

**CALDERDALE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD
THURSDAY 7 JULY 2016 – 2 PM – 5 PM
THE SHAY STADIUM – SHAW HILL, 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	Y	A		
Jo Sewell	CAFCASS	D	D	Y	D	A	Y	Y	A		
Penny Woodhead	Calderdale CCG	Y	Y	A	D	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Howard Browes	Calderdale College	Y	N	A	A	Y	A	Y	Y		
Raj Unsworth	Calderdale Govs Assoc.	-	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	A		
Pamela Ohadike	CHFT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Robin Tuddenham	Comms & Service Support	Y	D	Y	A	A	Y	D	A		
Julia Caldwell	CSCB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Richard Burrows	CSCB Independent Chair	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Julie Jenkins	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A		
Stuart Smith	CYPS	Y	Y	Y	D	-	A	A	A		
Ian Hughes	Democratic & Partnerships	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	D	-	-	-	-
Julia Kirkbright	Democratic & Partnerships	-	-	-	-	A	Y	Y	Y		
Janette Pearce	Housing	N	Y	D	N	N	Y	A	Y		
Shaheen Khawaja	LAY Member	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	A	Y	A		
Jo Taylor	LAY Member	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	A	A		
Councillor Megan Swift	Lead Member (Participant observer)	Y	A	N	Y	A	Y	N	N		
Maggie Smallridge	National Probation Service	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	D	Y		
Gill Poyser Young	NHS Commissioners	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y		

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

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

Observing:

Ged McManus – Calderdale Adult Safeguarding Board

Present for Items 4.1 and 4.2:

Jacquie Hellowell (CSCB PMQA Officer)

Present for Items 4.7 and 4.9:

Allison Waddell (CSCB Learning & Improvement Officer)

In Attendance for Apologies:

DCI Ed Chesters (EC) representing Chief Superintendent Dickie Whitehead

Julie Warren-Sykes (JWS) representing Tim Breedon

Helen Foster (HF) representing Nick Hawley

Subject	Discussion and Agreed	Responsible Person
<p>1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence</p>	<p>Members were welcomed, introductions made and the apologies noted.</p> <p>It was noted that the Local Authority Senior Management Team are attending an ACDS Conference in Manchester today.</p> <p>Action – RB to follow up with SS, re appropriate LA representation</p> <p>Action - RB to follow up with the Lead Member as she has not been able to attend the May or July CSCB meetings</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>RB</p>
<p>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (5 May 2016)</p>	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Page 1 Action - LGS to amend the minutes as a representative attended the meeting on behalf of MS - COMPLETE</p> <p>Page 5 <u>CP-IS Letter</u> RB is still to get a view from GPY.</p> <p>Page 6 <u>Interfaith Council Representative</u> The Communication & Engagement Sub-group are following up with the Interfaith Council representative regarding strengthening links with faith communities and opening a dialogue or contributing to current dialogues with those parts of the community.</p>	<p>LGS</p>

Page 8

Prevent Protocol

SH (Prevent Co-ordinator) has taken the comments on board and revised the Protocol and Flow Chart. It is with the Local Authority Legal department at the moment.

JC is taking it to the West Yorkshire Consortium and she will keep the CSCB updated,

Page 11

Peer Challenge feedback

On today's agenda.

Page 12

Budget

On today's agenda.

LSCB Chairs Association

This was discussed at the last Business Group and it was decided not to contribute.

Page 14

Retention Dates

Timeline for Retention Dates is being worked on and JC will circulate to the CSCB when completed.

Other areas are looking at voluntary services and commissioners and whose responsibility it is. The CSCB to keep on the table.

Page 17

CAFCASS Presentation

Work still to be done by RB and JC.

	<p>This is a best practice document. Producing a Challenge Log for every Sub-group was discussed at the last Business Group and it was agreed that it is good to have a Challenge Log for the CSCB and the Performance Management Sub-group and LGS is to pull out the challenges from every Sub-group for JC for evidence/Annual Report purposes. PW felt that Challenge Logs were good because they captured and got things sorted out between Practitioners that don't need to go to the CSCB. Jacquie Hellowell has started to produce a Challenge Log. RB is cautious about becoming over bureaucratic and JP agreed. RB said to keep simple and refine it and let's be clear about what we mean by and understand as "challenge" GPY confirmed that when her service had a DfE visit they asked how challenge is evidenced.</p> <p>Action – Members to think about Challenge and Logs</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p>2.1 Correspondence received and sent</p>	<p><u>CSAAS Letter – Putting Vulnerable Children First</u> Letter received. RB advised members that following concerns raised through a number of LSCB's, this was essentially from a LSCB point of view a commissioning issue, but the current interim situation and any future arrangements did have and could have a significant impact in this important part of the statutory response to children who may have been sexually abused. He noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner were taking a lead role from a West Yorkshire point of view. PO informed members that the Designated Doctors across Local Authorities are concerned. The Pathway has been tweaked to reflect the current position. Continuing to meet to discuss young people being sexual abused, counselling etc. This is just being done for a year. There was a concern that letter has not actually gone to CCG's and PW is seeking to confirm that both CCGs and NHSE are aware and are responding. RB thinks there is a subsequent letter and RB will follow this up.</p>	

	<p>Action – RB to follow up the subsequent CSAAS letter</p> <p>Action - All partners to be aware of current negotiations and any future proposals for arrangements</p> <p>BL confirmed that Public Health need to be involved in the discussions. RB will check that they are. RB felt this emphasised the point that the 3 main commissioners (PH, CCG and NHSE) may need to improve their communication and coordination.</p> <p>Action – RB to check out regarding Public Health’s involvement in discussions</p> <p><u>DfE Feedback to LA and LSCB</u> Formal feedback from the DfE was received today and it was positive feedback about the CSCB.</p> <p>Action - Members will receive a copy of the feedback</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>RB</p> <p>RB/JC</p>
<p>3.1 Early Intervention Annual Report</p>	<p>Two papers received.</p> <p>RB reminded the meeting that it was an ongoing priority for the Board to keep up with and be assured that the early help response in Calderdale was effective and ensured that children were protected. The report requested was intended to provide the Board with an overview and progress report from the LA as lead partner.</p> <p>The Early Help & Prevention Sub-group has received the Early Intervention Services Report April 2015-March 2016 report, but further amendments were being addressed. JC suggested that the report comes back to the CSCB after being amended and RB agreed as it would be helpful for the Board to have a clear and up to-date overview.</p>	

OVERVIEW AND EXCEPTION REPORT

Positives/Accomplishments (Green)

1st bullet point (Data capture)

OK.

2nd bullet point (Chronologies)

There is a push for agencies to complete Chronologies for any Tier as this is good practice and has made an improvement.

3rd bullet point (GP Referrals)

A GP sits on the Early Help & Prevention Sub-group.

Action - It was agreed that narrative would be helpful and to make sure the Overview and Exception Report and any other reports collaborate

JR/JP

Areas to Watch (Amber)

1st bullet point (Lower Valley)

(NB There are no page numbers on the Early Intervention Services Report April 2015-March 2016 report) but this refers to page 5 in the report.

2nd bullet point (EISA)

The language might need changing. Should say “no negative impact since been reduced”. Needs narrative.

Areas for Improvement/of Concern and Action Taken (Red)

It was agreed that Health data to be analysed separately as it is not helpful to put all health in one line.

BL would like a conversation if health data is being discussed at Sub-groups.

JP thought this item should have been a presentation from the Local Authority.

Action – BL to follow up re use and breakdown on health data and this to be reflected in CSCB PMQA

BL

Action – Further work to be undertaken, re review of LA report and analysis/presentation to the Board

JR/JP

	<p>Action – Business group to reconsider status of report and need for direct presentation to the Board as a part of the rolling programme (re JP’s challenge)</p> <p>Members noted the work to date and felt that it presented some evidence of the direction of travel and assurance, but noted the further actions needed in order to ensure a higher level of evidence, analysis and assurance.</p> <p>It was noted that the Early Help & Prevention Sub-group is taking feedback from each Locality (from Front Line Practitioners) on how the system works, and that this will help triangulate the LA report and set further lines of enquiry.</p> <p>RB noted that the format for reporting was new, and that we need to continue to work out how this will work as it was an agreed response to the learning from the Peer Challenge and one element of how we are going to raise our game.</p>	<p>Business Group (JC)</p>
<p>3.2 Multi-agency Training</p>	<p>Thanks were given to HB for the reports.</p> <p>OVERVIEW AND EXCEPTION REPORT Positives/Accomplishments (Green)</p> <p>The cancellation rate is a good news story, i.e. rate has reduced and appears stable.</p> <p>Some steps have been made to recognise what Single Agency training is happening and how this relates to the multi-agency offer and wider strategy. This will continue as a priority.</p> <p>It was noted that last year, figures included Safeguarding Week attendance and this one doesn’t, which explains why the attendance looks to be lower this year. There is a Task & Finish Group carrying out Deep Dive Audits looking at impact on practice which are underway.</p> <p>Signposting has improved but there is scope for further improvement for all the training opportunities.</p>	

E-Learning appears to be a cost effective means of delivery, but a clearer strategy and position is needed and this will be addressed.
HB has an E-Learning meeting tomorrow.

Areas to Watch (Yellow)
There is a need to look at how the programme is put together in terms of timing, content and target audiences as well as a need to identify and improve take up, especially for practitioners under represented.

Areas for Improvement /of Concern and Action Taken (Red)
Working with the Communication & Engagement Sub-group around improved communication.
Recognised that the wider strategic development (re Ofsted recommendation) presents challenges around scope and capacity, i.e. who is the children and young people's workforce.
Next year want to do another Training Needs Analysis to reflect improved statistical and other analysis, and will provide further guidance of how to complete. Members will need to be clearer as to their responsibility to account for their own organisations training and the relationship of this to the Board objectives
No on-line booking system yet. This needs to be progressed as it would represent an efficiency gain and improve access/management and planning. MS is worried that her service won't be able to access the on-line training. HB felt that the specification for any system would need to meet the access requirements of all partners.
BL asked if we had considered working with other agencies that do on-line training. HB felt this was a part of the current review, as there was a need for the Board to agree the desired balance between on line and face to face training.
GPY suggested using the Pathway that Jacquie Hellowell uses (for Section 11) for training and this was agreed as a good idea. This highlighted the need for

<p>the Business team to look at integration opportunities. A number of issues around venues (parking) and timing of training was discussed.</p> <p>RB summarised that the Sub-group report indicated that there was good grip of the issues and matters in hand, that there appeared to be an ongoing rebalancing between the focus on delivery, the need to map and integrate other forms of training (including that provided by partners) with a more strategic approach. He also felt that the evidence base and use of information appeared to be more robust and consistent than in the past. He drew member's attention to their key role in this area of the Board's work. He indicated that the Annual Report was suggesting that a broader focus targeted at different parts of the child's journey was likely to be needed in the coming year.</p> <p>Areas for Escalation/Recommendations for the CSCB</p> <p><u>1</u> It is a priority that everyone who works in schools receives safeguarding training. A discussion followed that highlighted; schools (and other partners) need to be able to evidence that training objectives are met, that a measure of this is not only attendance at multi-agency training, a variety of inputs in terms of timings, place of delivery and length appeared to work well, and further collaboration and planning across schools may be important.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Sub-group would lead and liaise, r.e. development of the above with the LA Schools Safeguarding Lead (RK) and the Board (education) members termly meeting would contribute (including a dialogue about the boundaries and issues).</p> <p>The Safeguarding Leads will feedback to their colleagues in Schools.</p>	<p>JC/RK</p> <p>CSCB Education Members</p>
---	--

2

Other agencies to participate in the Training Needs Analysis as well as CSCB members. **It was agreed to consider how we ask the questions and who we ask, and to make sure that Board members are aware as they have a leadership role.**

GPY suggested the focus should be establishing what single agency training is being delivered across the partnership.

RB noted that he felt it was important to remember that as a partnership we agree standards, seek to facilitate and support a joined up approach in order to present members with evidence that would encourage them to take the needed steps. Equally as a partnership is needed to be clear about what was “good”.

3

PW raised whether that the Multi-agency Workforce Strategy was up to the CSCB. RB confirmed that this was an Ofsted recommendation. He felt there was a need to evidence that we have engaged with this recommendation but agreed that a further discussion may be able to achieve further context in this respect. He felt that if the Board were to set aside the Ofsted recommendation or significantly change it, then this would need to be carefully considered.

Action - RB to work on the Strategic Children’s Workforce Strategy with JC/HB

RB/JC/HB

4

The principle of Deep Dive Audits to further explore how we can more broadly evidence whether or how taking part in training has an impact on practice was supported.

5

The Board confirmed a preference is a 12 month Training Programme and the CSCB to review on a regular basis, though noted the need to be responsive to

new developments and trends in take up/cancellations. The wider issue, r.e. the future volume/methods of delivery etc needed to be carefully considered on the basis of improved analysis of data and information.

6
Board agreement, which directs the Learning and Improvement sub group to continue to explore alternative methods to deliver Safeguarding Training including on-line methods, with the recognition that this may increase costs to purchase or develop new methods of providing leaning and development opportunities.

The above was agreed.

7
It was agreed that continued focus on improving communication (generally and in relation to training) remained a priority for all.

8
There are no requests for additional funding at present. However, the review of on-line booking and other areas may result in a need to look at resource allocation.

HB noted that there was a need to widen our approach to not just be Council led, though this was important in respect of Social Care led activity and also it helped to reduce costs. The on-line booking options were one expression of this and it was recommended that the Sub-group should carefully consider the different types of systems to take care of what system we choose and to explore to join with the Adult Board.

Multi-agency Training Evaluation Report for 2015-2016
Paper received and noted.

**Learning &
Improvement
Sub-group
(HB)**

	<p><u>Multi-agency Training Programme for remainder of 2016-2017</u> Paper received and noted.</p> <p>Action - RB queried the % of the programme that was reliant on there being sufficient take up/demand and asked the Sub-group to consider whether this rational represented any significant risks.</p> <p>It was agreed that this Training Programme meets our current understanding of needs and the Learning & Improvement Sub-group are able to evidence a balanced approach to the range of issues and priorities that have been agreed.</p>	<p>Learning & Improvement Sub-group (HB)</p>
<p>3.3 Child Friendly Calderdale Cabinet Report</p>	<p>LK introduced the proposal being consulted on about Calderdale applying for “Child Friendly City” status. The LA cabinet would be considering a proposal from SS and it was felt that the initial views of partnerships and partners would be helpful. For further information please see http://childfriendlycities.org</p> <p>Applicants have to evidence they meet or are willing to meet key criteria, and the external recognition contributes to overall assurance. Leeds and Bristol are among the cities that have achieved this. There is evidence that it also helps give improved focus across the system on children. It has been to CYPPE and they supported it. SS is setting up a Sub-group as part of CYPPE and a workshop is being planned which will provide the opportunity for further information and understanding. BL asked how we make this work for Calderdale and how to maximise the outcome for us. LK said a representative from Leeds is visiting Calderdale in a couple of months’ time to report on how they are finding it. MG thought this would be good especially with Eureka being in Halifax.</p> <p>RB summarised that it was agreed that, in principal, the CSCB support the steps being taken re Child Friendly Calderdale, and that the Board and</p>	

	<p>partners would need to be clear as to the impact of this for safeguarding and any need for changes in our priorities and plans.</p> <p>Action - RB and Business Group to ensure that Board is represented and sighted on developments</p>	<p>RB/Business Group (JC)</p>
<p>3.4 CSCB Annual Report</p>	<p>Paper and presentation.</p> <p>RB thanked all concerned for their input to date. We are more or less on target in that we have a final working draft and this has resulted in the need to clarify a number of areas/points.</p> <p>In summary, the report represented a continued effort to produce a high quality Annual Report that reflected our ambition to be able to evidence impact and continuous learning. In the light of the Peer Challenge this year's Annual Report is also focusing on the wider whole system and strategic aspects of this. It is broadly indicating that we need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to refine and develop how we “do business” on the basis of improved coordination and integration - It highlights and reinforces the need for all that we do to be founded in PMQA i.e the partnership scrutiny of evidence set against agreed standards and commitments, that results in analysis that enables the partnership to challenge and or be assured that standards are being met, and if not to better understand why and what we need to do next - It indicates that we may need to re-focus to reflect the significance of the early help part of the child’s journey and our understanding of some of the wider risks - It indicates that we may need to rationalise some of our activity in order to focus on initiatives and developments that will have a “whole system” and not just a part system impact - It indicates that we need to improve how we work with other partnerships and commissioners - It affirms the centrality of and direction of travel for Section 11/157 self 	

	<p>assessments and the focus on promoting learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It affirms the role played by members and the need to maintain and develop this <p>Action - Draft version to be sent to members by tomorrow for comments - COMPLETE</p> <p>Action – LGS to send the presentation to members - COMPLETE</p> <p>PW asked about the Child’s Voice. RB indicated that the report suggested we focus on maintaining our relationship with Young Advisors and mapping/ improving co-ordination of what partners and their agencies already do. GPY indicated that the CCG has met to discuss how they evidence the Voice of the Child.</p> <p>LK noted that members would be advised of revised timeline for final comment and publication</p> <p>AF thinks the practice on the ground makes a difference and suggested this should be captured. RB confirmed that this is in the Summary and will be made bolder.</p> <p>RB hopes that members recognised that the report was not just an end in itself but was another opportunity to have a more strategic dialogue and look at how we continue to form our narrative as a partnership.</p> <p>Action – Members to send Annual Report comments to RB</p>	<p>RB/JC</p> <p>LGS</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p>4.1 Performance Management Quarter 4 Analysis and Overview</p>	<p>Jacquie Hellowell was welcomed to the meeting. Six papers received.</p> <p>EARLY HELP OVERVIEW AND EXCEPTION REPORT Positives (Green)</p>	

1.1

Number of Early Intervention Single Assessments. . The target was 75% and this is being achieved.

People have engaged with this and the feedback from partners is positive. It is good that there is one Form and colleagues are getting used to using this format.

1.2

Escalation and de-escalation from Early Intervention Single Assessment (EISA) Progress is being made in supporting and encouraging a wider range of partners to use this pre any referral or sharing of a concern. It is recognised that for some this presents some challenges in terms of resources and familiarity with the concepts used. The development of children's mental and emotional health and wellbeing services raises a new issue as these will work to a different model of levels of intervention. This will need to be addressed by the Board.

This highlighted the need to focus The Continuum of Need and Threshold arrangements as a partnership to ensure that these were relevant and up to date. (NB Copies were available for members at the meeting)

JP raised a challenge that members should ensure and be assured that these were being used. RB felt this was an appropriate challenge as it raised the issue of how central were these in terms of the Boards work and whether or not they were in fact easy to understand?

Board members felt that there was inadequate narrative and analysis from the exception report, and whilst they could understand that this was about being assured that when people had concerns they went to the right place and received the right outcome, this did not really come through. The question was raised as to whether this was both a process measure and an outcome

<p>measure? It was noted that a LA Single Agency Audit has been carried out of how followed up in the service area and that this would be looked at.</p> <p>Action - Further consideration to be given to how information regarding contacts and referrals is subject to analysis and reporting. It was recognised that this was a key process and an outcome measure. Areas for Improvement Activity (Red)</p> <p>It was confirmed that A&E are both showing green and red boxes because the red box is deliberate self harm and this is a high category issue and therefore subject to ongoing scrutiny.</p> <p>It was agreed that additional commentary is needed for Areas for Improvement Activity as well as the more general observations and suggestions raised by members.</p> <p>BL feels there are colleague's around the table who can talk to these areas and issues and LK confirmed that is why Jacquie Hellowell is here to help coordinate this.</p>	<p>JH</p>
<p>Action – Members to feedback to Jacquie Hellowell what would be helpful to enable them to be more prepared and involved</p> <p>It was agreed it would be better to have sentences rather than bullet points.</p> <p>RB summarised that a number of helpful points had been raised that would develop the new way of reporting and place further emphasis on the member role. He reminded members that we need to be sure that data, analysis, narrative and reporting was targeted but also took into account the wider</p>	<p>ALL</p>

aspects of the child's journey. So it was positive that we were committed to checking that the data and narrative is as clear as possible.

CHILD PROTECTION OVERVIEW AND EXCEPTION REPORT

This is a picture of improvement regarding repeat referrals in 12 months but it is below statistical neighbours. There is still scope for improvement but it indicates that interventions are effective the first time round.

JP raised a challenge as to whether there was sufficient scrutiny at the Board of how the amber and the reds are to be addressed?

RB again felt this was an appropriate point and was sure that this would be considered by the Business Group and relevant Sub-groups as to how the exception reports could help Board Members focus their scrutiny and understand what is being asked of them.

Areas for Improvement Activity (Red)

2.10: Stability of placements: Percentage of children looked after with 3 or more placements during the year: The target for this had not been met, and therefore the indicator had moved from Amber to Red. JH explained that even though this was a Red indicator, the % had exceeded both national and statistical neighbour comparators and therefore should be seen as good performance. The lead officer had indicated that the set target was 'overly optimistic and would likely change the target in future reports. This suggestion was met with concern from Board Members who raised issues of how targets were set, who and when revises them, and to what extent as a partnership we challenge this?

RB felt this was a matter the Sub-group may wish to reflect on.

The Stability of Placements: This is an Ofsted measure and RB asked why this is a priority for the CSCB? LK thought it was because the CSCB are concerned about the LAC in Calderdale, and this was an overall indicator as to how well

the LA was discharging its responsibilities. RB felt this was reasonable but raised a question as to how as a partnership we focus on key indicators that principally relate to the performance on one partner.

BL felt that overall it appeared satisfactory but JWS suggested that we should consider impact for children who do not experience stability? There is some relevance for the numbers reported (2 children or 100 children). Small numbers change %'s for Calderdale as we are a small authority. It was agreed it would be helpful to quantify in certain instances %'s with numbers.

Jacque Hellowell noted that Quarter 1 follows a new dataset that the CSCB have agreed and aim to plan to review in the autumn.

RB summarised that there were some helpful suggestions that would need to be considered.

CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER AND ADOPTION OVERVIEW AND EXCEPTION REPORT

Indicator 3.1: Number of children being placed in adoptive families is an area to watch and PW asked when will we see improvement and when will it go back to green? This again raised the issue of why and how as a partnership we monitor particular areas. LK confirmed that the Lead Officer rag rates and this therefore suggested that the CSCB needed to be able to demonstrate they had subjected this assessment to scrutiny?

The result should or could be clear recommendations or advice to the partner(s) concerned and/or consideration of the frequency of reporting.

RB suggested that this complimented other observations from members as to how to continue to develop the arrangements and refining "trigger" or "escalation" points.

JH referred to the Indicator Report and BL said he would prefer a Rolling Report every 12 months rather than individual quarters. However, the frequency of reporting JH observed probably related to the indicator/area in question and

	<p>previous status as well as the level of scrutiny and its results.</p> <p>LEADERSHIP & GOVERNANCE OVERVIEW AND EXCEPTION REPORT</p> <p>JH reminded members that this was intended to present an overview of some of the key indicators that enabled us to monitor things like vacancy rates/use of newly qualified workers/agency workers as well as demand type indicators such as caseloads.</p> <p>RB reflected that though the focus was presently on the LA, this seemed to indicate that some progress was being made, and that the inclusion of information from other partners was important.</p> <p>RB felt due to time constraints and the stage the data/analysis was at it was not possible to draw any firm conclusions</p> <p>Jacque Hellowell confirmed that there is an opportunity to refine the documents.</p> <p>Action - Board member comments and suggestions to be considered in ongoing development of indicators, scrutiny and analysis, narrative and reporting into the board within the new Highlight and Exception reports</p>	<p>JH</p>
<p>4.2 2015-2016 Section 11 Overview Analysis</p>	<p>Paper received.</p> <p>RB noted that this was an initial report to update members, and that further analysis and work was planned.</p> <p>Jacque Hellowell reported good support for new groups to get involved (Schools and North Bank Forum). 152 (89%) return rate was a positive improvement on last year, outstanding returns are being followed up. JH felt there was evidence that people were seeing more benefits especially those who were in effect updating previous assessments. Provisional analysis of data does not appear to skew the picture as going forward. JH has made really useful contacts and relationships and it has been an easier process than last year.</p> <p>JH apologised to SWYPFT for missing them off the report even though their data was received.</p>	

	<p>PW was concerned that the report suggests that the CCG only commission 2 organisations but they do more. It was agreed that further work was needed to more consistently represent the relationship between commissioners and commissioned services, as this was a complex area. JH undertook to address this.</p> <p>Action – PW to discuss the breaking down of data further with JH</p> <p>It was agreed that any further technical queries to be discussed outside of this meeting with JH.</p> <p>PW wondered if the report in its present form contributed to constructive conversation for the CSCB. RB said this was a good point but that this was an initial report principally to make sure members were up to date, as delivery and progress were key areas of improvement from last year’s Annual Report. He was sure that JC/JH would consider further reports in addition to the challenge and learning events.</p> <p>There was some discussion re the next steps and especially thoughts around the challenge and learning events, improving communication and engagement.</p> <p>Members agreed progress is satisfactory, noted the positives re engagement and initial indications of what returns were telling us and looked forward to a fuller evaluation report.</p> <p>Thanks were given to Jacquie Hellowell.</p>	<p>PW</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p>4.3 Wood Review June 2016</p>	<p>Link and paper received. RB referred members to the paper that was a personal reflection. He noted that further details re the wider government response were emerging, and that the legislation was currently subject to some detailed challenge and scrutiny in the House of Lords as it relates to wider issues around the future role of Local</p>	

	<p>Authorities. It was not possible to indicate a clear timeline at present but DfE were looking at a 2 year transitional period.</p> <p>In Summary, RB said that the proposals created greater freedoms for the 3 key statutory agencies (LA/Health and Police) to put arrangements for the independent scrutiny of partnership working for child protection (Safeguarding). The need for some sort of partnership arrangement would remain, SCR arrangements would be subject to change and the responsibility for CDOP would pass to the Department of Health. RB is having conversations with the Chief Executive, PW (Health) and DW (Police) about how we may wish to respond as things become clearer. They will touch base next in September, It was agreed that we need to keep a close eye on our neighbours but at the moment it is business as normal.</p>	
<p>4.4 Serious Case Review (SCR) Update</p>	<p>Paper received and presented by GPY.</p> <p><u>Child M</u> Sentencing concluded There is an extra CSCB meeting on 29 July 2016 and members will receive the report before the meeting. The report will then be submitted to the National Panel. Looking to publish in autumn 2016. There will be a Challenge Event later in the year.</p> <p><u>Child J</u> Agreed publication for 29 July 2016 and members will receive the report a week before publication. Challenge Event in September 2016.</p> <p>Three cases in discussion with RB and will be ready for the next CSCB meeting. The Audit paper re progress on overseeing recommendations and learning form past reviews will come to the next CSCB meeting.</p> <p><u>Child K</u> Had a Challenge Event and this was useful in testing out impact of</p>	

	<p>recommendations and learning. Outcomes are being consolidated and will be shared with Sub-group.</p> <p>There have been no serious incident notifications since the last CSCB.</p>	
4.5 Budget	<p>JC drew attention to baseline alteration re superannuation costs and the Local Authority has put in £4,000 towards this leaving a negative impact of £3300.</p> <p>Action – JC to bring a half year position paper to the next CSCB meeting</p> <p>Action – Members to contact JC if they have any questions about the budget</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>ALL</p>
4.6 Board Members Access to CSCB Papers	<p>Paper received.</p> <p>A new way of accessing information remotely is being introduced for a six month trial. This will allow members to look at and print off papers and other documents for meetings.</p> <p>The Secretariat will still be sending meeting papers in the usual way (via email) and printing papers for Lay members as normal.</p> <p>Will be asking how it's working via Survey Monkey or something similar.</p> <p>Extranet is available now once members have completed and returned the Form.</p> <p>There was a discussion re various concerns and these were noted and will be addressed in management and evaluation of the trial. It was felt important to ensure that all members had access and that this was straightforward and reliable.</p> <p>Action - To review Extranet in 6 months' time to see how it is working</p>	<p>JC</p>
4.7 Safeguarding Week Update	<p>Allison Waddell was welcomed to the meeting.</p> <p>Paper received.</p> <p>The Planning Group is meeting tomorrow and partners have been encouraged to target their own workforce as well as to ensure they are contributing to the</p>	

	<p>programme. There are 3 more events to add to the list, which brings it to approximately 50 events. There will be a launch in the afternoon of Monday 17 October and formal invites to the launch will be coming out next week to all CSCB members.</p> <p>Safeguarding Week materials should be ready by September. PW asked that these are sent out sooner rather than later and AW confirmed that we are drip feeding information out now. Ideally, all the information will be available on the website first.</p> <p>Members asked a number of questions and sought assurances. RB thanked AW and the Planning Group, and noted the points raised re early circulation of information, the need to assure ourselves that all partners were contributing, and the overall objectives would be met.</p>	
<p>4.8 Partner Impact Statements</p>	<p><u>Health (PW)</u> CCG has responded internally to recent inspection and is waiting for formal report. This will be shared with the Board. Outcomes and indications appear positive and strengthen continued improvement.</p> <p><u>CYPPE</u> SS spoke at the CYPPE regarding areas being audited.</p> <p><u>Joint Target Area Inspection</u> Joint target area inspections have completed nationally CSE and missing. (This has shaped the current cross partnership assurance/peer review exercise). The autumn theme is Domestic Abuse and this will require us to be prepared.</p>	
<p>4.9 Updated Assessment of Neglect Toolkit and Introduction of Thresholds Tool</p>	<p>Three papers received. Allison Waddell explained that this was an update of the Assessment of Neglect Toolkit. AW was asked if children have contributed to the revision and she explained that the focus was on professionals and that it had not been felt to be</p>	

	<p>appropriate. AW confirmed that she is holding 2 workshop sessions during Safeguarding Week.</p> <p>It was noted that mental Health is not referred to and this should be added. It refers to depression but needs to be more specific. There were a number of other points and suggestions raised by members</p> <p>Action – AW to add information on mental health</p> <p>Action – AW and JWS to discuss the above outside of this meeting</p> <p>Action – AW to make Toxic Trio clearer</p> <p>The Tool is to cascade to Front Line Practitioners for them to use and AW confirmed that she can attend team meetings to promote this.</p> <p>It was agreed as this was a revision of an existing Toolkit we would take a view from the Business Group re the amendments and then to sign off.</p> <p>It was agreed that an updated version of the Tool to come to CSCB for members to cascade.</p> <p>Thanks were given to Allison Waddell</p> <p>NB Chairs comment: I neglected to address the separate item regarding the introduction of a Thresholds tool. I have agreed to discuss this with JC with a view to it coming to the next Board.</p>	<p>AW</p> <p>AW/JWS</p> <p>AW</p>
<p>5.1 Child Death Overview Panel</p>	<p>Paper received and noted as providing members with update</p>	

(CDOP) Newsletter		
5.2 Minutes from other Partnerships/Boards and Sub-group Reports/Minutes	<p>Papers received from: Business Group (minutes from 25 May 2016) Performance Management (minutes from 7 June 2016) and Indicator Dataset Learning & Improvement (minutes from 14 June 2016) and Rationale for 2016-2017 Programme Communication & Engagement (minutes from 12 May 2016) Early Help & Prevention (minutes from 16 May 2016) Proactive & Responsive (minutes from 2 June 2016) Multi-agency Audit Group (minutes from 14 June 2016)</p>	
6 Any Other Business	<p>It was noted that SWYPFT attend the Proactive & Responsive Sub-group and represent CAMHS.</p>	
7 Rolling Reports/Future Agenda Items	<p>Not discussed due to time constraint</p>	
8 Deferred Items for September 2016 Meeting		
9 Date and Time of Next Meeting	<p>Thursday 1 September 2016 2 pm – 5 pm Shay Stadium, Halifax</p>	