





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)	  Apols
Colin Morris (CM)	LSCB Independent Chair	SLSCB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LSCB and SSAB Chair Sunderland LSCB Chair Newcastle 	Apols
Pauline Beall (PB)	Business Manager		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MALAP (Multi Agency Looked After Partnership) Stockton VCSE Safeguarding Forum 	✓
Leanne Bain (LB)	Lay Member			✓
Lesley Cooke (LC)	Lay Member		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Ravens Trust Catalyst 	✓
Deborah Wray (DW)	Lay Member			✓
Jane Humphreys (JH)	Director of Children's Services	Local Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) HWB Adult Partnership HWB Children's Partnership SMB – Public Protection Safer Stockton Partnership 	Apols
Peter Kelly (PK)	Director of Adults and Health		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) HWB Adult Partnership HWB Children's Partnership Adult's Joint HWB Commissioning Group Children's Joint HWB Commissioning Group Tees Adult Safeguarding Board Safer Stockton Partnership Tees VEMT Strategic Group 	✓
Martin Gray (MG)	Assistant Director - Early Help, Partnership and Planning		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HWB Children's Partnership Children & Young People Health and Well-being Commissioning Group MALAP (Multi Agency Looked After Partnership) Stockton YOS Management Board 	✓
Diane McConnell (DM)	Assistant Director - Schools and SEN		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAF Board Convener of the Safeguarding Forum for Education Settings Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group 	✓
Shaun McLurg (SM)	Assistant Director - Safeguarding and Looked After Children / Chair Tees LSCB's Procedures Group / Chair SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children & Young People Health and Well-being Commissioning Group Spark of Genius Children's Homes 	✓
Jane Edmends (JE)	Strategic Housing Manager		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stockton Early Help Partnership Group Housing and Neighbourhood Partnership (Thematic Group) 	✓
Julie Nixon (JN)	Transformation Team (formerly Head of Housing & Community Protection)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HWB Adult Partnership HWB Children's Partnership Tees Adult Safeguarding Board Safer Stockton Partnership SBC Adult Social Care Programme Board 	✓
Cllr Ann McCoy (AM)	Lead Cabinet Member - Children and Young People (Participating Observer)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Tees, Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust (TEVV) 	✓
Neil Schneider (NS)	Chief Executive (Participating Observer)			✓
Elisa Arnold (EA)	Service Manager		CAFCASS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redcar and Cleveland LSCB Local Family Justice Board Able to feed in national changes within the Family Justice Service

SLSCB Members	Title	Representing	Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair)	  Apols
Alastair Simpson (AS)	Detective Superintendent / Chair LIPSG	Cleveland Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redcar SCB (Full board, Exec and LIPSG) Middlesbrough SCB (Full board and LIPSG) Hartlepool SCB (Full board, Exec and LIPSG) Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group MAPPA SMB MASH Strategic Management Board (N Tees) CDOP 	Apols
Alex Taylor (AT)	Head Teacher Independent Schools	Education Establishments		✓
Clare Mason (CMa)	Deputy Principal Secondary Schools			✓
Kerry Coe (KC)	Head Teacher Primary Schools		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Needs Panel Primary Heads Group ARP Cluster 	✓
Joanna Bailey (JB)	Principal Stockton Sixth Form College		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor at Thornaby Academy Governor at The Grangefield Academy Campus Stockton Teaching Alliance 14-19 Partnership, Campus Stockton CPD Group Campus Stockton R&D Group Secondary Heads Group 	✓
Jean Golightly (JG)	Executive Nurse	Hartlepool & Stockton-on-Tees Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Tees CCG (Exec Nurse) Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board Member of NHSE Quality Surveillance Group meeting 	Apols
Trina Holcroft (TH)	Designated Nurse, Safeguarding Children & LAC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hartlepool SCB (full board, exec and LIPSG) CDOP Tees LSCBs Procedures Group Multi-Agency Looked After Partnership (MALAP Stockton) Stockton Performance Management Stockton LIPSG Hartlepool Performance and Quality Group Joint Training Group MACH SMB and Implementation Group Teeswide Designated Professionals Group NTHFT Steering Group 	✓
Kailash Agrawal (KA)	Designated Doctor <i>Advisor to the Board</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Middlesbrough LSCB Redcar and Cleveland LSCB NT&HFT Safeguarding Steering Group Teesside Designated Doctors Group (Ch.) 	✓
TBC		NHS England (Cumbria & North East)		✗
Lindsey Robertson (LR)	General Manager, Nursing & Professional Standards	North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust (NTHFT)		✓
Elizabeth Moody (EM)	Executive Director of Nursing and Governance	Tees, Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust (TEWV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teeswide Adult Safeguarding Board North Yorkshire Adult Safeguarding Board North Yorkshire Children's Safeguarding Board (Member of other safeguarding boards but send deputies on regular basis) 	✓

SLSCB Members	Title	Representing	Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair)	✓ ✗ Apols
Julie Allan (JA)	Head of Cleveland Area – National Probation Service (NE)	Probation Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middlesbrough LSCB • Redcar and Cleveland LSCB • Hartlepool LSCB • South Tees YOS • Stockton YOS • Hartlepool YOS • YOS Management Board • LCJB • Local Public Service Board • Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board • Tees Adult Health and Wellbeing Board • Strategic DV and Abuse Strategic Group • Contest Gold • Stockton Scanning and Challenge • ETE/OSE Board • Tees Strategic VEMT Group 	✓
Barbara Gill (BG)	Head of Offender Services - Community Rehabilitation Company			Apols
Julie McNaughton (JM)	Accommodation Contracts Manager	Thirteen / Housing Provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tees Valley Choice Based Lettings Steering Group • My Sisters Place – Board • North East Homelessness Group • MAPPa Representative 	✓
Steve Rose (SR)	Chief Executive Officer Catalyst	Voluntary Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	✓

Guests:		
Rhona Bollands (RB)	SBC - Service Manager, Assessment & Fieldwork	For item 5
Cllr Carol Clark (CC)	SBC - Elected Member	For item 8
Jon Doyle (JD)	SBC - Implementation Manager, MACH	For item 4
Margaret Whellans (MW)	Former SBC - Interim Head of Early Help, Part. & Pl.	For item 3(a)
Simon Walker (SW)	Police - Detective Inspector	Sub for Alastair Simpson
Dave Pickard (DP)	HSCB Independent Chair	For item 2

Minute-Taker:	Gary Woods - SLSCB Business Support Officer
----------------------	---

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

Declarations of Interest:	None
----------------------------------	------

Ref No. 1	Attendance, Apologies & Quoracy
Discussion	<p>As a frequent participating observer, and as agreed at the last Board meeting in December 2015, NS acted as Chair for this meeting in the absence of CM.</p> <p>JE and CMa were welcomed to their first Board meeting following their recent addition to the SLSCB membership. SW was in attendance as the substitute for AS.</p>

	<p>JN noted that this would be her last Board meeting following 17 years as a SLSCB member - thanks were given for her considerable efforts during this time.</p> <p><i>Note: Due to other work commitments, KC and JB left the meeting at 10.15am, TH left the meeting at 10.45am, and CMA left the meeting at 11.30am.</i></p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.

Ref No. 2	Tees Performance Data Framework Proposal
Discussion	<p>With reference to the circulated 'A Data Set and Performance Management Framework for the Local Safeguarding Children Boards of Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar & Cleveland, and Stockton-on-Tees' report, DP gave a presentation (to be circulated following this meeting) in the absence of the report's author, Mike Batty (Independent Consultant), who had sent apologies. DP has worked closely with Mike since the four Tees Board's jointly secured funding from the Department for Education to design and implement a single multi-agency performance management framework (PMF) and data set across the four LSCBs of Teesside. This presentation gave the opportunity for Board members to offer their views on the proposals.</p> <p>The four key aims of a Tees PMF were highlighted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Improved monitoring and accountability of partners to the Boards (too often a Social Care focus). ➤ Improved decision-making and prioritisation. ➤ Efficiency savings in some partners only having to provide information once instead of four times, and consistency as to the type of information collected. ➤ Better outcomes for children and young people as a consequence of improved understanding of need and prevalence. <p>The report sets out detailed proposals for a PMF consisting of 10 key elements, and makes 16 recommendations (arranged in priority order). Specific focus was given to the recommendations (section 10), where the following points were noted and discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>10.1; 10.2; 10.3; 10.15:</u> AT asked if the proposals would allow for data to be compared year-on-year - this could be undertaken as long as the parameters remain the same, although it was acknowledged that the common core data set of 23 main indicators are likely to evolve over time. It will be the role of the single Tees-wide Performance Group to oversee the data set, amending and updating as required. MG felt that the NEET indicator (reference 4) needed to include data on those 'not known' in order to give a more accurate account. DM added that the EHC Plans/SEN statements indicator (reference 14) needed interpreting to ensure clarity. • <u>10.4:</u> more an issue for Redcar and Middlesbrough than for Stockton. SR questioned whether, should Redcar and Middlesbrough not agree to amend their meeting patterns, Stockton should change its current scheduling - PB noted the different governance arrangements across the Tees LSCBs. • <u>10.5:</u> although not currently a fixed timescale across Tees, it is considered adequate for section 11 audits to be undertaken every two years, as long as the rest of the PMF supports this approach. • <u>10.6; 10.10; 10.12; 10.13; 10.16:</u> agreed without comment. • <u>10.7:</u> AM queried whether this recommendation was somewhat loose, particularly the use of the phrase 'at the earliest opportunity' - would it be more appropriate to state 'no later than'? LR highlighted the differences between internal audits and externally-led audits of agencies, and MG noted that the recent inspection of Cleveland Police would have been presented at this meeting had AS been present - there was still a need for a more robust process in bringing those internal audits that are flagging up issues and require escalating to LSCBs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>10.8</u>: the annual process for self-evaluation is an idea in principal, and will be for the Tees-wide Performance Group to devise something for all Board's. • <u>10.9</u>: the proposed annual report by each partner agency would be more focused than the section 11 audit, and would provide more detail and assurance regarding safeguarding activity. LC noted the issues around the length of time this takes agencies, something which has been raised in the past. Debate followed in terms of those partners who attend all four LSCBs only needing to produce one report - although this will produce efficiency savings, will these reports have enough of a local perspective to ensure maximum relevance? EM stated that, in the past, an overall TEWV report has been provided to Board's, but future reports may indeed need to be more Tees-orientated. JN felt it would also be useful to include detail regarding the level of an agency's role in safeguarding, as some may have involvement in this on a more daily basis than others. DM proposed the use of a common template (this was agreed), though PB urged the need to ensure the Board do not lose anything it is doing now that it considers of value. • <u>10.11</u>: AM cautioned against evidence in relation to the voice of the child becoming a tick-box requirement - Board's need to see detail so challenge can be made if required. • <u>10.14</u>: Mike has consulted with Ofsted and received good feedback in relation to this recommendation - the proposals need to be resourced as this cannot be achieved via existing resources across the four LSCBs. Funding is principally required for the analytical function to support delivery - seven potential funders (four Local Authorities, two CCGs, and the Police) identified, with an annual requirement of a £3-4k up to £7-8k contribution each. AM felt a longer-term commitment was needed in terms of funding to avoid future issues - DP emphasised that doing nothing was not an option, and highlighted the estimated efficiency savings of £5-6k for those partners who attend all four LSCB's. <p>SR queried how applicable this document was for those agencies more involved with prevention and early intervention - although elements of early help are present within the proposed PMF, further strengthening around this area may need consideration. JA felt there was a positive appetite for these proposals across the four Board's, and confirmed Probation's support for its concept.</p> <p>DP thanked those Board members who had helped shape the proposals within the report, particularly via the monthly operational group he has Chaired. The next phase of the process was noted, whereby a final meeting of the Executive Group (Tees LSCB Chairs and the respective Directors of Children's Services) will take place on the 26th January 2016 to consider comments by the four LSCBs on the proposed recommendations, and determine the way forward.</p> <p>NS thanked DP for his presentation, and offered formal thanks to Mike and the operational team for all their work in compiling this report.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Tees Performance Management Framework proposals noted and discussed. SLSCB broadly supportive of the proposals, with areas for strengthening and clarification to be raised at the final meeting of the Tees PMF Executive Group on the 26 th January 2016.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
92/01/1516	21.01.16	Circulate the Tees LSCBs Data Set and Performance Management Framework (PMF) presentation to Board members following the January 2016 meeting.	Business Unit	22.01.16

<i>Ref No. 3</i>	<i>Thematic Area (TA) Updates</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>a) Case Work</u></p> <p>MW gave an overview of the circulated Independent Review of Casework report (November 2015). This series of reviews was commissioned by the Director of Children's Services</p>

to complement the performance data that was being received through normal performance management systems to combine data, audits, complaints and consultations with a focused piece of external evaluation of casework.

Key questions were constructed to guide the review of practice, including:

- Why was the outcome for a high number of children 'no further action' at the end of the single assessment?
- Were IROs bringing appropriate challenge to professional practice to ensure the best outcomes for children within the looked after system and child protection?
- Were assessments and care plans appropriate and effective?
- What can be identified as enabling the increased number of de-registrations?
- What actions would assist with the next phase of performance improvement?

175 different pieces of casework were reviewed using a desktop exercise, with key themes collated during the work – areas of strength and areas that would warrant more consideration within practice were subsequently highlighted as follows (any single areas of concern were raised directly with the Heads of Service during the reviews):

Areas of Strength

- Families have recorded in conferences that the help they received had made a difference to their ability to parent and look after their children.
- The voice of the child, their wishes and feelings was seen consistently in all documents read, and reflected in assessments and plans.
- There is an impressive array of professionals and services working together to enable parents and children to improve their lives (but is this being done effectively?).

Areas for Consideration

- All partners need to keep momentum of their work throughout the whole journey of the child, including the review conference where de-registration is being recommended (may require some reflection and monitoring in the future).
- Focused work could be undertaken within the core group activity where priorities and plans are discussed, captured and built on with families to maximize progress in the shortest time (uncertainty whether this is recorded).
- Greater use of research being evidenced in practice across assessment, planning and conference discussions to ensure currency and appropriateness of judgments and actions (applying theory to practice).

Three recommendations were given at the end of the report:

- 1) The SLSCB focuses its priority over the next year in auditing and receiving updates from the IRO service about commitment of agencies working together at de-registrations and stepping down services.
- 2) The IRO service makes recommendations to the SLSCB about ways to develop the role and practice of core groups, including the incremental care planning and recording of outcomes for children and families.
- 3) The SLSCB takes oversight of the way that evidence is reflected in the practice of all lead professionals to assure itself of practice being current, evidence based and appropriate. This would also share learning and understanding across the partnership.

PK drew attention to points 1 and 7 within section 4.5 (What actions would assist with the next phase of performance improvement?) of the report. The practice of opening every sibling in a family when the issues are clearly focused on a single child (point 1) raised some concern – **MW** reported that, in such cases, information was often cut-and-pasted into documentation, resulting in the loss of individuality, and confusion as to why some children were subject to this framework. Also, were issues around awareness of the Troubled Families programme (point 7) a general comment about the programme itself, or whether specific children were involved in it – **MW** advised that there appeared to be little

knowledge of the overall programme in Stockton, but this may be due to the programme being introduced via Community Protection as opposed to the more usual Social Care route. **NS** felt this was a challenge to the Local Authority, as regardless of where a programme is embedded, this should not impact upon staff awareness and knowledge.

MG highlighted the positive feedback regarding IROs within the report, though noted that there was still work to do. As for the issue around staff awareness of the Troubled Families programme, Board members were assured that it is not that staff had not heard of the programme, it was more about how to utilise it when stepping cases down – more work around the issue has been identified, and will be addressed at a future Board meeting. **LR** added that work involving Troubled Families within Health is being assisted via the Early Help Panels.

TH emphasised the importance of RCPCs – these were arguably more critical than ICPCs for analysing risk and outcomes. **KA** re-iterated the issue of cases coming back into the system due to agencies backing-off during de-registration.

NS thanked **MW** for her report.

b) Quality of Plans

MG referred to the circulated report from the former Chair of the SLSCB Performance Sub-Group, Simon Willson, summarising the findings of work undertaken in connection with an action from the SLSCB Business Plan (ensure that the recently revised CP plan template is embedded, and monitor its impact on outcomes for the child). The overall conclusion to the work was summarised as:

'The format of the agreed CP plan template appears to be embedded in practice, in so far that it is being used for the outline CP plan agreed at ICPCs. However, there are inconsistencies in the extent to which plans provide clarity about desired outcomes and how actions will support these. Accordingly, whilst the progress of actions to support the child can generally be tracked through the Core Group and RCPC process, it is not always easy to reconcile this progress with specific outcomes for the child.'

The report was supplemented by a summary of findings for each of the six cases reviewed by the Performance Sub-Group based on examination of ICPC, Core Group and RCPC minutes. Key themes emerging from these case reviews included:

- a) The format of the agreed CP plan format is often difficult to follow, so they lack clarity as a result.
- b) There needs to be continuing work to achieve a more outcomes focused approach to the development and monitoring of CP plans.
- c) The linkage between Core Group and Review Conference minutes are not always evident.
- d) The plans, as set out in Conference minutes, will be difficult for parents to follow and understand clearly what is expected of them; this is exacerbated by the use of language more aimed at professionals than parents / carers and young people.

The SLSCB will need to consider these findings alongside the report from a separate piece of work, undertaken during November/December 2015, auditing a sample of cases to review child protection practice across a range of themes. Consideration will also need to be given to other work currently in hand which will impact on outcomes-focused planning (e.g. Signs of Safety; Graded Care Profile).

JN, through experience of looking into cases within the SLSCB LIPSG, emphasised the difficulty in ascertaining clear outcomes, and **LR** furthered that outcomes can be made too difficult for children and families to understand – practitioners need support in moving away from the use of jargon, and should ensure plans are kept simple. **LC** queried whether

shortfalls in the quality of plans could be attributed to issues previously noted at the Board, namely workloads, capacity and recruitment, along with potential administrative and technical difficulties - **MG** felt the issues around plans were more about recording processes as opposed to work not being done.

c) Voice of the Child

JB gave a presentation (a copy of which will be circulated after this meeting) on the key thematic work around the Voice of the Child (VoC). Board members were reminded why this area was being looked at, how it was being investigated, the initial findings and subsequent analysis, and the intended next steps. **JB** thanked those representatives who had given their time to progress this work, and specifically **MG** for help in putting this presentation together. The following areas were noted and discussed:

- *Initial findings*: responses from 13 organisations / services, so only a partial picture (not all agencies have provided a response).
- *Inclusive methods?*: questions remain over how evidence of the VoC is gathered from the very young, children with a disability, etc.
- *Best practice*: consideration to venue includes thought in relation to the nature of the space and the time of the day; verbal and non-verbal comms - St John's 'My Views' is a simple proforma which should be shared with the Board; clarity on what discussed/done next - V stamp is used in education settings and documents when the VoC has been sought; feedback - includes thanking the child for their contributions, and the need to ensure that the child has confidence that their views are heard and understood.
- *Barriers*: influence of family members - exacerbated if the child is not seen alone; technology - Health proposed the idea of using texting, but this is not in operation yet; time (caseloads, relationship-building) - a particular issue for School Nursing, and attention is required in order to establish how this is overcome.
- *Recommendations CRPO 2014*: need to ask how much progress has been made since these recommendations.

Recommendations were listed at the end of the presentation, including a future development event, amending the SAFER Referral Form to make VoC-gathering more explicit, ensuring best practice becomes the norm, and addressing/overcoming barriers.

LC expressed concern in relation to those agencies who did not respond to the questionnaire survey to all partners (**PB** is addressing this). **TH** advised of some of the VoC tools already available (e.g. Three Houses technique) - staff could be made more aware of these instead of developing new tools. **KA** felt it was key to overcome the identified barriers, particularly the practice of not seeing the child alone.

AM asked if the intention was for all partner agencies to take these recommendations back to their organisations, and then report back to the Board in order to demonstrate how they are addressing them. **NS** added that some of the issues flagged by Ofsted in 2010 remain a challenge - agencies need to consider how they will deliver against these requirements. It was agreed that all agencies would reflect on the presentation and recommendations, and come to the next Board meeting in February 2016 prepared to discuss and suggest how the findings and recommendations of the VoC group are taken forward and translated into an all-agency implementation plan - this must consider, as a priority, the barriers identified, and the sharing and adoption of the identified best practice.

NS thanked **JB** for her presentation, and for all her efforts regarding this thematic work.

Agreement/ Outcome	Thematic area updates noted and discussed, with future developments outlined and agreed for each piece of work.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date

93/01/1516	21.01.16	Circulate the Voice of the Child presentation to Board members following the January 2016 meeting.	Business Unit	22.01.16
94/01/1516	21.01.16	Reflect on the Voice of the Child presentation and recommendations, and come to the next Board meeting in February 2016 prepared to discuss and suggest how the findings and recommendations of the VoC group are taken forward and translated into an all-agency implementation plan.	ALL	18.02.16

Ref No. 4	North of Tees Continuum of Need			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>With reference to the circulated 'Providing the right support to meet a child's needs in Hartlepool and Stockton' document, JD gave an overview of the proposals to replace the current Continuum of Need with a single threshold document across the North of Tees area. The main alteration is the reduction in the number of levels of need from five to four (level four will capture what was previously levels four and five) - these were listed in more detail within the document, and JD gave a brief description of each level.</p> <p>Regarding Level 2 (2.10), MG felt that an Early Help Assessment should be 'considered' (not 'completed' as stated), though SM thought there was a danger of diluting all the work done in the past in relation to CAF if this was amended as such - MG agreed to consult with Hartlepool LSCB to ensure a consistent approach around this statement.</p> <p>PK cautioned against the potential assumption that every referral to a paediatrician is a Level 2 of need (2.12; bullet point 3). Also, the inclusion of 'Smoking' in the matrix of indicators of possible need (page 10) under Level 2 provoked debate, and it was queried whether secondary heads would be expected to identify those children who smoke - there is a risk that the Board could swamp itself with work/information, and focus needs to be retained on those children at risk. It was noted that Level 2 does not meet the safeguarding threshold, and that the matrix tables are a guide - an element of common sense/professional judgement was required when assessing a child's level of need (indicators should not be seen in isolation). KA suggested that 'neglect' should be added to the list of indicators under Level 4 – this was agreed.</p> <p>Hartlepool LSCB has agreed the proposals as presented at this meeting, and the updated document will be released for practitioners once it has been approved by the SLSCB. Subject to clarification of the identified issue in relation to an Early Help Assessment being completed/considered at Level 2, Board members accepted these proposals.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	North of Tees Continuum of Need proposals outlined and discussed – subject to clarification over one identified issue, the SLSCB accepted these proposals.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
95/01/1516	21.01.16	Check with Hartlepool LSCB regarding the wording around the completion/consideration of an Early Help Assessment in relation to Level 2 of the proposed North of Tees Continuum of Need.	MG	18.02.16

Ref No. 5	Missing from Home or Care Data			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>RB presented the circulated Children Running or Missing from Home or Care (RMHC) report covering the period from the 1st April 2015 to the 31st December 2015 (Q1-Q3). Two assurance reports have been previously presented to the SLSCB, but since this time, the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group have recommended that reports scrutinised by the Tees Board's contain a minimum set of key information – the report presented at this meeting is the first to cover the majority of the key areas recommended.</p> <p>The following elements of the report were highlighted and/or discussed:</p>			

Children who have been reported Missing

- (3.2) From 1st April 2015 – 31st December 2015 there were 448 children reported as missing, with a total of 796 reported missing episodes. Surprise was expressed in relation to the relatively low number of missing episodes recorded during Q2 – higher numbers may have been anticipated due to the school summer holidays and lighter nights during this time.
- (3.3) 265 (33.2%) of the 796 reported missing episodes were children Looked After by Stockton Borough Council, either within Stockton borough or placed out-of-borough.
- (3.4) From the 796 missing episodes 276 (34.7%) were the result of 11 specific children. 47 (5.9%) of these missing episodes were the result of one Looked After Child placed in Stockton by another Local Authority. 31 of these episodes (3.9%) were the result of one Stockton Looked After Child who has since been placed out of Borough.

Children who have been reported Absent

- (4.2) From the 1st April 2015 – 31st December 2015 there were 183 children reported as having an unauthorised absence, resulting in a total of 319 unauthorised absence episodes.
- (4.3 – 4.6) Data in respect of reported unauthorised absence by gender, type and frequency, ethnicity, and age have only recently been collated – Q2 data provided within the report, with Q3 data to follow.

Return Interviews

- (5.1) Data in respect of Missing from Home Return Interviews is not yet available for Q3. In Q1 and Q2, there were 517 missing from home episodes (301 in Q1; 216 in Q2).
- (5.2) 163 return interviews were carried out in this period (81 in Q1 and 82 in Q2) – in Q1, 32.8% of all missing from home episodes had a return interview; in Q2, 42.5% did.
- (5.3) As some children have multiple missing from home episodes within a short space of time, one return interview may have covered several missing from home episodes. We are not currently able to accurately report the number of return interviews that cover multiple missing from home episodes.

With reference to 7.3 in the conclusion section of the report, **AM** felt it was important to recognise that staff clearly have the confidence to carry out their duties in reporting missing children. Also, the common notion that looked after children are the most disruptive is not the case.

JA asked whether there was any benefit in the impact of the return interview being undertaken following one missing episode as opposed to doing it after a number of episodes – no evidence had been seen to suggest one way was better than the other. The value of the return interview was therefore queried, with questions raised as to what is learnt from this process. **LR** felt there was a lot of responsibility on Social Care/Early Help teams regarding return interviews, and questioned how this information is cascaded and shared with other agencies – **RB** advised that information is cascaded amongst agencies on a monthly basis at the VEMT Practitioners Group (which she Chairs), and that the key issue around ‘missing’ is the learning.

The recommendation asking SLSCB members to clarify how frequently Children Running or Missing from Home or Care (RMHC) reports should be produced (8.3) provoked comment, with **SM** noting that the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group had specifically asked that these reports are produced quarterly. Concern was expressed that this may be too frequent, and may result in capacity issues regarding future Board agendas. Although **SR** acknowledged that the report at this meeting was largely positive, there is a need to know immediately if things are going wrong – however, since the SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group and Tees LSCB Procedures Group (TPG) also oversee this area of work, it was agreed to keep the RMHC report an annual document. In addition, it was agreed that future reports should include Ward breakdown data (8.2).

Agreement/ Outcome	Children Running or Missing from Home or Care report noted, with current and future issues highlighted and discussed. Recommendations considered and agreed as identified, including the report remaining an annual document.
-----------------------	---

Ref No. 6	SLSCB Income & Expenditure Report April – December 2015
Discussion	<p>With reference to the circulated SLSCB Income & Expenditure Report April – December 2015, PB advised that there are currently no identified pressures. Taking into account projected allocations for salaries, running costs and the Graded Care Profile Project, it is anticipated that there will still be a surplus to be carried forward to 2016-2017.</p> <p>Agencies have sent an email to advise on financial support to the core SLSCB budget for 2016-2017, however, not all are in a position to confirm the final amount yet. The indicative amounts are looking as though they will be similar to 2015-2016.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB Income & Expenditure Report April – December 2015 noted.

Ref No. 7	Licensing
Discussion	<p>PK gave an overview of the circulated Licensing & Safeguarding Report, outlining updates to the SLSCB following recent policy reviews, and providing the latest position in relation to the arrangements which are in place across the licensing regime in Stockton to protect children and young people from harm. Key points noted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3.2; 3.4) <i>Licensing Act 2003</i>: the licensing authority, under the Act, carries out its functions with a view to promoting four licensing objectives – one of these objectives refers to the protection of children from harm. The Council recommends that applicants risk assess their operation against these objectives to identify potential areas of concern, and then use this to inform their operating policy and staff training. • (3.9) <i>Stockton’s Statement of Licensing Policy</i>: clearly states the requirements in order to achieve the policy objective to protect children from harm. To support this the LSCB has developed guidance for license holders – Safeguarding Children on Licensed Premises and guidance which supports and assists event organisers to prioritise the safety of children and young people at the planning and operational stages of events. • (3.10; 3.11) <i>Role of SLSCB as the Responsible Authority</i>: Home Office Guidance with regard to the protection of children from harm states that the Responsible Authority is ‘a body that represents those who are responsible for, or interested in, matters relating to the protection of children from harm’. This is covered by a Service Manager in Children’s Social Care and the LSCB Business Manager. In this role, they scrutinise all received applications, provide an essential source of advice and information on the impact of any licensable activity promoting the protection of children, and liaise directly with licensees or prospective licensees. • (4.6) <i>Test Purchasing</i>: most usually deployed to monitor the effectiveness of the Gambling Policy in relation to underage sales. Stockton Licensing Service as a co-regulator has carried out joint inspections with the Gambling Commission to ensure operators are controlling this risk and preventing underage gambling. • (5.4) <i>Revocation of License</i>: Stockton has strengthened the way the powers of suspension and revocation are used when the fitness or propriety of a driver is called into question. In particular, when the Licensing Section receives an allegation or complaint which is of a particularly serious nature, and gives rise to a genuine and urgent concern for the protection of public safety, licensing officers may give consideration to the immediate revocation of a driver’s licence. • (5.6) <i>LADO</i>: Licensing Officers continue to work with the LADO to raise concerns relating to those who have or may have harmed children. • (5.7) <i>Training</i>: the Tees Valley Licensing Liaison Group, in conjunction with Barnardo's, is developing a web-based training tool as an aid to licensed drivers in dealing with issues around vulnerability, safeguarding and child sexual exploitation - it is hoped that

	<p>the website will be up and running within the first few months of 2016. The Council's Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Licensing Policy specifies that all existing drivers and private hire operators (or a representative of the licensed company) shall have successfully completed this safeguarding awareness training by the end of 2016. Once the safeguarding awareness training is in place, new applicants shall have successfully completed it before the issue of their first licence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (6.2) <i>Strategic Overview</i>: proactive projects and campaigns to safeguard children within the licensed premises industry take place examples of which can be found on the SLSCB web pages. <p>With reference to the Say Something if you See Something campaign (6.2), SR queried whether this had any impact. NS also questioned the impact of licensed drivers undertaking training around safeguarding, and how this was being evidenced. PK emphasised that the key point of such training is to re-assure the public that this issue is taken seriously, and would liaise with the Licensing Team in terms of evidencing the effectiveness of the training as no system is currently in place.</p> <p>NS noted the emerging area of safeguarding concern in relation to food takeaways - assurance was given that this is considered via the various Tees and SLSCB VEMT groups.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Licensing & Safeguarding Report noted, with agreement to receive a copy of the amended License Policies as agreed by Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
96/01/1516	21.01.16	Liaise with Licensing Team in terms of evidencing the effectiveness of the safeguarding training for licensed drivers.	PK	18.02.16

<i>Ref No. 8</i>	CYP Scrutiny Review of SLSCB (Timeframe)			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>With reference to the circulated Children and Young People Select Committee: Review of SLSCB (Outline Scope) document, CC provided a brief outline of the intention to evaluate the effectiveness of the SLSCB against the Ofsted inspection criteria.</p> <p>Key lines of enquiry were listed, along with the information required to be collected, where the information will be sought from, and how it will be gathered. The expected duration of the review is 12 months, and a project plan detailing the key tasks was included. CM, as outgoing Chair of the SLSCB, will be asked for his views about the effectiveness of the Board, with the incoming Independent Chair to be asked for their views in Autumn 2016.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Children and Young People Select Committee: Review of SLSCB noted.			

<i>Ref No. 9</i>	Partners Operational Safeguarding Issues			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>Probation</u></p> <p>A new National Offender Management Service practice guidance document regarding safeguarding children is now in use (this will be circulated to Board members following this meeting). Probation continues to have a high regard for safeguarding, and are working on a future Action Plan to strengthen policies and practice.</p> <p>In relation to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), recommendations have been made within the new Tees-wide Performance Management Framework - the MAPPA Strategic Management Board has a performance sub-group who are looking into these recommendations. Stockton continues to be well represented at Level 2 and Level 3 MAPPA meetings. The MAPPA Annual Report 2014-2015 will be circulated to Board members following this meeting, along with a HMIP report around a follow-up inspection of MAPPA.</p>			

<p><u>Voluntary Sector</u> The next Stockton VCSE Safeguarding Forum is taking place on the 23rd February 2016 - Board members to let SR know if they need to present anything.</p> <p><u>Local Authority</u> AM asked whether the outcomes of the Operation Encompass project, specifically its effect on children in schools, could be presented at a future Board meeting - this could include a very powerful video presentation associated with the project.</p> <p>The <i>Chelsea's Choice</i> programme was also noted, aimed at school children in Year 8 and above (not appropriate below this age) - it was suggested that Board members should have sight of this too, and dates for professionals to attend will be circulated on the next SLSCB email bulletin from PB. DM advised that the questionnaire to all secondary school pupils aiming to ascertain how empowered children are to keep safe will be launched across Stockton and Middlesbrough on the 3rd February 2016.</p> <p>On behalf of JH, SM gave an update on the situation around workloads and staffing levels - there continues to be pressure at the initial phase of the Social Care system, and there were a record 400 active cases just before Christmas 2015, though no obvious reason for this could be determined. There are no unallocated cases in relation to Assessment and Fieldwork, though the numbers currently in the system will cause issues elsewhere as work is progressed. Significant staffing challenges remain, particularly around qualified Social Workers where there are currently 10 vacancies - interviews are scheduled for the end of January 2016, and the Board will be kept informed of developments.</p>				
Agreement/ Outcome		Updates noted.		
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
97/01/1516	21.01.16	Circulate the new National Offender Management Service practice guidance document regarding safeguarding children to Board members.	Business Unit	10.02.16
98/01/1516	21.01.16	Circulate the MAPPAs Annual Report 2014-2015, along with a HMIP report around a follow-up inspection of MAPPAs, to Board members.	Business Unit	10.02.16
99/01/1516	21.01.16	Circulate dates for professionals to attend the forthcoming <i>Chelsea's Choice</i> programme in the next SLSCB email bulletin.	PB	29.01.16

Ref No. 10	17.12.15 Board Minutes for Accuracy
Discussion	<p>Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 17th December 2015 were agreed as a true record.</p> <p>Ref No. 7 (Tees LSCBs VEMT Strategic Group): '<i>...Social Care are awaiting some feedback from the Police in relation to the number of cases in Stockton marked as 'CSE', which exceeds the number that Social Care are aware of.</i>' - SM still awaiting a breakdown regarding these cases as there appears to be an over-reporting of CSE (a meeting with AS is scheduled), and this is contradicting information being reported to SBC Cabinet. AM questioned if there was a reason why CSE data could not be classified as exempt (as per Domestic Violence information) when presenting to Cabinet - SM felt a more open approach was the best way forward, but with this comes a responsibility to ensure the information presented is accurate. Concerns have been raised that data around CSE across the whole of Tees is inaccurate - this issue will be discussed at the next Board meeting in February 2016.</p> <p>Ref No. 8 (Tees CDOP): '<i>...issues around the Rapid Response admin process had now resolved</i>' - KA reported that arrangements in relation to the Rapid Response process are</p>

	<p>now in place for the next unexpected child death, and that agencies need to ensure identified representatives can attend a meeting 24/48 hours following a death.</p> <p>Ref No. 12 (Any Other Business): 'Interviews will be scheduled for February 2016' - NS advised that the interviews for a new SLSCB Independent Chair will take place on the 19th February 2016.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	The minutes of the Board meeting held on the 17 th December 2015 be recorded as ratified.

<i>Ref No. 11</i>	Any Other Business			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>Role of the SLSCB Independent Chair</u></p> <p>NS has asked CM to develop and conduct a mini-360° appraisal, and give a view of the contribution and effectiveness of the Board and its members. CM to provide an update on this process at the next Board meeting in February 2016.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted. Update on appraisal of the SLSCB and its members to be provided at the next Board meeting in February 2016.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
100/01/1516	21.01.16	Develop and conduct a mini-360° appraisal, and give a view of the contribution and effectiveness of the Board and its members – updates to be provided at the next Board meeting in February 2016.	CM	18.02.16