

1. Attendance, Apologies & Governance.

| SLSCB Members | Title | Representing | Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair) | ✓ ✗ |
|----------------------|---|-----------------|--|--------|
| Colin Morris (CM) | LSCB Independent Chair | SLSCB | | ✓ |
| Pauline Beall (PB) | Business Manager | | MALAP (Multi Agency Looked After Partnership) | ✓ |
| Lesley Cooke (LC) | Lay Member | | Eastern Ravens Trust | ✓ |
| Jo Thornhill (JT) | Lay Member | | Middlesbrough College Lecturer Teesside University Lecturer | ✗ |
| Jane Humphreys (JH) | Corporate Director of Children, Education & Social Care (CESC) | Local Authority | CCG Stockton Locality Board Member Stockton Local Executive Group Adult Safeguarding (Ch.) Hartlepool & Stockton CCG Board Member Health and Well Being Board (HWB) HWB Adult Partnership HWB Children's Partnership SMB – Public Protection Tees Adult Safeguarding Board TSVG Strategic Group Safer Stockton Partnership | ✗ |
| Lynda Brown (LB) | Head of Education, Early Years & Complex Needs and SBC / Spark of Genius Joint Venture: King Edwin School | | | ✓ |
| Eric Jewitt (EJ) | SBC CESC Children's Workforce Manager / Chair Children's Workforce Sub Group | | | ✓ |
| Peter Kelly (PK) | Director of Public Health | | | ✗ |
| Liz Hanley (LH) | Adult Services Lead | | Health and Well Being Commissioning Group. Learning Disabilities Partnership (Ch.) Stockton Local Executive Group Adult Safeguarding; | ✓ |
| Shaun McLurg (SMcL) | Head of Children & Young People's Services and Spark of Genius Children's Homes | | CAF Board (Ch.) Children & Young People Health Wellbeing Commissioning Group Youth Offending Service Management Board | ✓ |
| Julie Nixon (JN) | Head of Housing & Community Protection | | Domestic violence Strategy Group, Health and Wellbeing Partnership Safer Stockton Partnership, SBC Adult Social Care Board, Welfare Reform Board | ✓ |
| Simon Willson (SW) | SBC CESC Head of Business Support & Improvement / Chair Performance Sub Group | | | ✓ |
| Cllr Ann McCoy (AMc) | Lead Cabinet Member - Children and Young People (Participating Observer) | | | ✗ |
| Janice Deakin (JDe) | Service Manager | | CAFCASS | ✓ |

| SLSCB Members | Title | Representing | Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair) | ✓ ✗ |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|--------|
| Rob Donaghy (RD) | Detective Superintendent | Cleveland Police | | ✓ |
| Alex Taylor (AT) | Head Teacher Independent Schools | Education Establishments | | ✓ |
| Claire Humble (CH) | Head Teacher Secondary Schools | | ✗ | |
| Kerry Coe (KC) | Head Teacher Primary Schools | | ✓ | |
| Joanna Bailey (JB) | Principal S'ton 6 th Form College | | 14-19 Partnership, Campus Stockton CPD Group Campus Stockton R&D Group Secondary Heads Group, | ✓ |
| Diane McConnell (DMc) | SBC Chief Advisor School Effectiveness | | ✓ | |
| Jean Fruend (JF) | Executive Nurse | Hartlepool & Stockton Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) | | ✗ |
| Karen Hedgley (KH) | Senior Manager, Children's Safeguarding and Looked After Children (Designated Nurse). <i>Advisor to the Board</i> | | ✓ | |
| Kailash Agrawal (KAg) | Designated Doctor <i>Advisor to the Board</i> | | ✓ | |
| Bev Walker (BW) | Deputy Director of Nursing, Quality and Safety | NHS England (Durham, Darlington & Tees Area Team) | | ✓ |
| Linda Watson (LW) | Clinical Director Community Services (SLSCB Vice Chair) | North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust | Better Care Fund Steering Group Hartlepool LSCB Hartlepool LSCB Training & Development Group (Ch.) North of Tees Partnership Group | ✓ |
| Chris Stanbury (CR) | Executive Director of Nursing and Governance | Tees, Esk & Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust | | ✗ |
| Julie Allan (JA) | Director of Offender Services -Durham & Tees Valley | Probation Services | | ✗ |
| Barbara Gill (BG) | Head of Offender Services - Community Rehabilitation Company | | ✗ | |
| Julie McNaughton (JM) | Accommodation Contracts Manager | Thirteen / Housing Provider | | ✗ |
| Steve Rose (SR) | Chief Executive Officer Catalyst | Voluntary Sector | Safer Stockton Partnership, Stockton 14-19 Partnership, Stockton Carers Implementation Group, Stockton Health & Wellbeing Partnership Stockton VCSE Senior Leaders Forum, Stockton Voice, Stockton Youth Offenders Service Board, Tees Dementia Collaborative, Tees Valley Local Development Agencies Forum, Tees Valley Unlimited European Social Inclusion Task & Finish Group | ✓ |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Minute Taker & Guests: | Nigel Hart, SLSCB Administrator | | |
| Karen Agar- Tees, Esk & Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust (sub for Chris Stanbury) | Rita Taylor -Non Executive Member-North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust | Chris Callan -NHS England | |
| Sarah Bowman-Public Health (sub for Peter Kelly) | John Bagley -National Probation Service (sub for Julie Allan) | Jeff Evans-DTV-CRC (sub for Barbara Gill) | |

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Meeting Quorate: | Yes |
|-------------------------|-----|

| | |
|---------------------------------|------|
| Declarations of Interest | None |
|---------------------------------|------|

| Ref No. 1 | SLSCB Action Log |
|----------------------------|---|
| <i>Discussion</i> | PB advised that the SLSCB Action Log had been circulated for information. There were no actions overdue. Further evidence in respect of any outstanding actions should be reported to the Business Manager. |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted content of Action Log. |

| Ref No. 2 | Continuum of Need and Services |
|----------------------------|---|
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>SMcL presented the final draft version of the Board's Continuum of Need and Services which reflected amendments suggested by the Police following the last Board meeting to include a summary of their contribution to the framework in working with children and families.</p> <p>It was noted that the framework prescribed that all professional referrals made by telephone should be followed up by the referrer with the submission of a completed Tees Multi Agency SAFER referral tool <u>within 48 hours; and not 24 hours</u> as currently stated on the Tees Procedures website.</p> <p>Members endorsed the final draft of the document and asked that the anomaly in respect of the referral timescale on the Tees Procedures Group website be reviewed and corrected to make sure the information is consistent.</p> <p>Discussion ensued regarding the most appropriate arrangements and timescale for 're-launching' the agreed Continuum of Need and Services document. It was suggested that awareness of the new framework be rolled out within a concise one page Communications Strategy including the following actions that would form the basis of a formal launch from 1st January 2015:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the document be reformatted to include the date of endorsement by the SLSCB; ▪ Tees Procedures website in respect of the 48 / 24 hour anomaly related to submission of the SAFER Referral form to Children's Social Care to be consistent; ▪ new changes to the document be highlighted to increase awareness; ▪ the next e-mail briefing to Board Members to include new Continuum of Need and Services document be circulated to each of the partner agencies; ▪ each Board Member be requested to raise awareness within their own organisation to the changes and content of the new framework; ▪ Workforce Training to include reference to the new document within their current CAF briefings, and arrange additional sessions specific to the document itself. |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted and endorsed the final draft Continuum of Need and Services document. |

| Log Ref | Mtg Date | Action Required | Person Responsible | Due Date |
|------------|----------|---|--------------------|----------|
| 63/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | A brief Communications Strategy to be prepared documenting the steps taken to raise awareness of the new Continuum of Need and Services document as | KH/EJ/PB | 01/12/14 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | outlined above with an official launch date of 1 st January 2015. | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Ref No. 3 | DBS Notifications | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>PB advised the Board of legal advice received which confirmed that LSCB Board Members, including Lay Members, were required to hold a valid DBS (Disclosure & Barring Service) certificate.</p> <p>Schedule 4 Part 1 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 Para 4 (1) provided that membership of a Local Children Safeguarding Board was a regulated activity relating to children, and therefore required a valid DBC certificate.</p> <p>Board Members were therefore asked to provide evidential assurance by 27th February 2015 that they had a valid DBS notification by presenting the original document to PB so that she can verify the evidence and record the date of issue. Renewal will be required every 3 years. Costs associated with DBS applications in respect of Lay Members would be met by the SLSCB.</p> | | | |
| <i>Agreement Outcome</i> | / Noted the DBS checks for LSCB Members Report and agreed that all Board Members are required to have a valid DBS notification. | | | |
| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
| 64/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | Board Members to let PB have sight of their original DBS notification. | All Board Members | 27.02.14 |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Ref No. 4 | Future Arrangements for the Board's Annual Challenge (S110 of Partner Agencies | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>Consideration was given to the purchase of an on-line Audit Toolkit as an appropriate and cost effective means of assessing how Partner Agencies were meeting their safeguarding requirements in accordance with Section 11 of the Children Act 2004. It was noted that if adopted, this would replace the individual presentations to the Board from key agencies.</p> <p>The proposal was submitted in accordance with the SLSCB Business Plan, Objective 6: Strengthen the QA and Performance Management framework, Key Action 6e required the SLSCB Chair to clarify future arrangements for the Board's annual challenge of partner agencies' quality assurance processes.</p> <p>The Safeguarding e-Academy from whom the LSCB purchase e-learning in conjunction with the Virtual College had developed an online visual auditing tool for organisations that work with children to conduct such audits, allowing them to save time by automating the resource hungry but all important Section 11 Audit process. A demonstration of the toolkit had been given to both the SLSCB Chair, Business Manager and acting Business Support Officer, where it was explained that its functionality could additionally be used for other audits / evaluations that the LSCB were expected to carry out. This multi-functional audit tool would make this process far more efficient and effective not just for the LSCB to track and monitor organisations that work with children, but also for the organisations themselves to see at a glance what they need to do and how to become fully compliant.</p> <p>Purchase of the full Audit Toolkit allowed the purchaser to build as many audit tools as it required. e.g. MACFA, Training Evaluations, Surveys etc . As Stockton LSCB was a founder member of the Safeguarding e-Academy; the following reduced member rates for purchase of the toolkit had been offered:</p> <p>i) For the Section 11 Toolkit only, the cost would be £5,000 per annum, with any additional templates charged at £1,000 and Virtual College would build these for the LSCB.</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| | <p>ii) Purchase of the full Audit Toolkit (allowing it to be used to undertake S11 and any other audits / evaluations) would cost £8,000 per annum and the LSCB would have the freedom to build as many templates as required.</p> <p>Members of the Board were offered the opportunity to see a demonstration of the toolkit themselves prior to making a decision as to a possible purchase.</p> | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | <p>Noted the content of the future arrangements for the Boards Annual Challenge of Partner Agencies report and agreed that representatives of Virtual College be invited to demonstrate the toolkit to Board Members in advance of either the December or January Board meeting.</p> <p>N.B. This will be provided prior to the 18th December Board meeting.</p> | | | |
| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
| 65/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | PB to arrange a demonstration of the Audit Toolkit prior to either the December or January Board meeting | PB | 01.12.14 |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Ref No. 5 | SLSCB Multi Agency Training:- |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>a) SLSCB Multi Agency Training Attendance & Evaluation Report-April-September 2014</p> <p>A summary of Multi Agency Safeguarding Training delivered during the period April-September 2014 was presented to the Board. During this period, 30 multi-agency training courses had been delivered, with 551 attendees from the various partner agencies and organisations.</p> <p>The report also included evaluation feedback received from attendees regarding each of the 30 courses delivered, specifically requesting that attendees rate the course against the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting the aims/objectives of the course ▪ Organisation of the course ▪ Facilitation/presentation of the session ▪ Meeting the attendees needs/expectations ▪ Administration of the course <p>The Board noted that 90-95% of all courses were rated excellent and good, with the remaining small number rated as satisfactory.</p> <p>EJ advised that it was essential for the aims/objectives of each course to be clearly set out beforehand to ensure that all those attending were fully aware of what each training course intended to be achieved. PB advised that in addition to post course evaluation, each course was quality assured beforehand and opportunities were taken to observe delivery of the courses whenever possible.</p> <p>b) SLSCB Charging Policy 2014-15-Review</p> <p>At the Board meeting held on 19th June 2014, it was agreed that the current SLSCB Training Charging Policy be reviewed following the decision to introduce within this policy charging in respect of attendance at training by staff members from local charities or small voluntary community groups eg Third Sector organisations.</p> <p>EJ provided attendance statistics from the period immediately prior to the introduction of charging for Third Sector organisations, to the present date (end of Sept 2014). The</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| <p>Board noted that since the new charging was introduced, attendance at full day courses had reduced significantly, although the reasons for this could also be in part due to organisations no longer having the capacity to release people to attend full day courses. The annual revenue raised from the charging policy was expected to be around the same for both 2013/14 and 2014/15 (£2,620).</p> <p>The Board noted that many small charity or voluntary sector groups were unable to access grant and funding streams that other larger Third Sector organisations were able to, and were therefore disadvantaged in terms of being able to access available training.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with colleagues from Hartlepool Safeguarding Children Board (HSCB) regarding the possibility of a joint training provision being established for 2015/16, which would require a single charging policy being developed and approved by each respective Board. One option being considered within any new charging policy would be to identify a 'cut-off' figure based on annual turnover that would enable any groups/organisations with turnover less than this amount to be eligible to access the training free of charge.</p> <p>SR advised that with immediate effect, CATALYST were prepared to offer a bursary fund for safeguarding training that would consider applications for financial assistance from small charity or voluntary sector groups that were unable to meet the current cost of attendance at training courses or alternatively they could provide some core funding to SLSCB. Further discussions were necessary with EJ, Chair of the Training Task Group, to identify the likely demand from their members, the training needs required, and the estimated costs involved. PB, Business Manager to discuss the financial arrangements with SR.</p> | | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | | Noted and endorsed that the current charging policy be retained pending further development of the HSCB/SLSCB discussions and the possible introduction of a single charging policy for 2015/16; and that further discussions take place with representatives from CATALYST regarding arrangements to allow small charity or voluntary sector groups to receive training free of charge. | | |
| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
| 66/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | Discussion to take place with representatives from CATALYST re training for small charity, local or community sector groups. | EJ / PB | 20.12.14 |
| 67/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | Arrange meeting to discuss financial contribution from CATALYST to SLSCB | PB | 5.12.14 |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Ref No. 6 | SLSCB Evaluation |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>Members of the Board were invited to discuss (in group work format) responses received as part of the internal self-assessment of the SLSCB conducted via Survey Monkey, which was developed based on the existing Ofsted framework, but localised by the LSCB Chair and circulated recently to all partner agencies.</p> <p>19 responses to the questions had been received and each group were invited to evaluate the responses received to specific questions and asked to confirm or reject the response received based on their own assessment of the question. It was noted that of the 22 questions put, only 3 had generated a response that suggested our arrangements were less than satisfactory. Each group was therefore asked to particularly focus on a response to these questions.</p> <p>Details of the specific questions and responses provided are detailed at Appendix 1.</p> |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Agreed that the outcomes from the self-evaluation process proved beneficial in helping |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Board Members to determine SLSCB strengths and areas for improvement. |
|--|---|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Ref No. 7 | Health 2013/2014 Annual Reports as provided to their Organisation |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>a) Tees, Esk & Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust-Annual Assurance Update from Safeguarding Children Working Group</p> <p>The Board noted the content of the Annual Assurance update provided by the Tees, Esk & Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust on current issues pertaining to Safeguarding Children.</p> <p>The report included an analysis of Safeguarding training undertaken across each of the Trust's areas. In Teesside, it was noticeable that there had been an increase in the numbers of staff undertaking all levels of training, including level 3 which had not been the case for some other areas of the Trust.</p> <p>b) Extract from Hartlepool, Stockton and South Tees Clinical Commissioning Group Joint Annual Quality and Safeguarding Report 2013/14</p> <p>The Board noted the content of an extract from the Hartlepool, Stockton and South Tees Clinical Commissioning Group Joint Annual Quality and Safeguarding Report 2013/14 insofar as it applied to activity undertaken during the year to safeguard children and Looked After Children (LAC).</p> <p>KH highlighted for the Board's attention to the fact that at present there were currently no Named General Practitioners (GP's) for Safeguarding Children across the Tees. Although not a statutory requirement, the role was acknowledged as being important within the Accountability Framework: Safeguarding Vulnerable People in a reformed NHS 2013 for driving up the quality of Primary Cares contribution to safeguarding children. More was needed to be done to 'market' the role in a way that was likely to attract interest from GP's; but in the meantime, safeguarding children professionals would continue to work with NHS England Area Team, Co Durham, Darlington and Tees to mitigate against any potential risks that this may cause.</p> |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted the content of the Health 2013/2014 Annual Reports. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Ref No. 8 | Review Arrangements for Risk Assessment of domestic incidents/Revised Protocol |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>RD updated the Board regarding ongoing discussions between the Police and Assistant Directors of Children's Services across the Tees regarding the Police's desire to seek consent from individuals known to them through investigation of acts of domestic violence and for their details to be forward to relevant colleagues in Children's Social Care.</p> <p>The discussions included the development of IT solutions that would assist onward referral however, there was much still to be done to define what could be sensibly referred from a domestic violence incident without overburdening Social Care systems with unnecessary referrals.</p> <p>National guidance on the issue was expected which would provide some direction for the current consultation process. The issue was also being addressed as part of discussions around the Strategic MASH in the belief that all of the partner agencies involved may also be able to contribute to any revised protocol.</p> <p>The outcome of the consultation held would be reported to this Board for consideration, along with any proposals to revise the current protocol.</p> |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted the update regarding ongoing discussions around revisions to the protocol for referrals in respect of domestic violence incidents. |

| Log Ref | Mtg Date | Action Required | Person Responsible | Due Date |
|------------|----------|--|--------------------|----------|
| 68/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | Report to SLSCB on the outcome of the consultation regarding proposed revisions to the protocol for referrals in respect of domestic violence incidents. | RD | TBD |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Ref No. 9 | VENT/CSE Presentation and Update from Tees LSCBs VENT Strategic Group & SLSCB VENT Sub Group |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>Consideration was given to a joint presentation by RD & SM summarising the national context and local arrangements in place to safeguard Vulnerable, Exploited, Missing and Trafficked (VENT) Children and Young People.</p> <p>The DfE Statutory Guidance in 2009 had established the initial national context for suitable VENT arrangements to be in place and had first introduced the term Children Sexually Exploited. Regular guidance and media coverage had been seen in the time since, with the Ofsted inspection framework heavily laden with safeguarding in respect of CSE and VENT particularly following incidents in Rotherham.</p> <p>In response, a consistent Tees wide approach to addressing VENT/CSE had been established, led by a Tees Strategic VENT Group chaired by Cleveland Police and supported by Sub Groups for each of the 4 Tees LSCBs.</p> <p>This structure had been responsible for the inclusion of CSE in the Tees wide SAFER Referral form. It was supported by the recent introduction of a CSE Tees wide Risk Assessment tool to provide guidance on the making of referrals.</p> <p>Strategic VENT had also been responsible for recent LSCB publicity campaigns such as 'Silent Victims' and Say Something if you See Something' and had recently revised the Tees LSCBs Running, Missing from Home or Care protocol.</p> <p>The SLSCB VENT Sub Group also oversaw the work of the VENT Practitioners Group (VPG), chaired by the Service Manager LAC with multi agency representation, which collated and maintained information regarding individuals on the VENT list, those that had been reported missing, and the details of any known victims, perpetrators, or locations where incidents had been known to have occurred.</p> <p>In 2013/14, the work of the VPG could be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 61 children considered ▪ 46 female, 15 male ▪ 59 under 18, 2 care leavers 18+ ▪ 42 considered to be at risk of CSE although no confirmed cases or prosecutions ▪ Monthly average 24 ▪ Average length of time being considered 2 months <p>There were currently 25 young people on the VPG list as follows:-21 females and 4 male aged as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 female, 4 male ▪ Age breakdown: 1 x 12 yr old; 1 x 13 yr old; 23 x 14-17 yr olds ▪ Risk breakdown: 5 high; 13 medium; 7 low ▪ 18 at risk of CSE; 1 confirmed CSE disclosure <p>RD confirmed that there were currently 6 ongoing Police operations connected to CSE/VENT within the force area. The Police were currently reviewing its approach and</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| | <p>available resources to tackling this issue and were considering putting in place a dedicated CSE team of officers.</p> <p>KH reiterated comments made at the last Board meeting regarding the need to clearly map out the pathways available to young people and their families of available services in place for those at risk of CSE/VEMT.</p> <p>The Chair thanked both SMcL & Rd for a very helpful and informative update.</p> | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted the content of the CSE/VEMT presentation. | | | |
| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
| 69/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | Email a copy of the presentation to all Board members. | PB | 01.12.14 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Ref No. 10 | Partners Operational Safeguarding Issues | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>a) <u>Police</u>:- RD advised that:-</p> <p>There were currently 6 ongoing Police operations connected to CSE/VEMT active within the force area which were being co-ordinated by a Strategic Group of key partners. RD gave a briefing on the 2 operations that could be reported on and will update the board in future meetings as necessary.</p> | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Safeguarding issues noted. | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Ref No. 11 | Chairs Appraisal | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>Due to his unavailability to attend this Board meeting, the SBC Chief Executive had requested that consideration of the SLSCB Chairs appraisal be deferred.</p> <p>Board members were invited to submit any questions they wished the Chief Executive to address during the appraisal via the Business Support Manager.</p> | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted that consideration of the Chairs appraisal be deferred to a meeting when the SBC Chief Executive can be in attendance. | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Ref No. 12 | Board Minutes for Accuracy 16.10.14 | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | The Minutes of the Board meeting held on 16.10.14 were agreed as a correct record. | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | The Minutes of the Board meeting held on 16.10.14 be recorded as ratified. | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Ref No. 13 | SLSCB LIPSG | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>RD provided an update from the LIPSG meeting held 13/11/14.</p> <p>An update was provided regards the Gavin SCR and the results of the Learning Review received to date in respect of KWS were considered. In the case of KWS, LIPSG supported the rationale reached within the Learning Review to date and concurred that the decisions reached were reasonable, but that significant areas of learning regards CSE could be identified. This included frontline training for Police officers and the possible use of alternative locations to carry out interviews with young people under EPP.</p> <p>JN advised that Caroline Wood (Housing) was currently looking to commissioning the</p> | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| | <p>possible use of 'crash pads for young people' and would advise as to whether these would be available for use by vulnerable victims.</p> <p>PB advised that the Learning Review in respect of KWS would be written up and presented to the Board in due course so that they are aware of any concerns, key issues, learning and any progress / actions that had been made. This would be based on a standard reporting template LIPSG had agreed for completed Learning Reviews rather than the Board receiving verbal updates.</p> |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted: Update from the LIPSG |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Ref No. 14 | Tees LSCB Procedures Group |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>Comments from Board Members in respect of the Tees LSCB Procedures that had been sent out for consideration had been circulated. It covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3.11.13 Fabricated or Induced Illness Procedure ▪ 3.11.19 Child Abuse & Information Communication Technology (ICT, The Digital World) Procedure ▪ 3.11.27b Assessing and Responding to the Impact of Parental Learning Disability on Children Procedure ▪ 3.11.28b Assessing and Responding to the Impact of Parental / Carer Substance Misuse Abuse on Children Procedure ▪ Immobile Babies Guidance. <p>Given the availability of time for the Board to consider each of the above in full today, it was proposed that the Chair of the SLSCB, in consultation with the Business Manager, be authorised to determine the SLSCB response. The Business Manager would then feed this into the Tees Procedures Group.</p> |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted: Update from the Tees LSCB Procedures Group and endorsed that the Chair of the SLSCB, in consultation with the Business Manager, be authorised to consider and respond on behalf of the SLSCB. |

| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
|----------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 70/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | <p>Agree and advise Tees Procedures Group of SLSCB decision in respect of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3.11.13 Fabricated or Induced Illness Procedure ▪ 3.11.19 Child Abuse & Information Communication Technology (ICT, The Digital World) Procedure ▪ 3.11.27b Assessing and Responding to the Impact of Parental Learning Disability on Children Procedure ▪ 3.11.28b Assessing and Responding to the Impact of Parental / Carer Substance Misuse Abuse on Children Procedure ▪ Immobile Babies Guidance. | CM / PB | 01.12.14 |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Ref No. 15 | Tees CDOP |
| <i>Discussion</i> | <p>Four reports from CDOP were received; two of which were for information and two required discussion.</p> <p>a) CDOP Budget – Information Report</p> <p>b) 2014 /2015 Case Summary, Recommendations & Action – Information Report</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>a) & b) were noted with comment being made that early discussions would need to take place during 2015 / 2016 regarding future funding for CDOP in 2016 / 2017.</p> <p>c) Unexpected Child Death Rapid Response Process – Consideration / Approval</p> <p>Across the Tees area the overview of all child deaths was discharged through the Tees Child Death Overview Panel. However, there was no current arrangement in place to convene a rapid response meeting/discussion following a child’s sudden death. The aim of a Rapid Response Process was defined as being:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To help work out the cause of death and identify any risk factors pertaining to that death ▪ To explicitly consider whether there are any safeguarding issues for surviving siblings, potential future siblings and other associated children ▪ Identify any urgent action to be taken ▪ To signpost to appropriate help and support for family/friends and staff where necessary ▪ To help gather information for CDOP in a standard format <p>A draft procedure for Rapid Response to an Unexpected Child Death was submitted and the cost of resourcing this process required consideration.</p> <p>It was agreed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administrative funding should come out of the pooled budget as referred to in report a). Backfill funding for GPs would require a separate discussion as other agencies also attended a series of meetings for CDOP purposes for which they were not paid. ▪ Reference to be made in the procedure regarding immediate actions of other agencies e.g. Children’s Social Care when a child dies who was the subject of a CP Plan or Looked After Child. <p>d) CDOP Terms of Reference – Consideration / Approval</p> <p>The terms of reference for the Tees Child Death Overview Panel were also submitted for approval.</p> <p>Approved subject to amendment in membership section to make it clear who people were representing e.g. The Designated Nurse represents Hartlepool, Stockton-on-Tees and South Tees CCG not just South Tees, is Dr Anne Phellas representing NHS England, does Yifan Liang only represent James Cook University Hospital Paediatricians or Paediatricians from the Tees area etc</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted the Tees LSCB CDOP reports and subsequent actions reports were endorsed:- |
|----------------------------|---|

| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
|----------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 71/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | CDOP Manager to be advised Budget report noted and that SLSCB request that early discussions would need to take place during 2015 / 2016 regarding future funding for CDOP in 2016 / 2017. | PB | 05.12.14 |
| 72/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | CDOP Manager to be advised in respect of Unexpected Child Death Rapid Response Process that Administrative funding and backfill should come out of the | PB | 05.12.14 |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------|--|----|----------|
| | | pooled budget. Backfill funding for GPs would also require a separate discussion as other agencies also attended a series of meetings for CDOP purposes for which they were not paid. | | |
| 73/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | KH to make reference in the Unexpected Child Death Rapid Response Process document regarding immediate actions of other agencies e.g. Children's Social Care when a child dies who was the subject of a CP Plan or Looked After Child. | KH | 20.12.14 |
| 74/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | CDOP Manager to be advised that CDOP Terms of Reference were approved subject to amendment in membership section to make it clear who people were representing e.g. The Designated Nurse represents Hartlepool, Stockton-on-Tees and South Tees CCG not just South Tees, is Dr Anne Phellas representing NHS England, does Yifan Liang only represent James Cook University Hospital Paediatricians or Paediatricians from the Tees area etc | PB | 05.12.14 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Ref No. 16 | A Safer Place for Children | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | It was proposed that consideration of the A Safer Place for Children guidance document be deferred until the next meeting of the Board, by which time it was hoped to be able to include the views of young people regarding the proposed policy. | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | Noted and endorsed that consideration of the A Safer Place for Children be deferred until the next meeting of the Board. | | | |
| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
| 75/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | Agenda item: 18.12.14 - A Safer Place for Children | PB | 01.12.14 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Ref No. 17 | Any Other Business | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | | | | |
| <i>Agreement / Outcome</i> | <p>a) Hartlepool & Stockton Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) KH advised the Board that she was to take up a new post in the New Year with North Yorkshire Foundation Trust and therefore would be resigning as CCG Advisor to the Board.</p> <p>On behalf of the Board, CM thanked KH for her valued contribution to the SLSCB and wished her well in respect of the new role she was to take on in North Yorkshire.</p> <p>This does not leave Stockton without a CCG representative as Jean Freund is the Board Member for Hartlepool & Stockton CCG. It is also anticipated that when appointed the new Designated Nurse will act as an Advisor to the Board and replace KH on the Task Groups she attended.</p> <p>b) Police RD advised that the Police had launched an awareness campaign regarding the risks of sending indecent or sexually explicit images via social media. The campaign had been introduced to Secondary Schools Head Teachers in Cleveland.</p> <p>PB requested that details of the campaign be provided on official Cleveland Police letter-head so that she could forward it on to the attention of all partner agencies.</p> | | | |

| <i>Log Ref</i> | <i>Mtg Date</i> | <i>Action Required</i> | <i>Person Responsible</i> | <i>Due Date</i> |
|----------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 76/11/1415 | 20.11.14 | A copy of the Police Social Media campaign to be forwarded to the Business Manager for onward circulation to all partner agencies. | RD | 01.12.14 |

Appendix 1 (Notes received from Group Work Tables)

Questions denoted with * had returned a lower than satisfactory response from the consultation exercise carried out

Table 1

Q1 Does the LSCB governance arrangements enable partners to assess whether we are fulfilling our statutory responsibilities for help (including early help) to protect and care for children and young people in Stockton on Tees?

Yes, evidenced by:-

- S11
- Quality Assurance
- Data Analysis
- Challenge
- Reports
- Annual Review

Q7b Are there opportunities to fully engage partners in learning?

Yes, evidenced by:-

- Workforce Development Report/Activity/Training Programme
- VCS commitment; eg contribution to engaging organisations who cannot afford to attend training

Q11 Does our LSCB use case file audits (including multi agency case file audits) to identify priorities that can initiate multi agency improvements in professional practice?

Yes evidenced by:-

- Audits taking place, but more evidence needed regards reports/actions taken

Q12a Does our LSCB Chair encourage and work with Local Authority colleagues and other statutory partners where potential improvements are considered ineffectual?

Yes evidenced by:-

- Regular challenge of Board minutes, correspondence amongst partners, eg e-mails, letters etc

Q17c Does our LSCB Annual Report include learning from SCR's and other reviews?

Yes evidenced by:-

- Annual Report
- Regular e-mail briefings
- LIPSG Sub Group reports

*Q6 Are all statutory partners making a proportionate financial and/or resource contribution to our LSCB including the audit and scrutiny of work taking place in the Sub Committees?

No

- no national funding formula in place
- some organisations budgets determined nationally, and therefore flexibility to decide priorities locally restricted
- reliance on 'in kind' contributions

Table 2

Q2 Does our LSCB sufficiently prioritise according to local issues and demands, and provide and demonstrate evidence of clear improvements priorities to deliver improved outcomes?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-Business Plan outlining our priorities; eg CAF changes

Q7c Is evidence from SCR's used to shape and improve learning?

Yes, evidenced by:-

- Clear recommendations for agencies
- Learning plans demonstrating lots of learning
- Role of LIPSG to ensure that actions are embedded, recorded in minutes and Action Plans

More work required to ensure that practice has changed as a result; and whether this has had an impact.

Q8 Does our LSCB ensure that comprehensive, quality policies and procedures are in place (as required by Working Together) which are regularly monitored, evaluated and, where necessary, improved ?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-Board consideration of policy/procedures. But is this disproportionate?

Q13 Is our LSCB active and influential in informing and planning services for children and young people and their families, and does it draw upon and utilise its assessment of the effectiveness of multi-agency practice?

Inconclusive. Evidence available that supports as follows:-

- SCR reviews and inspections of SLSCB inform our future procedures, but questioned how much planning of services takes place?
- Board priorities mostly about compliance/assurance
- Continuum of Need is influential regards future services needed
- new MASH evidences how future services will be provided
- performance data regularly reviewed

Q17b Does our LSCB Annual Report identify weaknesses (and know the causes of these weaknesses) and set out the necessary challenges that require action to be taken?

Yes, evidence by:-

-Action Plan setting out future challenges

*Q12b Are the experiences of children and young people used as a measure of improvement?

No

- Unclear where there is evidence of the 'voice of the child?'
- Some evidence of children surveyed re their experiences as part of Child Protection plans
- How are views of SYA; Youth Inspectors; and Children in Care Council reported; and to whom?

Table 3

Q3 Does our LSCB regularly monitor and evaluate multi-agency front line practice to safeguard children and young people and identify areas for improvement in the quality of practices/services?

Yes, evidenced by :-

- S11 Audit
- Annual Report from each agency
- CAF Board-changes to CAF reporting statistics; new CAF teams
- External inspection framework, including Safeguarding arrangements
- Case file reviews chaired independently
- positive changes made to single agency work
- information exchange; eg to GP's

Q8 Does our LSCB ensure that comprehensive, quality policies and procedures are in place (as required by Working Together) which are regularly monitored, evaluated and, where necessary, improved ?

Yes, evidenced by :-

- Tees Procedures in place
- Minutes/Updates of Tees Procedures shared with Board
- local evidence, including good practice evidenced outside of meetings

Q14 Does our LSCB regularly receive and scrutinise performance data to assess how effective the overall safeguarding system is operating?

Yes, evidenced by :-

- Board has opportunity to discuss and challenge data presented
- data presented across all agencies

Q19 Does our LSCB have in place a comprehensive range of training opportunities for managers and practitioners that can be directly linked to multi agency improvement initiatives (such as the Improvement Plan)?

Yes, evidenced by :-

- comprehensive training programme in place and completed

*Q15 Does our LSCB use its scrutiny and other statutory powers to influence priority setting across other strategic partnerships including the Health & Wellbeing Board?

No

- more work needed to be done in this area
- lack of knowledge regarding our statutory powers to act
- more joint working needed with Childrens Partnership; Community Forums

Table 4

Q4 Have we got demonstrable evidence of holding each other to account for partners contribution to the safety and protection of children and young people (including those who live away from Stockton on Tees)?

Yes, evidenced by:-

- Quality Assurance reports, however, possible lack of understanding regarding each organisations respective domains? Does this lack of awareness affect our ability to hold each other to account?

Q9 Does our LSCB monitor and understand the application of local 'thresholds'?

Yes, evidenced by:-

- Continuum of Need. Need to disseminate this information better. Concise one page summary would be useful

Q16 Does our LSCB ensure that sufficient high quality multi agency training is available (and accessed) and subsequently evaluated for its effectiveness and impact in improving front line practice?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-Workforce Development Report/Activity/Training Programme

Q20 Does our LSCB create and foster an effective learning culture that extends to front line practitioners?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-Discussions at Board; eg self evaluation, shared learning, but more work could be done to foster a culture of inclusivity

*Q6 Are all statutory partners making a proportionate financial and/or resource contribution to our LSCB including the audit and scrutiny of work taking place in the Sub Committees?

No

-needs to be reviewed nationwide, rather than reliance on historical contributions
-present arrangements not robust enough and reflective of changing landscape
-delays in organisations budget position being confirmed

Table 5

Q5 Can we demonstrate that safeguarding is really a priority for all of our statutory LSCB members and is this demonstrated through Section 11 audits?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-reports scrutinised and challenged
-high priority set out through vision statements
-good attendance by partners at SLSCB meetings

More robust discussion/challenge welcomed in the future. Benefits can be seen from 'round the table' discussions such as this one.

Q7A Does our LSCB have a robust learning and improvement framework?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-LIPSG Group-increased representation across multi agencies
-reporting of lessons learned from both SCR's and Learning Reviews
-review of processes that have led to changes being introduced

Q10 Can we evidence that our LSCB understands the nature and extent of local issues in relation to children and young people missing and children and young people at risk of sexual exploitation and which informs and oversees an effective information sharing, local strategy and Action Plan?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-extensive work undertaken by Strategic VEMT and shared with this Board
-regular agenda items on this subject
-regular feedback received re activity of VPG

Q17a Does our LSCB Annual Report provide a rigorous and transparent assessment of performance and effectiveness of local services?

Yes, evidenced by:-

-all partner agencies sign/approve Annual Report

-consideration given as to how information should best be presented

*Q12b Are the experiences of children and young people used as a measure of improvement?

No

-lot of effort currently made to engage children and young people, but lack of co-ordination at present

-difficulty in engaging across the age range

-hard to identify best mechanism for capturing their views

-should Young People have the opportunity of presenting their views to this Board?

-do we consider enough the implications of decisions made regarding how they would impact on children and young people? What difference would these decisions make to them?

NB It was noted that engagement with children and young people was a priority within the current Business Plan and there was a need to carry out an audit of activity carried out by each agency in this regard. JN/JB expressed a wish to be involved in this piece of work.