evidence impact and be informed about future programmes.

- This would further enable Board members to undertake their role in coordinating and integrating Board provision with their own single agency arrangements and being able ask the questions about the value their worker has got from the course.
- It was felt that evaluations may be able to link in with risk in the context of the overall view and vision the Board set for ensuring that the children’s workforce was fully equipped to work within joint working arrangements.

AE commented that as agencies we should know what additional training staff need and it should say in the Training Brochure that organisations are responsible for going to wider area training. It was confirmed that we have started to think about individual agencies training offers and this will be brought to the CSCB well in advance of the consideration of the 15/16 programme.

RB noted that the Business Plan and the work of the sub group needed to reflect the wider strategic objectives once the current programme had been aligned to Board core functions/priorities and the arrangements for monitoring and evaluation were revised and effective.

In summary Board members felt:

Wish to avoid not being in this position in 12 months time.

There was an improved clarity around issues and the expectations the Board has.

There continued to be a need to be assured that the Learning &

	<p>Improvement Sub-group we will get to know who went on the training, where they came from, was it good or not, implication of impact and changing the model of training?</p> <p>RB proposed that until the point where the Board is able to consider more formal and detailed proposals (August), the Board should endorse meeting to meeting delivery of the programme date.</p> <p>JL to lead on achieving and focus on what is needed. This was agreed and endorsed.</p> <p>Action – Members to feedback any further comments to JL</p>	<p>JL</p> <p>ALL</p>	
<p>3.3 CDOP Annual Report 2012 - 2013</p>	<p>Presentation by Jill Farrington.</p> <p>Annual Report for the period 2012/13 received. (NB Part of Board’s catch up programme)</p> <p>Will be formally reviewing the recommendations for the 13/14 report shortly as the CDOP Annual Report needs to fit with the Board Annual Report cycle.</p> <p>Members were reminded that Child Death Overview was a statutory function and responsibility of the Board delivered through a shared sub group (with Kirklees). This Panel reports into the Case Review sub group and to the Board.</p> <p>It is necessary that the Board Annual Report is able to report whether the CDOP arrangements have been effective, what learning and improvement has resulted and what progress has been and remains to be made.</p> <p>GPY confirmed that things do happen at the panel that aren’t in the report and that this learning needed to be considered in order for it to be reported and assessed.</p> <p>The report confirms that self harm is rising in Calderdale and an Emotional Wellbeing group has been set up to support schools and</p>		

	<p>CAMHS work. The Summary of the report was ready to go into the CSCB Annual report last year but it was felt that it had to wait till the combined Kirklees report came out. RB noted that he felt that in future although the report would benefit from the context any national overview provided the local learning and impact could be reported on within the Boards Annual Report cycle and this was the intention this year. Subsequent revision and additional learning in the light of national data/reports could be tabled when available. Not formally published until Kirklees ready. National statistics available third week in July.</p> <p>Action: Calderdale section of CDOP report for 13/14 to be prepared for CSCB Annual Report Cycle and further item to be tabled for Board</p>	<p>JC</p>	
<p>3.4 Implementation of Early Help Assessment</p>	<p>PA was welcomed to present update. 3 papers received. This is on the agenda for next week's CYPPE to sign off, so Board's position and views are important. Launch for the Single Assessment is next Friday. PA confirmed that there has been consultation across partner agencies.</p> <p>Action – LGS to forward to members the launch email tomorrow</p> <p>VM said that it needs to be clear that this is Early Intervention in the title and at the bottom.</p> <p>CSCB endorsed the progress and proposals</p> <p>PA asked that this document goes on the CSCB website and asked that the policy and procedures reflect this (PA has already spoken to AW and JC about this).Need to look at Continuum of Need to make</p>	<p>LGS</p>	

	<p>sure there is no confusion and RB confirmed that this is a CSCB responsibility.</p> <p>Action There will be Locality Launches and members to promote these. Revision and updating of Continuum of Need, policies and procedures and multi agency training to be undertaken Board to receive regular updates on implementation Core performance and impact to be incorporated into PMQA arrangements</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>JC</p>	
<p>3.5 Section 11 Update and longer term strategy</p>	<p>Paper received. JC presented.</p> <p>JC advised members that there was a need to answer the question of what we are doing with the Section 11 in the longer term and in the short term how we were going to respond to the information from this years audit</p> <p>JF commented that she really liked the Tool. She is following through the services that are being commissioned out but she is not sure how that that information should go to the CSCB. JC said that she feels that the CSCB would need to see these. This is also a dilemma for NHS England.</p> <p>RB felt that the principle that this was a Board led and commissioned process was important, and whilst commissioning organisations collated returns, in part for their own compliance with Section 11 and their own functions, the information needed to be available and subject to the Board and its assessment and scrutiny arrangements.</p> <p>It was agreed that partners would like dialogue rather than instant escalation and JC confirmed that this. JC also reminded members that in year 1 it was important to consider key learning re process and build this into years 2 & 3 approach.</p>	<p>JC</p>	

	<p>PW confirmed that the CCG submission would just include the contractual services information (not the grant or non-commissioned information).</p> <p>JC confirmed that early indications are that there is a high level of take up and she confirmed the escalation process.</p> <p>RB reminded members that we were seeking to shift the focus of the Section 11 Audit and self assessment over 3 years to embed a culture of self assessment in terms of basic standards around prioritising safeguarding within all organisations.</p> <p>Action – JC to feedback at the August Board meeting</p> <p>Thanks were given to SWYPFT for their help with the Section 11 work.</p> <p>It was agreed to put in the 3 year timeframe and further progress the development plan which needed to include how Young people would be involved, the balance between learning, how to respond to poor quality and or compliance issues, and how to support self assessments that demonstrated organisations may be struggling to evidence how they are progressing in prioritising safeguarding standards.</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>JC</p>	
<p>3.6 LADO Report</p>	<p>Paper received but due to personal circumstances Keith Watson could not attend today's meeting.</p> <p>Action - Defer to August meeting</p>	<p>JC/RB</p>	
<p>3.7 Business Plan/Structure/Sub-groups</p>	<p>Paper received. JC summarised progress to date, and requested that members carefully consider the current version of the revised Business Plan.</p> <p>RB reminded members that this was an interim plan focused on catch up and the requirements of the Directions notice, but that it</p>		



see what the priorities are for each Sub-group?

- **The Board requested that Business Group gives further consideration to the revision of the BP.**

RB felt that there has been significant progress in what was a complex process. He felt that we needed to be sure we did not get diverted into “planning for planning’s sake” at the expense of direct activity.

It needs to be clear that this is fit for purpose and the Sub-groups have sufficient clarity and focus so that limited resources and energy are well directed. He reminded members that the new Business Group has an important role to play in coordinating and integrating this activity so the Business Plan needs to be a workable document for them. The Board also needs to be able to use the plan to relate and cross reference its considerations and decisions against and how these demonstrate evidence based progress and management of risk. Need to be clear and assured that it and therefore the Board is meeting overall purpose.

The following was agreed:

- **It will be important to ensure that activity is coordinated, integrated and impact focused through the Business Group.**
- **Priorities of the Sub-groups to be tightly as possible linked to the Business Plan.**
- **Board members supported the 5 priorities.**
- **Broad support for the objectives subject to further clarification and rationalisation**
- **Board felt there was not a need for much more detail at this level but wanted to be assured that where necessary this detail would be available**
- **Needs to be reported in at every Board on the basis of**

Business Group

	<p>evidence of impact, positives and exception reports where progress is not as had been intended (cross referenced to risk register)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure that what we have said we will do in the past and what is in the SIIP is clearly integrated. <p>JC confirmed that the Business group are visiting this as a high priority.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that JC has done a tremendous amount of work on this.</p>		
<p>3.8 Safeguarding Week</p>	<p>Paper received.</p> <p>JH presented and highlighted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 50 expressions of interest have been received. • A single week to promote safeguarding. • A unique opportunity for Calderdale. • Feedback is that everyone is very enthused about this. • This is supported by the Adult Safeguarding Board. <p>CSAW confirmed that they have previously been involved in Bradford and it is very positive.</p> <p>RB reminded members of his challenge to the Board in that we need to make sure there is sufficient capacity to do this as we already have trouble managing our core responsibilities. He was happy to proceed provided Board members felt that it would not compromise or detract from their commitment to meet the priorities for improvement that has been discussed in the previous item.</p> <p>Discussion took place and this included consideration of the following;</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broad level of support and interest in the idea - Some preliminary commitments had been made, (but this did not presume that the Board would agree to the final proposals) - Intended impact and how this would be assessed which in turn would be set against what members were able to commit would be important - The question was raised as to timing, given the possibility of an autumn inspection. - Fit with other planned events (Board and members) - Where lead would come from in terms of CSCB resources <p>The following was agreed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH and sub group would be lead with JC (and if necessary a T&F Group) • Members felt that it would be advisable to re schedule the week for March 2015 and incorporate the Annual Conference into the programme. • Members to be advised at future meetings of programme details and progress. 	JH/JC	
<p>3.9 Recruitment of new Lay Member</p>	<p>The CSCB need to formally agree a process to replace Ian Hillas. We are required to have Lay members. JH briefed members on the proposed recruitment process.</p> <p>The following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners are involved in the recruitment process. • Proceed with advertising for a Lay Member 	JC	
<p>3.10 2013/2014 Annual Report</p>	<p>RB advised that the Annual Report is for 2013/2014 is required and that he wanted the Board to consider the process and to formally commission the report. The paper was considered and discussed.</p>		

	<p>The following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSCB Annual Report to be published by September 2014. • To set up an Editorial Group. • Members to suggest ideas of what the Annual Report should look like to RB • Last year's Annual Report was extremely long and feels it should be shorter and more accessible • Looking to produce an Executive Summary version and a young people's version. • 1st draft – August 2014. • Publication – September 2014 		
4.1 SIIP	<p>Paper received. This is being referred back to the Business Group for progress report and will come to every CSCB.</p>		
4.2 Ofsted LSCB Review Preparation and Readiness	<p>Paper received. JC presented. There was not good representation at the meeting (only 4 people at the 1st meeting). There is a high degree of overlap between improvement/business plan and inspection readiness JC asked that members send a representative from their organisations. Plea for more involvement please. JC will be approaching representatives from schools for their involvement.</p>	<p>ALL JC</p>	
4.3 Independent Chair's Letter to Minister 15 th April 2014 & CSCB Capacity/risk	<p>Paper received. RB presented. Members felt that this is a good summary of the position/progress. The next report is due next Tuesday in preparation for the DfE Review Day. It was confirmed that CB's and RB's reports will be available to CSCB members.</p>		
4.4	<p>No further discussion as issues had been raised and covered in</p>		

Improvement Board Feedback	previous items		
5.1 Minutes	<p>Papers received:</p> <p><u>CYPPE</u> Minutes noted</p> <p><u>Safeguarding Adults Board</u> These are draft minutes but they were approved at this morning's meeting. There is no representative from the CSCB on the Adult Board. It was agreed that the Adult Board be asked to invite representation and that it would be appropriate for JC to attend. It was confirmed that the advert for the adult Independent Chair goes out on Monday.</p> <p><u>Improvement Board</u> Minutes noted.</p>	JC	
5.2 Budget	<p><u>Current Position Paper</u> received outlining expenditure to date</p> <p><u>Contribution Letters</u> were noted</p>		
5.3 Members Survey and Governance Arrangements	Members were asked to note ongoing survey and encouraged to complete and return.		
5.4 Newsletter	<p>JH presented a copy of the new Newsletter. The proposal that this is done bi-monthly after CSCB meetings. The first one is going out next week to the whole children's workforce, Commissioners and all Councillors.</p> <p>Action – send any comments to JC Action - Board members to be responsible for and ensure that newsletter is widely distributed</p>	ALL ALL	

	The next Communication & Engagement Sub-group will review and consider hard copies being available. RB thanked JH and the Sub group for producing the newsletter and that he felt this was another important step in connecting the Board to front line workers across all settings		
5.5 Child Health Profile Children Accessing Services Above Universal	Members were asked to note 2 papers with a view to future consideration of child health needs and how these relate to safeguarding and the wider governance/business plan arrangements.		
5.6 Inspection Feedback CAFCASS	Defer.		
5.7 Safeguarding Training – Information from NHS England	Action – GS to send a written update	GS	
5.8 Business Group and Sub- group Minutes	Papers received. Members were reminded that they could raise points having read the minutes in advance of the meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Group • Proactive & Response Sub-group (previously known as CSE, Missing & Trafficked Children) • Learning & Improvement Sub-group (previously known as Learning & Development Sub-group) • Communication & Engagement Sub-group (previously known as Communities & Communications Sub-group) • Case Review Sub-group (previously known as Serious Case Review Sub-group) 		
5.9 Board Away Day	Action – Date and details to be confirmed shortly – Purpose of the day to review progress and take stock.	JC/RB	
5.10 Agency Impact Statement	<u>Principal Social Worker Post</u> Bernadette Johansen has been appointed and has made some		

	good links.		
5.11 Peer Review	Board to consider options for Peer Review – Agreed to defer.		
5.12 DFE Review Day	Selected Board members have been invited to take part – RB attending and reporting – feedback will be available at the next meeting		
5.13 Work Programme	Paper received and noted re rolling programme of reports into the Board.		
6 Any Other Business	<p><u>Board capacity</u> Paper received.</p> <p>JC outlined the pressures on members and the Secretariat. It was acknowledge that we are in a process of transition. PW asked if we had used all of the budget and is there a risk? JC confirmed that we are on course to spend the budget.</p> <p>There are currently 2 Serious Case Reviews going on (maybe 3) and these are intensive processes that require considerable input of core resources and partner time.</p> <p>JC confirmed ongoing prioritisation and an audit on key tasks. RB felt it was important to ensure that current resources were lined up to the priorities and core responsibilities, so that we could evidence the most effective use of time and partner contributions against measurable results. He felt that the Board needed to be in a position where is can match resources to priority/demand and be prepared to stop doing things that were non essential or not results focused. He proposed that members further consider what might be needed and where this could be sourced. He noted and acknowledged that some partners had already suggested they may be able to identify additional resources and felt that if these were to be deployed they needed to be targeted.</p> <p>CSAW confirmed that she couldn't provide a staff member but has a pot of money.</p>		

	<p>Action - JC to do a skill/capacity gap report that members can take back to their agencies</p> <p>Action – JC to explore with members what additional resources may be available</p> <p>Action – Progress to be reported to the next Board</p> <p><u>Hate Crime</u> Booklet passed round which provided up to date information about the different forms and impact hate crime can take/have. Details were circulated about an “app” which can help children and young people to recognise and report hate crimes. CSAW is taking a bid to the Police Crime Commissioner for money. CSAW feels this is an issue and she is releasing staff to be available to Schools. JF confirmed that this is in the School Survey and she can analyse the data she receives. CSAW confirmed that SS went to schools yesterday to ask that this is brought up as a safeguarding issue but SS had to leave today’s meeting early so couldn’t receive the feedback. CSAW asked for an endorsement from the CSCB that she gets the App funded for Calderdale.</p> <p>RB agreed that the Board should support agency initiatives, but it also raised the question of where this sat in terms of partner priorities within current CYP Plan and the safeguarding agenda</p> <p>Action - RB and JF to raise at the CYPPE Action – IB to take to the Adult Safeguarding Board</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>JC</p> <p>JC/RB</p> <p>RB/JF IB</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>7 Deferred and Future Items for August 2014 Meeting</p>	<p>Report from Licencing Early Intervention Report Sexually Harmful Behaviour Tool Kit CHFT Inspection Report</p>		
<p>8 Date of Next Meeting</p>	<p>Thursday 7 August 2014 2 pm – 5 pm Wainhouse/Hardcastle Rooms 5th Floor, F Mill Dean Clough</p>		