



Lancashire Safeguarding Children Board

January 8th 2010, 9:30am – 12:30pm

Present

Sandra Bilsborrow	LCC
Nigel Burke	Independent Chair
Barbara Campbell	NL PCT
CC Susie Charles	LCC
Peter Ehrhardt	ELHT
Amanda Forshaw	Caritas Care
Ellis Freedman	EL NHS
Pauline Geraghty	Children's Society
Paul Jenkins	LSCB
Liz Laverty	Schools
Lorraine Norris	Preston CC
Sue Reed	LTHTR
Graham Coulston-Herrmann	Lancs Constabulary
Louise Taylor	LCC
Mike Banks	LCC
Jean Rollinson	CL PCT
Tony Morrissey	LCC

Apologies

Sally Allen	LCC
Paul Armitage	LCC
Helen Denton	LCC
Dawn Lang	NSPCC
Ian Phillips	Probation
Patrick Sullivan	LCT
Fatema Master	CAFCASS

Item		Action
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies for Absence NB welcomed all present and accepted apologies for absence.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of Meeting Held on 13 November The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record. SC queried if the issue of reporting to Overview and Scrutiny (pg 5) had been taken up. TM advised that this is scheduled to be looked at in March 2010. PJ advised that this work needs to address scrutiny of the Board and development of roles in relation to this.</p>	
3	<p>Action Sheet</p>	
3.1	<p><u>Action 1, Road Traffic Accident Sub-Group</u> LT advised that this was progressing</p>	
3.2	<p><u>Action 2, Local Authority Designated Officer</u> PJ advised that data had been updated and would shortly be sent out through the Performance Management Sub-group. PJ clarified that the identity of the lead officer needs resolving.</p>	
3.3	<p><u>Action 3, Safer Workforce Toolkit</u> Completed</p>	
3.4	<p><u>Action 4 – Training Update</u> PJ advised that this is still outstanding and that the LSCB Training Coordinator and Pauline Geraghty would submit a report to the next Board meeting.</p>	AFK, PG
3.5	<p><u>Action 5 – Child Sexual Exploitation</u> This action has been completed and is covered under agenda item 9</p>	
3.6	<p><u>Action 6 – 'Forced Marriage and Honour Based Violence' (FMBV)</u> NB advised that this action was just about resolved but needs finalising. NB will write formally to all relevant parties to ensure this is achieved. PJ agreed to arrange this after the meeting.</p> <p>PE initiated a discussion about the appropriateness of the term 'FMBV' and whether we could use a different term. It was concluded that this is the accepted term in policy and practice. It was however, agreed that the term could be used in inverted commas if this was preferred.</p>	
3.7	<p><u>Action 7- FMBV</u> LN advised that she has emailed the network of existing groups. Only a few responses received so far. LN will email out again and copy NB in.</p>	
3.8	<p><u>Action 8 – FMBV</u> Completed</p>	
3.9	<p><u>Action 9 – FMBV</u> Completed</p>	
3.10	<p><u>Action 10 – LSCB Membership & Structure</u> LT suggested the Board should agree a Stay Safe forum on behalf of the Children's Trust and that this should be less LCC focused, it was agreed that this would be a good way to proceed and that LT could be chair the forum. NB asserted that the Board are responsible but not accountable for the Stay Safe theme. PJ agreed to complete a report to the central governing body using a statutory template. PJ also raised the issue of reviewing the relationship between the Children's Trust and the Board when the new Working</p>	PJ

	<p>Together guidance comes into effect shortly. A consultation on this is currently in progress and the outcomes of this will not be available until the final document is rolled out. PJ advised that Ruth Clayton is doing a briefing on Ch7 (Child Death Procedures) and suggested a small group be convened to complete a briefing paper for each chapter. It was agreed this would be good idea from a multi-agency perspective. PJ agreed to send out a link to the relevant documentation with the minutes and to coordinate the establishment of a working group which would consist of TM, JC, PJ and a representative from the Constabulary. This to be done by 20th February.</p> <p>NB asked if all members could look at the Working Together consultation document and forward any comments so they can be collated into a Board response.</p>	<p>PJ</p> <p>All</p>
3.11	<p><u>Action 11 – SCR Post</u> This post has now been filled by Catherine Grindrod who will start on 25th January. NB commented on the high standard of applicants.</p>	
3.12	<p><u>Action 12 - IMR template</u> PJ advised that the common IMR template was still being discussed with regional LSCB Business Managers. Apparently there is little difference between our current one and the proposed regional one, so no problems with assimilation are currently anticipated. There is also work being done nationally in relation to IMR format, which could result in a national template. Ofsted will need to agree whatever template is decided.</p>	
3.13	<p><u>Action 13 – Servoco Dream</u> PJ advised this piece of work is currently on hold, Servoco Dream are currently liaising with GONW. The SCIE project is currently being prioritised.</p>	
3.14	<p><u>Action 14 – CDOP</u> This is on the substantive agenda please see item 11.</p>	
4	Lancashire's Response to the Badman Report	
4.1	<p>Angela Robinson (Special Teacher – LCC) gave a PowerPoint presentation in relation to the Badman report which addresses safeguarding issues for children educated at home. RM will send the presentation to all members with the minutes of the meeting. PE asked If someone chose to home educate, do they have to inform someone, if so who? AR advised that, yes the Local Authority should be informed and parents have a legal duty to register.</p>	
4.2	<p>EF asked if it was known how many children and families in Lancashire are home educating and what concerns existed. AR advised that there 430 known children and that numbers had risen alarmingly over the last 3 years. There may be more that are not known about where parents have not registered. LT added that Overview & Scrutiny had figures that showed 125 of these children were from traveller families and that measures are in place to engage with the traveller community.</p>	
4.3	<p>EF asked if there were reported instances of safeguarding issues in Lancashire. AE advised that any concerns should be raised with the Children Missing from Education or Safeguarding team. A lot of referrals are due to suspicion of safeguarding issues. TM asked if there are any checks made on the family and home circumstances. AR advised that there were, home visit are made within the first month and parents are engaged to work through any difficulties. A CRB check is also made as well as a check of agency records with regard to any adults in the home; this information is covered in a parent's questionnaire.</p>	

4.4	NB asked if information is shared with partner agencies. AR advised that it was, this included the Health economy. JC suggested that school nurses should also be party to any relevant information.	
4.5	<p>BC asked how disputes between parents as to whether home education is appropriate are resolved. AR advised that this is something that would be worked through with families.</p> <p>TM asked if an assessment process existed. AR advised that there was not and we are currently reliant on information provided voluntarily, it is recognised that this is a flaw in current system. AR also advised that there were no unannounced visits.</p> <p>GC-H advised that Contact Point should assist where there are gaps in self disclosure. NB summarised that there are a lot of questions for The Board with regard to systems and processes, especially between adult services and home education. Can we put something in place so adult services can notify the Elective Home Education team of any concerns? NB also asserted that The Board needs a mechanism for completing the annual report to the Children's Trust.</p>	
4.6	A discussion took place about self disclosure, appropriate safeguarding checks and the need for all agencies to be engaged in this. LT suggested that parents be informed that routine safeguarding checks would be carried out. This principal was agreed as a way forward. PE advised that legislation will provide a step forward and was expressed concerns that some organisations are campaigning against this as this could create barriers to safeguarding. NB asserted that agencies must share info if anyone discovers safeguarding issues, especially with regard to adults who have access to the home / children. JR added that health concerns, such as not receiving immunisations etc should also be investigated. GC-H suggested that proposals for a registration process could be useful in light of the concerns raised.	
4.7	NB summarised that The Board needs to do what it can to safeguard children, and specifically its engagement with adult services and the Children's Trust about these issues. Also a system needs to be explored for notifying agencies of the names and addresses of Children at risk and any adults present at the home. LT agreed to liaise with Bob Stott about this and report back.	LT
4.8	PE added that if a nurse should pick up a new case there needs to be a system to ensure the information is passed on.	
4.9	PJ highlighted the need for more robust links between information about missing children and children educated at home. These issues are significant in current Serious Case Reviews. PG advised that many parents are actively lobbying against proposed legislation which is likely to create a lot of challenges in the future.	
5	Finance report	
5.1	There is a planned contingency of £115K, this has been generated from a prudent use of the area based grant for the child death process. It has been agreed that this will be used to sustain activity when the CDOP grant ends next year. The Board also has to maintain a surplus to deal with any additional SCR costs in year. Costs for SCR are rising.	
5.2	PJ also pointed out that a number of issues around agency contributions means only about 80% of the proposed budget is available; therefore we are likely to have a deficit in the near future. A growing need for predicting expenditure and income is arising, especially in light of Government expectations for child death and other preventative work.	

	<p>Training particularly can prove to be cost intensive. We therefore need to plan the 2011/12 budget with this in mind - possibly through a sub group or the current steering group? GONW have been asked to clarify what the financial position for LSCB's is likely to be next year. Discussions between central government are ongoing and a decision is unlikely until after the general election.</p>	
5.3	<p>GC stated that over next 3 years all Police budgets will be reduced severely, the police may therefore need to reduce their contribution. The Board will also need to look at efficiency savings especially around training, SCRs and CDOP as soon as possible. NB asserted a need to plan financially regardless of which administration wins the general election. The Steering Group should look at this further. This is something the Steering group also needs to look at. PJ stated that the surplus may be absorbed very quickly, NB advised that there is a need to have and understand a clear rationale for the financial planning for The Board. The Board can demonstrate funds are being used effectively.</p>	
5.4	<p>EF asked if we should use the surplus for the new SCR post, rather than asking for additional contributions.</p>	
5.5	<p>LN advised that if the surplus is to be used for a soft landing to cover loss of the Area Grant, finance directors should not be too critical if this is clear from the budget. NB concluded that the Steering Group needs to get a handle on these issues, plan a way forward, and report back to board.</p>	NB, PJ
6	<p>CAFCASS Inspection This item was cancelled, FM sent her apologies.</p>	
7	<p>CAF Review</p>	
7.1	<p>LT summarised the findings of the CAF review report on behalf of Faith Mann. The report presented an analysis of the key findings of the review. LT felt the review did not give any new information or raise any issues that are not already recognised. Some issues were also discussed at the last Review group meeting, particularly concerns that CAF is being used for gate keeping purposes. The Recommendations of the review are set out in the report including the need for early intervention in families. The Children's Trust will review and revisit these recommendations.</p>	
7.2	<p>BC advised that in the Health Economy there are significant concerns that GPs are using CAF as a referral mechanism. The Local Medical Council has also discussed these issues. There are particular concerns about the time required to complete a CAF. BC advised that they are trying their best to support this. JR reiterated the need to get the process clarified and easier to use for staff. PJ advised that locality groups were also reporting a number of issues with it. However, issues exist with information in relation to CAF, its effectiveness and scrutiny of it in ensuring children's needs are met. Concerns have also been expressed about the level of support for the referral or assessment process, consistency of approach and accountability. More robust links are felt to be required between locality groups the Trust and the Partnership.</p>	
7.3	<p>GC-H advised that Faith Mann is leading on the development of CAF and has set up a group for this purpose. GC-H feels that if the group works properly it will substantially improve the safeguarding of children.</p>	
7.4	<p>LN reiterated that the review needs to be rolled out to localities, as they are really struggling with CAF.</p>	

7.5	<p>NB stated that the review raised some big questions, which appears to be incongruent with the recent inspectors report which suggested we are doing well in this area. LT added that there were additional complexities and problems due to size of the area, but acknowledged that some good work has been done. It was clarified that the inspectors were satisfied with the general level of knowledge about CAF, but there is still work to be done.</p> <p>NB summarised that the key question is whether CAF is actually working and how can it be evidenced that it is improving services. The Board needs to see evidence of this.</p>	
7.6	<p>A discussion then took place the key points from which are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to focus on the child and not get sidetracked by the process (SR) • Early intervention strategy needs to be progressed (NB) • Faith Mann is completing a progress report for the Children's Trust in relation to early intervention. This will be available for the next Board meeting • More support and reassurance is required for Health staff who have concerns (BC), JR advised this could be achieved through school nurses. • It would be helpful to see some data around numbers completed, trends, lead professionals etc. (EF) • Poor information from the database raises more questions which causes more confusion. (PJ) • Terminology is confusing, clarity required specifically around referral and assessment (PJ) 	
7.8	<p>NB advised that members should liaise outside the meeting to resolve issues that may arise as and when they occur.</p>	
7.9	<p>LT suggested that the main recommendations be shared freely. NB agreed that this would be useful and he would liaise with PJ to ensure this is done on behalf of The Board.</p>	PJ
7.10	<p>It was also agreed that a note would go out to LSCB members summarising the CAF review findings and clarifying some of the confusion regarding terminology. LT agreed to speak to Faith Mann about this and then PJ and TM will draft a briefing note to be agreed by NB and Faith and distributed to all members.</p>	LT, PJ, TM, NB
8	<p>Break</p>	
9	<p>QA / PM Sub-group – Progress Report</p>	
9.1	<p>BC presented the report. If anyone wants to be part of the group please contact BC. TM advised that the Appendix 1 reference to Peter Kemp needs to be changed to Sally Allen.</p>	BC
9.2	<p>BC went through Appendix 3, which was also an item at the last sub-group meeting, this looks at regulatory bodies, questions are suggested in order that a baseline can be derived and presented to The Board. Action plans need to be produced for 'red' measures. There is also a need to scrutinise performance at events and BC is looking for suggestions from agencies to suggest their own criteria. This will be sent out to all agencies within 3 months so an action plan can be developed within 12 months.</p>	
9.3	<p>JR expressed concern that the QA audit was duplicating information that was monitored as part of the Hospital Children's Services Review; it was agreed that SR and JR would review the standards contained within the Hospital Services Review to determine what if</p>	JR, SR

	<p>any should form part of the quality assurance audit. TM asked where The Board and its developments fit in with this work. BC clarified appendix 4 covered this in the 12 month calendar of audits. This can be used for identifying scrutiny areas. TM advised that he was happy to include LCC audits and asked if there are clear standards to measure against? If so do these need to be present in the framework? BC advised that there was and that ultimately all information needs to be pulled together to look at how effective agencies are, after 12 months.</p>	
9.4	<p>JR expressed concerns about duplicate existing reporting; this can be discussed within the group. BC reiterated the need to focus on improving outcomes. LC raised the issue of an absence of representation on the group from LCC CYP and better connections between the ToR for the Review Group. BC needs to see a copy of the modified ToR from Nicola Melia. It was agreed that the interaction between these groups needs to be looked at and the ToR's need to reflect this. Collaborative sessions may help to improve this connectivity.</p>	
9.5	<p>EF felt that this work represented a very useful starting point. We now need to set a date for an initial report to The Board in respect to individual agency and multi-agency work. This needs to take a holistic view to link with other reports and information.</p>	
9.6	<p>NB thanked BC for her good work and efforts so far. The concern is that we still don't have a robust system to evidence how well The Board is performing. NB asked members to go away and think about the issues raised, how the proposed audit calendar can be used and to populate the documents, so they can be endorsed. There is also a need to look at the relationship with Children's Trust PM / QA arrangements.</p>	
9.7	<p>AF asked if the voluntary sector could have some pointers with regard to their input. BC advised that it would be easier if the voluntary sector could come up with something based on their information then this can be looked at. This was agreed.</p>	AF
9.8	<p>PJ requested that direction to locality groups be provided as these are crucial to the framework.</p>	
9.9	<p>NB advised that developments would feature on future LSCB agendas.</p>	
10	<p>CYPP Priority Action Plan</p>	
10.1	<p>LT presented the report and reiterated the need to maintain close links with the main CYP Plan. The Stay Safe Policy Development Board (PDB) is planned to become a sub-group of the LSCB, representatives are currently being sought.</p>	
10.2	<p>LT advised that 4 key priorities had been identified for the Stay Safe Objective. Current work has provided an opportunity to refresh the action plan. LT asked if anyone wanted to add any other items which LT can oversee as chair of the PDB. It was suggested that a joint session with this group may be useful. Anything to be added should be forwarded to RM for inclusion.</p>	All
10.3	<p>The plan shows that we are generally on target with addressing most issues. Road Traffic Accident's and Children Killed or Seriously Injured has created a lot of concern. In relation to this, Environment Directorate colleagues are linking up with the Children's Trust and getting involved with families of victims. However, this work needs integrating into policy. LT advised that national child accident prevention week would be occurring in June, this would be a good opportunity for The Board to promote good practice.</p>	

10.4	EF requested that a 20mph speed limit be an explicit commitment in areas around schools. CCSC provided a good practice example from Leicester where flashing warnings signs have been used effectively.	
10.5	PE asked if something can be done to address problems with cycleway lay out and poor planning of these which creates unsafe situations for children cycling. LT advised that Environment have done a lot of worked around safer cycling, but will feed these further concerns in.	
10.6	LN queried who is leading on reducing accidents as this is currently unclear. LT advised that all agencies have a responsibility and need to link with community safety partnerships. NB stated that The Board needs to influence the development of the plan and a mechanism needs to be formalised. To this end NB requested all to give some thought to what can be added so a formal response can be made. The refresh is due in Feb/March.	
10.7	SR requested that clarity be provided with regard to effectiveness across the 6 areas. SR Asked if we need to identify specific indicators? LT & PJ advised that these are presented in the report, are linked to key indicators and are also part of the PM / QA framework.	
11	Managers Update PJ gave an update on items as follows:	
11.1	<u>CDOP</u> There are 3 key areas of work – rapid response, review and reporting and preventative work. Current issue for the panel is that these 3 areas are commissioned and funded in different ways we need to look at whether they can they be brought together across the 3 Local Authorities by having a CDOP pooled budget. PJ suggested that the group give this some thought and look at this in principal, identify any possible savings and acknowledge that some aspects of the process are still not compliant. JR agreed that this approach would improve current arrangements with regard to the Rapid Response element. NB asked that key officers can work on this and present back to the board. JR agreed to lead on this.	JR
11.11	PJ advised that there were still issues with reporting but progress has been made. Some frustration exists around completing the forms and getting in the information in. For this reason an extra panel has been planned before year end. Following an improvement in reporting, 21 deaths will be considered at the next meeting.	
11.12	PE stated that he had serious concerns as to whether all cases are being considered properly given the volume of work. GC-H suggested a system of tiering cases so more time can be spent on cases that require more scrutiny. NB & PJ agreed that this was worth exploring. PJ also advised that New Working Together guidance has made the process harder and the definition of 'preventable' is now more complex, this will mean more discussions will be required and bigger decisions made. NB agreed to speak with PJ about this outside meeting. RC will be doing a briefing for the new Working Together, Chapter 7.	PJ, NB NB
11.13	JR asked that the panel receive new guidance as a matter of urgency, and that if it is felt	

	necessary, The Board should approach coroners about this. NB agreed to do this. BC advised that she has contacted the Coroner's Office and is liaising with PJ about this.	
11.14	PJ advised that a decision has been made that the CDOP protocol can sit in draft form until the final protocol becomes available; this will go to business meetings and can be used for now. JR stated that partner agencies need to be involved. PJ advised that consultation needs will go out through CDOP.	
11.2	<u>SCIE review</u> PJ reported that this is progressing as planned. Initial concerns from OFSTED and DCSF have now been alleviated. Ofsted will now have to review the report produced at the end of the pilot as they would a SCR.	
11.3	<u>Police Safeguarding DCI</u> PJ confirmed that Justin Srivastava has now taken up his new post in the Police. A formal thank you was given for Justin by all members for his contribution to The Board.	
12	SCR	
12.1	PJ presented the matrix of current cases. There is only 1 SCR proceeding at present, for the case of CVRH. The initial Terms of Reference have been drafted and will be agreed with the independent chair and panel this afternoon.	
12.2	LT raised concerns that a number of cases have still not received OFSTED evaluations or that feedback was poor and / or late. Can The Board register concerns to OFSTED? NB is happy to do this and report back.	NB
12.3	PE stated that he feels SCR timescales are unrealistic (particularly if IMR's are to be of sufficient quality), and this is widely recognised so we need not raise this as an issue. NB stated that Lancashire was not performing as well as other areas in this respect. PJ advised that the case of DLN is now complete, this was delayed due to the inspector having competing priorities from unannounced inspections. The evaluation should be with us soon.	
12.4	PJ advised that the evaluation for the case of CS was close to completion. But there was no indication of where things were up to for the case of KLIB.	
13	LSCG Headlines	
13.1	PJ clarified to LN that Central and South Lancashire locality groups have now merged. This group still exhibits a high level of commitment. JR has recently been appointed as Chair.	
13.2	JR advised that Lancashire Care Foundation Trust are not tendering for drug services so we need to be aware that the provider is, as yet, not known.	
13.3	PJ advised that Lancaster, Fylde and Wyre locality group were experiencing a number of issues with CAF and SCR Action Plans. It was felt that the issue with SCR Action Plans needs to be raised at The Board for a formal steer and to give some sign off to the Review Group.	
13.4	LT questioned whether the ToR are clear enough in this respect for locality groups. NB agreed that the ToR should be to be checked.	PJ

14	Urgent Business	
14.1	NB expressed concerns that too much meeting time is being spent on process and systems, and although he recognised that it is vitally important to get these right in future would like to aim for shorter agendas concentrating more on outcomes, priorities, issues that matter and what is being done.	
14.2	GC-H advised that he now has the latest review of Domestic Violence proposals. He will circulate these when more information is available in relation to domestic homicide reviews.	
14.3	BC advised that the Child Sexual Exploitation results are still being worked on.	
14.4	EF announced that he had accepted a new post in London and said farewell and thanks to all. NB gave formal thanks to EF for the exemplary work done and that he will be missed. All present wished EF well for the future.	