























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

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

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"> <li>• Middlesbrough LSCB</li> <li>• Redcar and Cleveland LSCB</li> <li>• Hartlepool LSCB</li> <li>• South Tees YOS</li> <li>• Stockton YOS</li> <li>• Hartlepool YOS</li> <li>• YOS Management Board</li> <li>• LCJB</li> <li>• Local Public Service Board</li> <li>• Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board</li> <li>• Tees Adult Health and Wellbeing Board</li> <li>• Strategic DV and Abuse Strategic Group</li> <li>• Contest Gold</li> <li>• Stockton Scanning and Challenge</li> <li>• ETE/OSE Board</li> <li>• Tees Strategic VEMT Group</li> </ul>	✓
Barbara Gill (BG)	Head of Offender Services - Community Rehabilitation Company			✗
Julie McNaughton (JM)	Accommodation Contracts Manager	Thirteen / Housing Provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tees Valley Choice Based Lettings Steering Group</li> <li>• My Sisters Place – Board</li> <li>• North East Homelessness Group</li> <li>• MAPPAs Representative</li> </ul>	Apols
Steve Rose (SR)	Chief Executive Officer Catalyst	Voluntary Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safer Stockton Partnership</li> <li>• Stockton 14-19 Partnership</li> <li>• Stockton Carers Implementation Group</li> <li>• Stockton Health &amp; Wellbeing Partnership</li> <li>• Stockton VCSE Senior Leaders Forum</li> <li>• Stockton Voice</li> <li>• Stockton Youth Offenders Service Board</li> <li>• Tees Dementia Collaborative</li> <li>• Tees Valley Local Development Agencies Forum</li> <li>• Tees Valley Unlimited European Social Inclusion Task &amp; Finish Group</li> </ul>	✓

Guests:		
Ian Coxon (IC)	SBC - Assistant Director (Business Services & Info.)	Participating Observer
Heather Johnson (HJ)	SBC - Children's Rights & Participation Officer	For item 2
Rachael McLoughlin (RM)	NTHFT - Acting Named Nurse, Child Safeguarding	Sub for Lindsey Robertson
Linda McCalmont (LM)	Independent Author	For item 8

<b>Minute-Taker:</b>	Gary Woods - SLSCB Business Support Officer
----------------------	---

<b>Meeting Quorate:</b>	Yes
-------------------------	-----

<b>Declarations of Interest:</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

Ref No. 1	Attendance, Apologies & Quoracy
Discussion	<p><b>RM</b> was in attendance as the substitute for <b>LR</b>.</p> <p><i>Note: Due to other work commitments, <b>JA</b> left the meeting at 11.30am and <b>SR</b> left the meeting at 11.40am.</i></p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.

Ref No. 2	<b>Children's Rights Reports: Annual Report 2014/15 &amp; The Impact of Child Protection Consultation Documents</b>
Discussion	<p><u>i) Roles and Responsibilities of Children's Rights &amp; Participation Annual Report 2014/15</u>  <b>HJ</b> gave an overview of the circulated Roles and Responsibilities of Children's Rights &amp; Participation Annual Report 2014/15, providing a summary and update on the work undertaken by the Children's Rights &amp; Participation Officer (CRPO) during 2014-2015 (Heather Johnson: September 2014-January 2015 / Donna Grace: March 2015-Present).</p> <p>Noting the principal role of the CRPO in providing a children's rights and advocacy service to children and young people who are 'Looked After' by the Local Authority, the post also develops communication, information and participation systems for and with clients and carers, in relation to the planning and delivery of children and young people services.</p> <p>In terms of responsibilities, the following elements of the report were noted/discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Out of Borough Visits:</u> <b>JH</b> queried why the criterion for a visit was for children up to the age of 16 - consideration may need to be given to extending this beyond 16. <b>HJ</b> explained that the CRPO role was only a part-time post which impacts on the amount of time available to conduct such visits.</li> <li>• <u>Leaving Care Interviews:</u> Unless they were in Young Offenders Institutions, Care Leavers were not written to (as has been done in previous years) but attempts were made to contact all of them by telephone to find out if they would like to take part - this was felt to be a more direct approach. 14 Care Leavers subsequently completed a leaving care interview (all but three of the interviews were conducted on a face-to-face basis) - the need for more financial awareness for Care Leavers to prepare them for when they move into independent living was once again highlighted.</li> <li>• <u>Let's Take Action Group:</u> There are currently two Children in Care Councils that function in Stockton - the Positive Activities Group (for children aged 5-11) provides a pathway into the Let's Take Action Group (for young people aged 12-21). The Fostering Network project (Inspiring Voices) was noted following a successful bid by Stockton to become involved - three Care Leavers have been employed to engage with the Let's Take Action Group. WiFi access issues in Children's Homes were also acknowledged.</li> <li>• <u>Social Media:</u> The application for a Social Media Account to the Digital Media Group is going through its final stages - will need to ensure safeguarding elements are in place, and are appropriately robust, if this is approved.</li> </ul> <p><b>AM</b> reminded Board members of the agreement for a Credit Union representative to talk to young people at the Let's Take Action Group (LTAG) in order to address the identified need for improved financial awareness. <b>JH</b> added that a number of key professionals continue to attend the LTAG to get feedback from young people, and that this group is well established and long-standing.</p> <p><b>JG</b>, in light of a recent inspection she was involved in, queried whether attempts at leaving care interviews are recorded even if a young person does not wish to participate - it was confirmed that this was recognised within the statistics. <b>LC</b> felt it would have been helpful to include the statistics around the parents/carers telephone survey within the report - these will be circulated following this meeting (though have been considered at a recent Board meeting).</p> <p><b>CM</b> thanked <b>HJ</b> for an extremely comprehensive report containing a good level of intelligence.</p> <p><u>ii) Listening to the Voice of the Child - The Impact of Child Protection Consultation Documents</u>  <b>HJ</b> spoke to the already circulated Listening to the Voice of the Child - The Impact of Child Protection Consultation Documents report. The purpose of the research project, initiated as a response to recommendations arising from the Ofsted Inspection of Local Authority Arrangements for the Protection of Children (January 2013), is to look at how the Child</p>

	<p>Protection Documents have been received by the professionals and the children and young people who use them.</p> <p><i>Developments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young people's views on the Child Protection service were reported to the SLSCB in December 2014, alongside a DVD of these views produced during the Child Protection consultation groups. A copy of this DVD was given to the CESC Training Department to use in training sessions for practitioners.</li> <li>The 'Opt Out' Advocacy model, implemented in January 2015, needs further development. Concern was also expressed over the inclusion of 2, 4 and 6 year-olds in the list where the advocacy service was declined - children of this age should not have been offered the service, and staff need reminding of the age cut-off (8 years-old).</li> </ul> <p><i>Developments around the region</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many Local Authorities are using the MOMO (Mind of my own) app which can be used for Child Protection Conferences, LAC Reviews, Complaints and Family Conferencing. If this was to be considered then it would be useful to discuss tailoring the product to fit Stockton's Signs of Safety model.</li> </ul> <p><i>Future Developments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A joint project has been discussed with 'Horizon Trust' to develop Child Protection Consultation documents for children with complex needs - this is ongoing.</li> </ul> <p>The report concluded that there has been progress in developing systems for strengthening the voice of the child in Child Protection through the recording of views, wishes and feelings. However, there is a lack of knowledge around the Core Group consultation document that is available, and the way in which children are involved physically in conferences needs to be developed further – some children find it disheartening when they come out of school to go to a meeting which they are only included in for a short period of time (children have advised that they would be happy to Skype or talk to the Conference Chair on the telephone before meetings if they do not want to attend in person to avoid missing lessons). A number of recommendations were therefore included at the end of the report reflecting further developmental work as outlined above.</p> <p><b>LC</b> felt it would be useful to know why the small number of Social Workers noted that they did not use the consultation documents (appendix 2 - feedback from practitioners) - is there any evidence they adopted something else within their practice, and if they did, why did they choose this instead? In addition, <b>JB</b> reflected comments from Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) who have requested paperwork in advance of Conferences. <b>HJ</b> agreed to look at incorporating these issues into future reports.</p> <p><b>CM</b> again thanked <b>HJ</b> for a very helpful and informative report, and one which needs to be regularly reported back to the LSCB.</p>
--	---

Agreement/ Outcome	Children's Rights reports noted and discussed - information from these will be incorporated into discussions around the overarching SLSCB work on the Voice of the Child.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
101/02/1516	18.02.16	Circulate statistics around the results of the parents/ carers telephone survey to Board members.	<b>Business Unit</b>	19.02.16

Ref No. 3	<b>Voice of the Child</b>
Discussion	<b>MG</b> referred to the circulated Voice of the Child: Follow-up Proposal report, which sought SLSCB endorsement on suggestions to take forward the work on the key thematic priority of the voice of the child (VoC). Following an audit of current activity, led by <b>JB</b> and reported on at the last Board meeting in January 2016, proposals for the next steps were outlined:

	<p>a) Establish a Task and Finish Group, which takes forward the audit work and builds on the recommendations in it. The outcome would be to prepare an agreed VoC framework / commitment for the LSCB and for the Children and Young People's Partnership (CYPP). As such, this approach would also need to be considered at the CYPP also.</p> <p>b) Framework to cover a series of actions and commitments at three levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Strategic</u> – to develop an agreed commitment / framework / protocol; to be clear about how we are going to use, commission, analyse information from a wide range of sources, and use it to influence the action plans and annual reporting of the LSCB and the CYPP. Need an annual collation of information into an annual report, which then feeds into LSCB and CYPP.</li> <li>ii. <u>Service level</u> – how we are going to ensure that all agencies and organisations embed the VoC into their own work.</li> <li>iii. <u>Individual level</u> – how we are going to maintain a focus on the need for individual voices in case specific situations (seeing child alone, specific techniques).</li> </ol> <p>c) To support this type of approach we will look to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Develop some form of toolkit / directory of approaches as a good practice guide which operates at these levels (i.e. strategic, service, individual).</li> <li>ii. Establish a network of those who are especially skilled and use them to collate responses, develop approaches further, and embed good practice.</li> <li>iii. Commit to the use of technology which can be used by all agencies through the LSCB (Facebook, apps, protocols around use of Skype, messaging, etc.).</li> </ol> <p><b>MG</b> made an offer to co-ordinate the proposed Task &amp; Finish Group, and reported that there would be a willingness to bring updates to future Board meetings. Some Board members had been approached to become part of this group (<b>JB</b>, <b>LR</b> and <b>TH</b> had already agreed), and it was suggested that the SBC Children's Rights and Participation Officer should also be included. <b>LB</b> asked to be involved, and it was felt that following on from the helpful work undertaken previously, <b>EA</b> should be added too. <b>KA</b> advised that, in order to ascertain the VoC from those young people with disabilities or complex needs, there may be a need to utilise specialist professionals.</p> <p><b>CM</b> thanked <b>MG</b> for providing a framework to take the VoC work forward, and also <b>JB</b> for her efforts in relation to the initial auditing of current VoC activity.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Board members agreed to all of the proposals outlined within the Voice of the Child: Follow-up Proposal report. <b>MG</b> to co-ordinate VoC Task & Finish Group.

<i>Ref No. 4</i>	<b>DfE Reporting Child Abuse Campaign</b>			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>Reference was made to the circulated letter from Edward Timpson MP (Minister of State for Children and Families) regarding a new communications campaign to encourage members of the public to report child abuse and neglect (dated 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015). The campaign will launch on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2016, and further information in relation to it had also been circulated to Board members.</p> <p><b>JH</b> suggested that this campaign may result in an increase in work across all agencies, and would check whether SBC had received the proposed toolkit (which should have been received on the 15<sup>th</sup> February 2016).</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	DfE Reporting Child Abuse Campaign noted.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
102/02/1516	18.02.16	Check if SBC have received DfE Reporting Child Abuse Campaign toolkit.	<b>JH</b>	26.02.16

<b>Ref No. 5</b>	<b>Recording of CSE Data</b>			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>Further to previous comments made at the last two Board meetings around CSE data, <b>SM</b> reported that a meeting with the Police to discuss the apparent over-recording of CSE-related activity had been cancelled due to a key Officer being unable to attend.</p> <p>Specific attention was drawn to the 'Statutory definition of child sexual exploitation' consultation document from HM Government (circulated during the meeting). Launched on the 12<sup>th</sup> February 2016, views are being sought on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you content with the revised definition of child sexual exploitation?</li> <li>• Does the revised definition place child sexual exploitation clearly and unambiguously within wider child sexual abuse and other forms of abuse?</li> <li>• Are you content for the revised definition of child sexual exploitation to be included in the statutory guidance Working Together to Safeguard Children (2015)?</li> <li>• Are there any other options or changes that you consider need to be made to the revised definition? (please be as specific as possible)</li> </ul> <p>It was the view of <b>SM</b> that if the revised definition of CSE was adopted, there would be less distinction between this and the term <i>child sexual abuse</i> – this would have an impact on VEMT and child protection processes. This view was shared by <b>AS</b>, who would be addressing these concerns at the next Tees LSCB Strategic VEMT Group. <b>JH</b> proposed a regionally/nationally-co-ordinated response to the consultation, as the adoption of the revised definition could lead to the disappearance of the label of <i>child sexual abuse</i>.</p> <p>It was agreed that a response on behalf of the SLSCB would be provided by the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2016 deadline, with <b>AS</b> to lead on this via the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group. Feedback will then be given to the four Tees LSCB Chairs and Business Managers, as well as the respective Tees Directors of Children's Services. It was noted that the results of the consultation, and the Government's response, will be published on GOV.UK in Spring 2016.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Government consultation around the statutory definition of child sexual exploitation noted and discussed. <b>AS</b> to co-ordinate a response (on behalf of the SLSCB) via the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group, and through liaison with the Tees LSCBs Chairs and Business Managers, and the Tees Directors of Children's Services.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
103/02/1516	18.02.16	Lead on a response to the Government consultation around the statutory definition of child sexual exploitation via the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group, and through liaison with the Tees LSCBs Chairs and Business Managers, and the Tees Directors of Children's Services.	<b>AS</b>	11.03.16

<b>Ref No. 6</b>	<b>Cleveland Police – Vulnerability Inspection Report</b>			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><b>AS</b> presented the circulated PEEL: Police effectiveness 2015 (Vulnerability) report (December 2015) following the recent HMIC inspection of Cleveland Police which looked at four key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well does the force identify those who are vulnerable and assess their level of risk and need?</li> <li>• How well does the force respond to vulnerable victims?</li> <li>• How well does the subsequent police action and work with partners keep victims safe?</li> <li>• How well does the force respond to and safeguard specific vulnerable groups (missing and absent children &amp; victims of domestic abuse), and how well prepared is it to tackle child sexual exploitation?</li> </ul>			

	<p>Cleveland Police were graded as ‘requires improvement’ (the same evaluation as pertains to the majority of forces; no force were graded ‘outstanding’), with the report surmising that although protecting those who are vulnerable and supporting victims are priorities for Cleveland Police, there are some important areas requiring improvement in the way in which the force provides these services. There are weaknesses at the very first point of contact when people telephone the Police, and the way the force deals with calls means that the correct level of vulnerability of the victim may not be fully identified straightaway, and therefore the risks not properly assessed and the right initial response not provided. The force has invested in providing skilled, specialist teams to safeguard and protect victims, but the force does not respond to all non-urgent incidents within the required time-scale – this means some vulnerable victims may not be getting the speed of response they need to keep them safe.</p> <p>HMIC also found that there are some areas for improvement in the way in which the force records missing and absent children (<b>AS</b> noted that improved ICT abilities should strengthen this area). The force has, however, made a good start in developing its approach to tackling child sexual exploitation. It responds well to victims of domestic abuse, and has made good progress in improving these services since HMIC’s last inspection.</p> <p><b>CM</b> questioned whether an action plan had been devised to address the issues identified by HMIC. <b>AS</b> advised that Cleveland Police have already indicated that they fully accept the findings of the inspection, and confirmed that an action plan was now in place reflecting this report – this will be shared with partners of the SLSCB.</p> <p>In relation to the identification of the level of vulnerability of a victim, and the weaknesses reported at the very first point of contact when people telephone the Police, <b>AM</b> suggested looking at other forces to see if they have similar issues, particularly since call handlers are likely to be some of the lowest paid employees within a force – need to think about support/advice given to these staff. <b>AS</b> noted that Police Officers were now present within call centres to offer assistance to call handlers, and that this had already made an impact in terms of managing demand. <b>JG</b> supported the idea of looking at other forces, specifically those graded ‘good’, so best practice can be included within the action plan.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	PEEL: Police effectiveness 2015 (Vulnerability) report (December 2015), following the recent HMIC inspection of Cleveland Police, noted, with an action plan devised to reflect the identified issues to be shared with SLSCB members.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
104/02/1516	18.02.16	Share the action plan reflecting the findings of the HMIC inspection of Cleveland Police with SLSCB members.	<b>AS</b>	17.03.16

Ref No. 7	<b>TPG Procedure for Consideration: SAFER Referral Form &amp; PREVENT / Channel Referral</b>			
Discussion	<p><u>SAFER Referral Form</u></p> <p><b>PB</b> reported that a number of comments had been received in relation to the proposed amendments to the SAFER Referral Form, although a substantial amount of work does not appear to be required in order to address Board members’ identified concerns.</p> <p><b>SM</b> noted the difficulties in getting agreement on revisions to the SAFER Referral Form within the Tees LSCBs Procedures Group (TPG) itself, and expressed concern that some Board members’ issues do not relate to those elements of the form which have been changed. It is also known that the other Tees LSCBs appear reluctant to endorse the revised form too.</p> <p><b>SR</b>, reflecting the difficulty in producing forms by committee, and the acknowledgement from <b>SM</b> that the revised form was an improvement on the one currently in use, proposed the endorsement of the suggested amendments – it can then be reviewed after an agreed</p>			



	<p>period of time. This was agreed by Board members, subject to the appropriate strengthening of the ability to record the voice of the child - work to refine the form can follow in the future if necessary. <b>AS</b> agreed to reflect this decision at other Tees LSCB meetings.</p>
	<p><u>PREVENT / Channel Referral</u> This procedure was approved by Board members.</p>
<p>Agreement/ Outcome</p>	<p>SAFER Referral Form approved, subject to the proposed amendments and the enhanced ability to record the voice of the child. Also noted that the PREVENT / Channel Referral procedure had been approved by the SLSCB.</p>

Ref No. 8	Thematic Area Update
<p>Discussion</p>	<p><u>a) Decision Making</u> <b>LM</b> was introduced to Board members as the independent author of the two circulated Initial Child Protection Conference (ICPC) attendance and Section 47s reports, and proceeded to give an overview of each. The following elements were noted/discussed:</p> <p><i>Attendance by Agencies at Initial Child Protection Conference between 1<sup>st</sup> April and 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Background</u>: Scrutiny of ICPCs necessary given the relatively high number of children subject to CP plans. Hypothesis of undue influence by particular agencies.</li> <li>• <u>Methodology</u>: 51 ICPCs involving 85 children between 1<sup>st</sup> April and 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015. All convening sheets and minutes relating to these Conferences were scrutinised, and the author met with all of the Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) who chair the Conferences, and their Manager. Telephone discussions with Team Managers from CESC, and with representatives from Health and the Police, about their experience of ICPCs.</li> <li>• <u>Findings (Convening Sheets)</u>: The system of verifying the method of invitation was not consistent, and it became extremely difficult to determine whether an agency had been invited or not - little confidence, therefore, that the convening sheets were accurate and that the document consistently reflected who was invited to attend the Conference.</li> <li>• <u>Findings (Attendance at Conference)</u>: Not always possible to determine whether an agency's lack of attendance was due to non-attendance, or because an invitation had not been sent – this was further exacerbated by the fact that not everyone who attended the Conference was actually recorded as present. Also, information from an agency would be shared at the ICPC, but it was not always clear whether the owner of the reported information was actually present or had sent a report, because they were neither included in the attendance nor the apologies.</li> <li>• <u>Findings (Comments from IROs and other Agency Representatives)</u>: It would appear from the recordings of the Conference minutes that the greatest influence on decision-making is the IROs.</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion, none of the Conferences scrutinised appeared to indicate any undue influence by any one agency in respect of decision-making. The author felt that safeguarding decisions reached in Conference were reasonable and appropriate, and that the correct agencies attended. However, the recording of invitation and attendance, both on the convening sheets and in the ICPC minutes, was not always accurate and did not stand up well to external scrutiny. In addition, IROs have indicated that their comments about decisions were not recorded in the correct order in the minutes, and this is why it looks as though they are directing the decision-making process.</p> <p>Regarding the latter point as indicated above, <b>LC</b> felt that this highlighted the importance of minute-taking, and queried the level of training provided. <b>JH</b> advised that the abilities of minute-takers vary, but that there had been a significant amount of training undertaken with relevant staff to improve standards.</p>

**JG** reflected on the bracketing of Health partners within the report, and urged the need for clarity in the convening sheets to differentiate between agencies. There was also no mention of GPs (how many invited, how many submitted a report?) – work done in terms of GP attendance should be noted. **SR** added that GPs were in the process of ‘federating’, and suggested speaking to Dr Paul Williams (GP Lead for the Stockton Locality) about attendance issues – **JG** to tap into the GP federation, as well as Dr John Bye (HAST CCG Named GP).

**MG** acknowledged that the report highlighted specific shortfalls in what should be fairly basic processes, but assured Board members that changes had been made and have already had an effect. The changes in how Conferences are run (utilising the Signs of Safety process) should tighten up on recording issues, and a quality assurance framework in relation to the Independent Review Unit should re-enforce the standards expected. A more specific report regarding Health attendance at Conferences is now available – **MG** will discuss this with **JG** following the meeting.

**JH** advised that line management responsibility for administration has been separated from IROs (admin now managed corporately), and that two additional IROs have been added to the Review Unit. It was also noted that this report was commissioned by the Local Authority, and that agencies will need to look at funding through the Board if they want to do something similar in the future. **JG** offered thanks to the Local Authority for funding this piece of work, and felt it provided a wake-up call to all partners.

*Section 47 Enquiries started during April 2015 – June 2015 that did not proceed to ICPC*  
**LM** concluded that:

- The quality of the narrative in Strategies was generally good. The recording of attendance in some Strategies was not always clear, and it is recommended that Team Managers review this process with their line manager in order to achieve consistency. Similarly, the quality of S47 Enquiries was generally of an acceptable standard, and in the two cases where it is felt these could be improved upon, this information will be passed on to the relevant Manager.
- The fact that almost 50% of the Section 47 Enquiries substantiated the concerns raised in the referrals, but did not result in an Initial Child Protection for the reasons identified within the report, does appear to offer the most concrete explanation for the gap between the number of Enquiries completed and the number of children subject to an Initial Child Protection Plan.
- The majority of referrals related to domestic violence or allegations of physical abuse by children about family members. In some of the physical abuse referrals, a child was noted to have an injury, but this was not the case for others. The Council may wish to review the response to those cases where a child alleges being hit by a family member and where there is no injury.

**AS** sought clarity around the use of the word ‘informally’ in relation to the EDT relationship with the Police (‘...the Police are willing to assist the team informally’; Findings (paragraph 8)) – **JH** felt this reflected the helpfulness of the Police even outside normal working hours, despite the difficulties of reduced staffing during these times. **CM** also queried the statement in paragraph 9 of the Findings section from the EDT Manager (‘eight or nine out of ten calls received at any given time across all of Teesside to discuss concerns about individual cases do come from the host Authority’) – it was asserted that the majority of calls came from Stockton, but this was not backed up by any statistics; upon further investigation at the request of SBC, evidence showed that around 60-70% of calls came from Stockton or Middlesbrough, reflecting the size of these authorities. It was noted that the EDT Manager does not always work out-of-hours.

**CM** re-affirmed the Board’s thanks to the Local Authority for their investment into these extremely important reports, and along with **JH**, thanked **LM** for the work she undertook.

	<p><i>Conference Decision</i>  <b>MG</b> provided feedback in relation to the key thematic area of Conference Decision-Making, referring to the circulated details of a meeting of eight Board members on the 17<sup>th</sup> December 2015 to consider seven selected cases submitted by agencies following discussions at previous Board meetings. Prior to this meeting, it was agreed to look at the case types below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cases where it is believed children and young people were removed from a CP Plan prematurely.</li> <li>• Cases where step down from CP Plan was recommended, but not agreed.</li> <li>• CP cases where there is a view children should not be subject to a CP Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Each case was subsequently discussed at the meeting to determine whether attending Board Members agreed with the decisions made by their staff, and if they did not, whether they (Board Members) collectively could reach a consensus around the decision they felt should have been made based on the information they had.</p> <p>Of the seven cases reviewed, attending Board Members agreed with 6 of the 7 decisions made at the conferences. Discussions were based on the information they had, whilst acknowledging they were considering the cases with the benefit of hindsight.</p> <p><b>JH</b> highlighted the lack of agency understanding of the Public Law Outline (PLO) process, and asked whether the Board should be aiming to raise awareness of this to partners. <b>SM</b> reflected a discussion which took place at a Tees LSCBs Procedures Group (TPG) meeting around 'dual process', and re-iterated that, in Stockton, a CP plan is not removed if a child is subject to PLO. It was therefore agreed that, whilst the procedure around PLO appeared sound, there was a need for better awareness of this process - drop-in sessions for staff were proposed.</p> <p><b>CM</b> concluded that the December 2015 meeting had been a very useful conversation, which identified some key issues around decision-making. A similar process should be repeated in the future.</p>			
	<p><u>b) Early Help Update</u>  Further to the in-depth thematic discussion on early help at the December 2015 Board meeting, <b>MG</b> gave an update on developments. Details around how the approach to early help will be strengthened in order to provide a more coherent offer, as well as how early help work will be received from the forthcoming Multi-Agency Children's Hub (MACH), will be presented to the Early Help Partnership Group later this week. A report will then be submitted to a future SLSCB meeting for consideration.</p>			
<p><i>Agreement/ Outcome</i></p>	<p>ICPC attendance report noted and discussed – actions resulting from this acknowledged, and future work in terms of GP attendance and increasing clarity in Conference minutes regarding Health attendance agreed. S47 Enquiries report noted and discussed. Conference Decision-Making analysis has revealed a lack of awareness around the PLO process which needs addressing. Early help update also given - report to Board will follow.</p>			
<p><i>Log Ref</i></p>	<p><i>Mtg Date</i></p>	<p><i>Action Required</i></p>	<p><i>Person Responsible</i></p>	<p><i>Due Date</i></p>
<p>105/02/1516</p>	<p>18.02.16</p>	<p>Reflect GP attendance issues discussed at this, and previous, SLSCB meetings to the new GP federation, including Dr Paul Williams and Dr John Bye.</p>	<p><b>JG</b></p>	<p>21.04.16</p>
<p>106/02/1516</p>	<p>18.02.16</p>	<p>Liaise with <b>JG</b> regarding Health attendance at Conferences.</p>	<p><b>MG</b></p>	<p>26.02.16</p>

<p><i>Ref No. 9</i></p>	<p><b>Update on Tees Performance data approach</b></p>			
<p><i>Discussion</i></p>	<p>Further to the presentation and discussion on the Tees-wide Performance Management</p>			

	<p>Framework at the last Board meeting in January 2016, <b>MG</b> confirmed that all four Tees LSCBs have agreed to the adoption of the proposals, and the funding contributions required for the first year (it was noted that the Police are putting in additional funding to support this). <b>JG</b> will be the Chair of the new Tees Performance Sub-Group for the first year, and regular performance reports will be provided to future Board meetings. A Performance Analyst will be employed - this post will be funded through the agreed contributions from agencies.</p> <p><b>PB</b> cautioned that the cycle of reports noted in the presentation at the last Board meeting are unlikely to be in place by April 2016, and that Stockton will continue its current information-gathering processes until the new cycle begins. Decisions on when specific reports go to Board's will need to be reached in light of the current variance in meeting schedules across Tees LSCBs, some of whom may wish to reflect on their present governance.</p> <p><b>IC</b> reflected a recent discussion with <b>MG</b> regarding the lead role of administering the Tees-wide performance process - Stockton has expressed an interest in understanding this process further.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates on the Tees-wide Performance Management Framework noted. Current SLSCB performance processes to continue until agreed proposals are functional.

Ref No. 10	<b>Partners Operational Safeguarding Issues</b>
Discussion	<p><u>HAST CCG</u>  <b>JG</b> reported on the recent unannounced visit by CQC in Hartlepool. There was a marked difference in the tenure of the inspection, notably an increase in its intensity. A discussion with the inspectors following the visit revealed that a similar approach is expected during an anticipated joint inspection. The official report will be shared with partners, as well as progress against the identified actions.</p> <p><u>Local Authority</u>  <b>JH</b> advised that the MACH implementation remains scheduled for the 1<sup>st</sup> June 2016 - this has been through SBC Cabinet, and will be going to Hartlepool Borough Council Cabinet shortly. The new Continuum of Need document, discussed at the last SLSCB meeting in January 2016, has now been signed off. Signs of Safety will be adopted in all ICPCs from next week - training is ongoing, and good feedback has been received in relation to this tool. The Children and Young People Select Committee scrutiny review of the SLSCB is ongoing, and a session took place last night looking at the current picture - some Board members may be asked to provide a report for this review.</p> <p>An update on the current workload issues was provided - there are 437 active cases (300 is considered very high); all of them appear appropriate in terms of thresholds, and Social Care are struggling to meet timescales. There are a number of unallocated cases in the Fieldwork teams, and continued attempts to recruit staff are being made (13 vacancies, though 4 experienced staff have been recently recruited) - agreement for a retention payment in place, which although has a cost implication, will hopefully address the trend of staff leaving the authority for agencies, or moving into alternative roles.</p> <p>Detailed discussion ensued in relation to workload and staffing issues across partners - is the situation in Stockton reflected across the region/nation? Challenges experienced by Health and Probation were noted, and <b>JH</b> felt that the issue of vacancies/use of agency staff will be a key area of focus for Ofsted - some regional work is being undertaken around the use of agency staff, and analysis on this may be available in the near future. <b>JB</b> hears from a number of young people who express a wish to get into Social Work or Nursing, and suggested improved links to aid succession planning - although schemes to get young people into these fields were noted, there remains a critical need for experi-</p>

	<p>enced staff.</p> <p><b>DM</b> raised an issue around a lack of information being provided to schools from Health professionals - this will be followed up with <b>LR</b>.</p> <p><b>JE</b> drew attention to the 15% increase in the number of approaches to the Housing Options Service - 30% of these were from people with dependent children. <b>CM</b> reminded agencies that the Board agreed to attempt to track the impact of welfare changes, and queried whether this qualified as evidence - <b>SR</b> noted that this had been discussed at a recent Safer Stockton Partnership meeting, and links to this partnership, and the Health and Wellbeing Board may be required in relation to this issue. <b>LC</b> also highlighted the potential for private landlords in Stockton deciding to remove their property from private lots as they may no longer be financially viable.</p> <p><u>Voluntary Sector</u></p> <p><b>SR</b> felt that refugees/asylum seekers coming to the UK with transferable skills may help issues around recruitment. The next VCSE Safeguarding Forum date has now changed - any items for the agenda should be sent to <b>SR</b> or James Hadman (Stockton Voice Officer, Catalyst). In relation to the 'A Fairer Start' programme, a number of volunteers acting as Community Champions do not get access to safeguarding training - proposal made for Catalyst to pay for these volunteers to access training (<b>SR</b> liaising with <b>PB</b> regarding access to SLSCB programme).</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates noted.

<b>Ref No. 11</b>	<b>21.01.16 Board Minutes for Accuracy</b>
Discussion	Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 21 <sup>st</sup> January 2016 were agreed as a true record.
Agreement/ Outcome	The minutes of the Board meeting held on the 21 <sup>st</sup> January 2016 be recorded as ratified.

<b>Ref No. 12</b>	<b>SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group</b>
Discussion	<p>With reference to the circulated VEMT Sub-Group: Chairs Update Report for SLSCB, <b>SM</b> reported that there continues to be good attendance and positive contributions from all agencies involved. There has been no Health representation to date, but representatives from NTHFT and TEWV have now been put forward and will be invited to future meetings.</p> <p>The total number of young people subject to VEMT has increased in recent months, with a rise in the ratio of males evident. Those categorised as CSE have reduced, but other categories have gone up - the current situation is being closely monitored. An issue to be considered at future meetings involves the supply of photographs of VEMT children to the Police - this is being discussed at the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group, though difficulties around consent have been raised. Provision of photographs on a case-by-case basis for those children you regularly go missing may be considered.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates noted.

<b>Ref No. 13</b>	<b>SLSCB LIPSG</b>
Discussion	The circulated LIPSG: Chairs Update Report for SLSCB was noted - due to re-organisation within some partner agencies, changes in the LIPSG membership have taken place (current membership list provided). Ongoing work includes monitoring completion of action learning plans - the Gavin SCR plan has recently been reviewed, and the Harry action plan is nearing completion of its actions. Joint work with the Youth Offending Team Board is

	<p>planned relating to the vulnerability of young people involved in criminal anti-social behaviour which resulted in a death - this work is on hold due to the legal status of the case.</p> <p><b>AS</b> drew attention to the two circulated supplementary SLSCB Proforma for Review Feedback (Learning / SCR) reports regarding Cora and Daisy (these are not the children's own names). Both cases highlighted the difficulties faced by professionals.</p> <p><i>Cora</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Key messages</u>: Focus was on vulnerable adult which led to lack of professional challenge and disguised compliance taking place.</li> <li>• <u>Key points of learning</u>: Work must be child focused - adverse situations affecting adults should not detract from keeping the child at the centre of all decisions and actions; Assessment of ability to protect and any risk factors must be made and acted upon; How and what response should be made if written agreements are breached; Communication and challenge is required if positive outcomes for children are to take place.</li> </ul> <p><b>JH</b> questioned whether Adult Services were involved with the vulnerable adult in question – it was confirmed that they were. In terms of vulnerable adults with complex needs, <b>JG</b> noted the number of local facilities with such people – these adults may be former perpetrators who are subject to the same frailties/illnesses as everyone else.</p> <p><i>Daisy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Key messages</u>: Written agreements should be made at the earliest opportunity. Again, issues regarding the pathways and protocols relating to 'did not attend / missed appointments' has been a factor in this case. This has highlighted the need to review the process of closing a case following DNA's.</li> <li>• <u>Key points of learning</u>: Stockton Social Care and the Emergency Duty Team should ensure that voluntary agreements for the care of children must be backed up by written agreements with the involved parties at the earliest possible opportunity; Tees, Esk and Wear Valley Mental Health Trust to review the involvement of mental health services with Daisy during the period May 2014 – November 2015, with particular reference to the response to her stated intention to self-harm on different occasions. The response to Daisy's failure to attend CAMHS appointments should also be reviewed by TEWV. Liaison should then take place with education representatives, with any lessons learned feeding into the LIPSG and the Stockton schools safeguarding forum.</li> </ul> <p><b>JG</b> advised that Dr John Bye (HAST CCG Named GP) is looking into the issue of children missing appointments, and the fact that it is not the children who DNA.</p> <p>Board members agreed that <b>PB</b> could share the above learning with partners and other colleagues across the region for the purposes of training.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates and review feedback for Cora and Daisy noted.

<b>Ref No. 14</b>	<b>SLSCB Chairs mini-360° Appraisal of SLSCB</b>
Discussion	<p><b>CM</b> advised that there had potentially been a difference of interpretation in respect of this matter. By his recollection, he had agreed with <b>NS</b> to undertake a 360-degree assessment of the contributions made by key LSCB contributors, and feed this back to a meeting convened by <b>NS</b> prior to his termination of office as LSCB Chair. In terms of succession, a selection of Board members from each agency will be involved in this process, as opposed to the whole Board membership.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.

<b>Ref No. 15</b>	<b><i>Any Other Business</i></b>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>Ofsted Inspections</u>            The next Ofsted Single Inspection Framework (SIF) date is the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016. The SIF programme has been extended to December 2017, possibly due to resourcing issues around the need to further review those Councils (21) who have been graded 'inadequate'. South Tyneside are to undergo a joint targeted area inspection next week – attempts will be made to acquire any learning from this.</p> <p><u>SLSCB Independent Chair Interviews</u>            Interviews for a new SLSCB Independent Chair will take place tomorrow (19<sup>th</sup> February 2016) involving three candidates. Details of any appointments will be circulated to partner agencies at the earliest opportunity.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.