













## STOCKTON-ON-TEES LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD (SLSCB)

### 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)	<div style="text-align: center;"> <span style="color: green;">✓</span>  <span style="color: red;">✗</span>  <span style="color: blue;">Apols</span> </div>
Dave Pickard (DP)	LSCB Independent Chair	SLSCB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LSCB Chair Hartlepool</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>	Apols
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>	Apols
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)			✓
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>	✓

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 (CM)	Deputy Principal Secondary Schools			
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>	Apols
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>	
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>	
David Charlesworth (DC)	Quality and Patient Safety Manager	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"> <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>• MAPPA 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>	Apols

Guests:		
Rhona Bolland (RB)	SBC - Service Manager, Assessment & Fieldwork	For item 15
David Crosby (DCr)	SBC - Media Manager	For item 3
Dr John Bye (JBy)	HAST CCG - Named GP	Participating Observer

<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>DP</b> introduced himself as the new SLSCB Chair, informing the Board of his intention to conduct 1:1s with all members before the intended SLSCB Development Day in June 2016. This will allow <b>DP</b> to build evidence as to what is currently working well, what could be done better, and identify key elements to focus upon in order to make a difference to children and young people in Stockton-on-Tees.</p> <p><i>Note: <b>EM</b> arrived in the meeting at 9.30am, and <b>PK</b> left the meeting at 10.45am.</i></p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.

Ref No. 2	<b>Unallocated Children's Social Care Fieldwork &amp; Assessment Cases</b>
Discussion	<p>Further to the pressures within Children's Social Care referenced at recent SLSCB meetings, <b>JH</b> and <b>MG</b> had been asked to provide detailed updates on the current situation, including any safeguarding issues that the Board needed to be aware of, and any thoughts on how the Board could potentially assist.</p> <p><b>JH</b> outlined the context in which workloads are monitored. Regular meetings take place with <b>AM</b> and <b>NS</b>, and with Assistant Directors - the last meeting (15<sup>th</sup> April 2016) reported no unallocated cases. Every Monday, <b>JH</b> receives weekly information on Assessment Team workloads (other teams are received bi-weekly), and there are now 493 cases within the Assessment Team, nearly double the amount at the same time last year (no cases are awaiting allocation). LAC and CP figures are monitored - LAC numbers appear to have levelled out, but the number of CP plans is increasing.</p> <p>Vacancy rates remain very challenging - there are currently 15 Social Work vacancies which are being covered by agency staff. Recent recruitment campaigns have resulted in the appointment of 10 staff whose start dates are still to be confirmed - four of these are experienced workers, and four are from the 'Grow-your-own' Social Worker programme. 'Golden Hello's' (used as a recruitment tool) and retention payments (designed to retain experienced staff) began last month.</p> <p>Staff caseloads are monitored - staff are presently working with around 25 children each (national guidance is 15 per worker, so Stockton figures are high). Meetings take place regarding staff performance, and issues in relation to capability, disciplinary or sickness are addressed through the established Local Authority processes. It was noted that there is not a high frequency of sickness within Social Care.</p> <p>Additional workload pressures following the launch of Operation Encompass were highlighted - there had been 70 related referrals received in February 2016 and 65 in March 2016. Jill Anderson (SBC Service Manager, Early Help) is undertaking work around referrals received from the Police that should not have been submitted.</p> <p>A further key challenge is around stopping the flow of cases through the Social Care system - high numbers are coming into, and staying in, the system for a long time. Approaches to work involving domestic violence also needs to be examined across the SLSCB and other partnerships. In summary, Stockton is not the only Local Authority experiencing such difficulties, and it may be timely for other SLSCB partners to undertake an assessment of their own workload situation, particularly in light of the current number of cases being seen.</p> <p><b>AM</b> emphasised the position of SBC Elected Members in terms of their commitment to funding for Children's Social Care. The retention package appeared to paying dividends already, and it was clear from staff that they valued the protected caseload arrangements - this is key to safeguarding children, and needed to be kept in place.</p> <p><b>LR</b> queried whether there was an appetite from other Local Authorities to introduce a cap on Social Worker pay. <b>JH</b> reported that attempts have been made to come to some form of agreement across Council's, but not all are willing to keep to this – it will be re-visited in the near future, but only a national agreement (as in Health) would assist this process. In addition, the issue of agency workers (who get paid more) remains. SBC had proposed regional work (led by Middlesbrough) around encouraging people to get into Social Work across Tees, but the pace of this work is slow. However, encouragingly for the locality, <b>AM</b> highlighted the national 'Step Up to Social Work' programme - the three people who achieved the highest academic level all chose Stockton for their placements.</p> <p><b>LB</b> questioned why the focus is always on the need for experienced staff - <b>JH</b> re-iterated the key challenge around recruiting and retaining experienced practitioners, as newly</p>

	<p>qualified staff cannot oversee heavy-end cases (e.g. CP). <b>KA</b> added that, despite the focus around early help and the application of thresholds, it was disappointing that the number of cases continues to rise, thereby adding to the pressure upon systems.</p> <p>From a statutory safeguarding perspective, <b>DP</b> asked whether Stockton is meeting the timescales for assessments. Assurance was given that, even if a case is not immediately allocated, the statutory visits are still undertaken. Robust processes are in place to ensure that staff are carrying out the requirements of their role appropriately.</p> <p><b>DP</b> questioned if any analysis around these workload pressures was being done. <b>MG</b> is conducting a piece of work from an early help point of view - domestic abuse/domestic violence issues to be examined. A recent recruit from Redcar reported that cases were more complicated in Stockton, and efforts are being made to understand this more. <b>MG</b> will also monitor where cases are being signposted to following commencement of the Children's Hub in June 2016, with the aim of increasing knowledge of what is going on across the Borough, not just within Children's Social Care.</p> <p><b>DP</b> considered what could be done to minimise the use of agency staff, and whether this can be addressed by Chief Executives/Director of Children's Services. <b>NS</b> reminded Board members of the current national crisis in recruiting Social Workers, and that this inevitably impacts on the ability to safeguard children.</p> <p><b>DP</b> thanked Board members for an in-depth debate, and proposed that workload/vacancy issues are further explored at the SLSCB Development Day in June 2016.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Children's Social Care workload and vacancy issues discussed, with future plans and analysis noted - further exploration to take place at the SLSCB Development Day in June 2016.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
01/04/1617	21.04.16	Further discussions on Children's Social Care workload and vacancy pressures to take place at the SLSCB Development Day in June 2016.	<b>ALL</b>	16.06.16

<i>Ref No. 3</i>	<b>Governance Documents for Review</b>			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><b>PB</b> referred to the circulated SLSCB governance documents - all three draft papers had been recently reviewed, and comments on these were as follows:</p>			
	<p><u>a) SLSCB Constitution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (3.2) Voice of the child to be more explicit within the SLSCB statement.</li> <li>• (4.3) <b>DP</b> questioned whether the role of early help needed to be more explicit here, though a wider brief for the Board has been tried before, and the SLSCB is more about children and young people coming into the 'system'. Further discussion may be required around this at the SLSCB Development Day in June 2016.</li> <li>• (8) Add paragraph on Lay Member role/responsibility.</li> <li>• (16) Suggested that Executive Group membership references should be made more explicit, however it was agreed to keep the wording as it currently is (particularly since the SLSCB does not currently have an Executive Group).</li> <li>• (18.6.2) Include 'exploitation' in the example list.</li> </ul>			
	<p><u>b) SLSCB Scheme of Delegation</u> No comments received.</p>			
	<p><u>c) SLSCB Communications Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (2.3) Amend 'Julie Allen' to 'Julie Allan' (National Probation Service Cleveland).</li> <li>• (2.3) Amend 'Head Teach' to 'Head Teacher' (Education Establishments).</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>DP</b> felt there needed to be stronger references to social media as this is one of the biggest growth areas within safeguarding - <b>DCr</b> can take this back and review accordingly.</li> <li>• <b>DP</b> considered whether specialist media advice for high profile cases needed to be included within the strategy - <b>DCr</b> noted that this has not been sought in the past as it is felt that any media situations can be dealt with in-house.</li> <li>• Proposals put forward for a Communications Plan to sit alongside this strategy.</li> </ul>			
	Subject to the minor amendments identified ( <b>PB</b> to make these changes), all three SLSCB governance documents were approved.			
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB governance documents noted and discussed - these were approved, subject to the identified amendments.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
02/04/1617	21.04.16	Amend the SLSCB governance documents as identified at the Board meeting in April 2016.	<b>PB</b>	19.05.16

Ref No. 4	<b>SLSCB Business Plan Review 2014 / 2017</b>
Discussion	<p>Board members were referred to the circulated <i>SLSCB Business Plan 2014-2017</i>. Last approved in June 2014, this document has been recently reviewed and updated, and was now presented for comment.</p> <p>Discussion ensued in relation to the key actions within the plan that were currently RAG rated amber (some slippage, but this is not a significant concern, and work is in progress to complete this action) or red (significant delays or concerns in progressing the action):</p> <p><i>Objective 2: Improve the response to children and young people at risk of harm as a result of domestic abuse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>b) Review arrangements for risk assessment of domestic incidents</u>: this has sat within the Tees LSCBs Procedures Group (TPG) for some time as the TPG Police representative has not progressed the required work. A new Police representative is now in place on the TPG and will resurrect this action - <b>AS</b> will liaise with <b>SM</b> (TPG Chair) regarding the requirements of the TPG Police representative, but noted that only Stockton appears to have an issue with these review arrangements (which HMIC have given a good endorsement of). <b>PB</b> is meeting with the TPG Police representative in the near future, and it is hoped that a more tangible update can be provided at the SLSCB meeting in May 2016. The forthcoming Children's Hub across Hartlepool and Stockton will be informative on the management of domestic abuse referrals, and what needs to be early help or safeguarding. For now, the action remains amber.</li> </ul> <p><i>Objective 4: Improve early identification of, and response to, neglect</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>a) Develop a more outcomes focused approach to care planning (CAF, CIN and CP)</u>: this action is marked red as the lead (Multi-Agency Task Group) has not come together as anticipated. However, Signs of Safety and Graded Care Profile 2 are both now in operation, therefore <b>JH</b> will consider some wording in order to turn this action to amber. <b>PB</b> added that work taking place at the TPG will also support this action.</li> </ul> <p><i>Objective 6: Strengthen the QA and Performance Management framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>a) Further develop the quality assurance role of the Reviewing Service so that it provides a more robust independent check and balance function that informs both individual case management and wider service development</u>: <b>MG</b> advised that a lot of work has taken place in relation to this action, including an Improvement Plan - this can be evidenced and the RAG rating can therefore be changed to green.</li> <li>• <u>b) Review and develop arrangements across agencies for analysing the impact of service provision on children and young people / families where there has been a CP</u></li> </ul>

	<p><u>Plan in place:</u> as above, a lot of activity has been undertaken regarding this action - this can be evidenced and the RAG rating can therefore be changed to green.</p> <p>It was agreed to revisit the SLSCB Business Plan at the SLSCB Development Day in June 2016, as this will inform how the Board takes its work forward. For now, updates to those key actions currently marked as amber or red can be made as per the comments above.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	SLSCB Business Plan 2014-2017 noted, with updates provided for those actions still outstanding (RAG rated amber or red). Further discussions to take place at the SLSCB Development Day in June 2016.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
03/04/1617	21.04.16	Liaise with <b>SM</b> regarding the requirements of the TPG Police representative in progressing the <i>Review arrangements for risk assessment of domestic incidents</i> (Objective 2) action of the SLSCB Business Plan 2014-2017.	<b>AS</b>	19.05.16
04/04/1617	21.04.16	Provide appropriate wording for the <i>Develop a more outcomes focused approach to care planning (CAF, CIN and CP)</i> (Objective 4) of the SLSCB Business Plan 2014-2017, acknowledging Signs of Safety and Graded Care Profile 2.	<b>JH</b>	19.05.16
05/04/1617	21.04.16	Provide evidence to support completion of Objective 6 (actions a) and b)) of the SLSCB Business Plan 2014-2017.	<b>MG</b>	19.05.16

<i>Ref No. 5</i>	<b>LSCBs &amp; TSAB 'Think Family' Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of Children and Adults at Risk Guidance</b>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>With reference to the circulated comments from Board members in relation to the proposed Tees-wide Safeguarding Adults Board (TSAB) and Tees LSCB's 'Think Family' Safeguarding and Promoting the Welfare of Children and Adults at Risk guidance document, <b>PB</b> thanked all who had provided a response.</p> <p><b>JA</b> had forwarded a number of observations, but advised that she was happy to agree the procedure as it stood. <b>JH</b> had suggested the need to make some explicit reference to young carers somewhere within the document - this was agreed by Board members. All other comments received approved the procedure.</p> <p><b>DP</b> urged the need to review such approved procedures at some point in the future to ensure that they are appropriate for both practitioners and children/young people.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	TSAB/Tees LSCBs LSCB's 'Think Family' Safeguarding and Promoting the Welfare of Children and Adults at Risk guidance document approved subject to the identified addition.

<i>Ref No. 6</i>	<b>CYP Conversation</b>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>The <i>Annual Conversation 2015 - Feedback</i> report was presented for consideration following the Children &amp; Young People's Partnership (CYPP) Annual Conversation 2015, held with children and young people on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2015. The report provided details of the format of the event, and requested that partners consider what changes to arrangements for the 2016 event may be beneficial.</p> <p>Over 50 children and young people attended the session, and the following five themes (drawn from CYPP priorities and issues raised by children and young people at previous events) were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abuse Victims and Witness, Peer Pressure, Safe and Feel Safe.</li> </ul>

- Substance Misuse, Sex Education, Healthier Lives.
- Relationships, Isolation, Disconnection, Sense of Community.
- Life Skills, Adulthood.
- Emotional Performance, LAC Outcomes.

These themes were allocated to lead facilitators who, in turn, were allocated to different rooms within the Town Hall, Stockton. Young people were placed in groups, and each group visited each themed room (a carousel).

Subsequent analysis of the discussions held produced a range of findings (as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report) - these included feelings that adults often have a negative perception of children and young people, exploitation was not being discussed at schools, there were not enough things to do, issues around social media, bullying and self-harm, and the desire for more information about food and access to healthy food, and cheaper sporting facilities.

A session is planned for 2016, and in light of feedback received from facilitators and others involved in the 2015 conversation, it has been proposed to hold separate events for both primary and secondary school/post-16 age-ranges. In addition, it was felt too many adults were present in 2015 (a number of young people came with their carers), so those accompanying the young people may need to be accommodated in another room to allow for a more open conversation to take place.

Further to the range of issues identified from the 2015 session, some initial key areas of discussion for the 2016 conversation could include:

- Lots of work done around CSE, but the message is seemingly not being received.
- Use of supply teachers in schools - young people want consistency.
- Self-harm - CYPP have already looked at this, but the regional statistics are alarming. **KC** noted a recent issue with a year 6 pupil, and felt that consideration should be given to future work around self-harm being extended to involve primary schools too.

**DM** reminded the Board of the secondary school survey (years 8 and 10) which is presently being conducted - it will be completed by the end of May 2016, so results should be available soon regarding perceptions of young people. **AT** asked if Independent Schools could take part in this survey too, though **DM** thought that an invite to participate had already been extended to this schools sector during the original roll-out - **DM** to clarify this with **AT**. When feedback on the survey is given to secondary school Head Teachers, **JB** suggested that any findings in relation to careers advice should be focused upon.

**AS** felt that the range of findings following the 2015 event was largely what partners would expect to see, but questioned whether further exploration was required around how safe young people feel at home (potential issues around domestic abuse, domestic violence, alcohol in the home, etc.) - they may find this difficult to discuss, but agencies need to be mindful. **JH** was unsure if the annual conversation was the appropriate forum for these issues, and noted that it was the young people, not partners, who dictate the topics to be discussed. **DM** added that the schools survey asks young people for their experiences at home, and agreed to circulate the survey to Board members for information.

**PK** emphasised that the annual conversation is an excellent way to engage with young people, and encouraged Board members to get involved. **DP** thanked all those who took part in the 2015 session, and re-iterated the need to enhance links into primary schools (**DM** to explore potential options with **KC**).

Agreement/  
Outcome

Annual Conversation 2015 report noted and discussed, with plans for the 2016 session outlined. SLSCB members encouraged to become involved in future events.



Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
06/04/1617	21.04.16	Liaise with <b>AT</b> regarding involvement of Independent Schools in the ongoing schools survey (year 8 & 10).	<b>DM</b>	29.04.16
07/04/1617	21.04.16	Circulate a copy of the ongoing secondary schools survey to Board members for information.	<b>DM</b>	29.04.16
08/04/1617	21.04.16	Explore options to enhance links into primary schools in order to address relevant issues identified through the Annual Conversation feedback.	<b>DM/KC</b>	16.06.16

Ref No. 7	<b>Voice of the Child</b>
Discussion	<p><b>MG</b> presented the circulated <i>Voice of the Child - proposal</i> report, which sought the SLSCBs approval of proposals to embed an approach to voice of the child across the work of the LSCB. Identified as a key thematic priority for the SLSCB in 2015-2016, and further to the audit of current activity (led by <b>JB</b>, and reported to the SLSCB in January 2016), a Task &amp; Finish Group met on the 11<sup>th</sup> April 2016 to review the subsequent proposals for 2016-2017.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal is to agree a framework for 'Voice of the child' which includes action at strategic, operational and individual levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Strategically</u> - as partnerships we will ensure that we engage with existing representative structures, are pro-active in seeking the views of children and young people in the work we do, and that we commit to reporting on outcomes.</li> <li><u>Operationally</u> - individual services and organisations commit to their own processes to seek the voice of the child when taking decisions, and commit to reporting on this activity, and to collate examples as evidence.</li> <li><u>Individually</u> - ensuring that the voice of the child is sought and listed to when undertaking any assessment/review/care planning, and is a fundamental part of our work on safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children.</li> </ol> <p>The report outlined the way in which this framework will be delivered at each level, and included further details on the annual report process, operational guidance (why and how to consult and engage), and a good practice toolkit for working with children.</p> <p>These proposals have been presented to the CYPP as it is equally relevant there - CYPP endorsed them yesterday (20<sup>th</sup> April 2016). SLSCB members also agreed to accept the Voice of the Child proposals as presented.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Voice of the Child proposals (for implementation in 2016-2017) noted and approved.

Ref No. 8	<b>SLSCB 2015 / 2016 Action Log</b>
Discussion	<p>The <i>SLSCB Action Log 2015/2016 (Full)</i> had been circulated for information. Updates to this document were identified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23/8/1415: 'School Nurse Programme evaluation report to be presented at end of pilot' (Linda Watson) - <b>LR</b> reported that neglect had been excluded from this pilot, therefore agreed to bring a paper to the Board meeting in May 2016 regarding the inclusion of neglect within the School Nurse programme.</li> <li>38/07/1516: 'Leads for each key theme to carry out scoping on intended areas of focus, and give updates at the next Board meeting in August 2015' (<b>Key theme leads</b>) - status can be changed to green as per 65/09/1516 discussion (see below).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40/07/1516: 'Raise the 'Information Sharing' theme at the next MACH group' (LR) - an information sharing agreement has been drafted, but clarity is still required in terms of the current position. Discussion to take place at next week's Children's Hub meeting.</li> <li>65/09/1516: 'Complete scoping document for the Managing parents / carers challenging behaviours / culture of optimism &amp; Involvement of all adults living in the household thematic work for consideration at the Board meeting in October 2015' (Clare Humble) - delays in this work being initiated have been well documented in past Board minutes. However, due to this issue being a recurring theme arising from SCRs/Learning Reviews in previous years, it was agreed that it remained an important area to explore. SLSCB training is available, but LR felt this was just as much about supervision to support practitioners in dealing with families. AS suggested that conversations with professionals should take place within agencies regarding key cases that they have found particularly challenging, including what support they would have found beneficial. Since this key theme appears to sit between the LIPSG and Training Sub-Group, AS and LR agreed to lead on completing a scoping document, with support from JB, SM, an Education representative of the SLSCB, and Vicky Smith (HAST CCG Senior Safeguarding Children's Officer) - scoping document to be considered at a future Board meeting. PB added that this key theme could be used as the topic for the 2016-2017 SLSCB staff engagement event.</li> <li>80/11/1516: 'Review the Neglect Strategy Action Plan and refine the current version to make it Stockton-specific' (LR/PB/MG) - actions on neglect to be included as part of the revised Early Help Strategy and Action Plan.</li> <li>100/01/1516: 'Carry out a 360-appraisal of the SLSCB to give a view on its effectiveness and the contributions of its members - updates to be provided at the next Board meeting in February 2016' (Colin Morris) - NS has shared this appraisal with DP, who will also reflect on the contribution of partner agencies at the end of 2016-2017. DP will conduct 1:1s with Board members in the coming months to establish what is expected of Board members and DP himself.</li> </ul> <p>PB will update the SLSCB Action Log following the above comments and developments. DP emphasised the importance of converting actions into impact - this provides evidence of the SLSCB making a difference.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB Action Log 2015/2016 noted, with updates to outstanding actions provided.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
09/04/1617	21.04.16	Present a paper regarding the inclusion of neglect within the School Nurse programme at the SLSCB meeting in May 2016 (re. Action Log ref. 23/8/1415).	LR	19.05.16
10/04/1617	21.04.16	Update the SLSCB Action Log 2015/2016 as per discussions at the Board meeting in April 2016.	PB	19.05.16

Ref No. 9	<b>LSCB Review</b>
Discussion	Further to the ongoing LSCB national review, DP has met with Ivan Wintringham (Department for Education) who advised that the final report is not expected to be published until early summer of 2016. As such, there were no updates at present.
Agreement/ Outcome	Current situation regarding the LSCB review noted.

<b>Ref No. 10</b>	<b>SLSCB Finance</b>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><b>PB</b> referred to the circulated <i>SLSCB Income &amp; Expenditure Report April 2015 - March 2016</i>. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All accounts are in credit at the end of the financial year, and the balances will be carried forward to 2016-2017.</li> <li>The introduction of the Hartlepool &amp; Stockton Joint Training programme during its first year of operation has highlighted some anomalies which resulted in SBC Children's Workforce Development Team still carrying out some multi-agency training work (which was not accounted for). Discussions are taking place to recompense them for this service, and will also need to be taken into consideration for 2016-2017.</li> <li>Due to a change in SBC finance processes, the Serious Case Review account will not be in place for 2016-2017. The balance of this account, plus the balance from the core SLSCB budget (£72,768), will be carried forward to the 2016-2017 core SLSCB budget. The SLSCB Multi-Agency Training account has a balance of £15,873 which will be carried forward.</li> <li>It would be prudent to ring-fence an element of the 2016-2017 core SLSCB account in case there is need to undertake a commissioned Learning or Serious Case Review.</li> </ul> <p><b>PB</b> added that an £8,000 contribution to support the new Tees Performance Management Framework has been agreed, and that a further sum will be required to support additional Signs of Safety training.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	SLSCB Income & Expenditure Report April 2015 - March 2016 noted and accepted.

<b>Ref No. 11</b>	<b>Membership of AILC</b>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>With reference to the circulated <i>Partnership Support Renewal for 2016/17</i> email from the Association of Independent LSCB Chairs (AILC), <b>DP</b> outlined his support in renewing the SLSCBs AILC membership for 2016-2017, particularly in view of the anticipated changes to LSCBs later this year following completion of the national LSCB review.</p> <p>As part of this membership, <b>PB</b> attends AILC conferences which have provided good value in the past. AILC have also been used twice by the SLSCB to disseminate information, the latest being work around safer places. Peterborough LSCB has previously commended Stockton for its work circulated via AILC.</p> <p><b>JH</b> queried whether contributions would be returned if LSCBs cease to exist following outcomes from the Wood review - it was felt this was probably unlikely. Despite this, Board members agreed to the £1,500 renewal of the AILC membership for 2016-2017.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	AILC membership renewal for 2016-2017 agreed.

<b>Ref No. 12</b>	<b>Partners Operational Safeguarding Issues</b>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>TEWV</u></p> <p>Further to a query from a Named Doctor, <b>EM</b> asked whether SBC have a policy on the use of laptops in Conferences - this followed a recent objection raised by an Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO). <b>JH</b> felt the use of laptops in such an arena was inappropriate, particularly if the user was overtly typing during discussions, though accepted that using them for checking Conference papers could be accepted. <b>AS</b> added that more information is being carried on laptops and tablets, and there was a need to strike a balance in terms of accessing documentation. <b>SM</b> noted that some attendees may be using such equipment as a form of assistive technology, and agreed to take this issue to the TPG for consideration.</p>

Local Authority

**JH** advised that the Hartlepool and Stockton Children's Hub will be live from the 1<sup>st</sup> June 2016, and most of the posts within the Hub have now been recruited to.

Signs of Safety training data will be presented at the next Board meeting in May 2016 – there remains a lack of knowledge amongst some agencies regarding this tool, and some core staff have still not been trained. To address this, there may be a need to call on additional funding, as future SBC funding will only be provided to train SBC staff.

At a recent Strategic Management Board (SMB) meeting of the Teesside Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), a discussion took place regarding the lack of available resources to deliver MAPPA training. This training is required across all agencies, and **JH** is in the process of collating current provision across the four Tees LSCBs and the Tees-wide Safeguarding Adults Board (TSAB) which will be fed back to the Chair of the MAPPA SMB, Peter McPhillips.

**AM** highlighted a recently distributed Department for Education poster and pocket card in relation to tackling child abuse, noting the powerful wording used. Of less help was a recent fictional TV drama which gave the wrong impression of reporting issues to the Police.

Police

**AS** gave an update on forthcoming Police staffing changes to ensure that the resourcing model meets key threats. More staff will move into the Child Abuse Investigation Team (including Police Investigators), three officers will form an on-line team, and there will be a 24-strong team covering VEMT issues. Permanent staff will become part of the Sex Offenders Management Team too.

Probation

**JA** reported the ongoing national review of Probation services, with the current consultation period ending in May 2016. This is likely to impact upon staffing structures (including the loss of the Deputy Head of Area) as Cleveland ceases to be viewed as a National Probation Service (NPS) 'complex area'. Although there will be a continued expectation to contribute to LSCBs, **JA** may need to occasionally delegate this responsibility in the future.

HAST CCG

**TH** advised that the findings from the CQC CLAS Hartlepool review can be shared in a presentation to the Board - this will be added to a future SLSCB agenda.

NTHFT

**LR** noted the recent appointment of a Named Nurse for Hartlepool and Stockton, Rachael McLoughlin.

NHS England

**DC** reported that the NHS still commission Community Dentistry, and concerns had been raised over inconsistent approaches by other agencies (Police/Social Care) in demanding information - the dental service are happy to co-operate with requests, but in a consistent way. **JH** asked if some Stockton-specific examples could be provided - **DC** to forward any such cases to **JH**.

<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Updates noted, with subsequent actions identified around the use of laptops/tablets in Conferences and information requests to Community Dentistry.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
11/04/1617	21.04.16	Review and update policies in relation to the use of laptops in Conferences.	<b>MG</b>	19.05.16
12/04/1617	21.04.16	Raise the issue of the laptop/tablet use within Conferences at the next TPG meeting in May 2016.	<b>SM</b>	27.05.16
13/04/1617	21.04.16	Forward <b>JH</b> any Stockton-specific examples of in-	<b>DC</b>	19.05.16

		consistent approaches to Community Dentistry for information.		
--	--	---	--	--

<b>Ref No. 13</b>	<b>Hartlepool &amp; Stockton LSCBs Joint Training – Update Report &amp; 2016 / 2017 Programme</b>			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><b>LR</b> advised that the intended report on Hartlepool and Stockton LSCBs joint training group was not yet available. However, a suite of documents reflecting discussions with <b>MG</b> are being produced - these will include a financial outturn for 2015-2016, a revised strategy, and proposals for taking the group forward (the frequency of the joint training group meetings is being increased in the short-term to aid this process). In addition a paper on the cost effectiveness of the current training programme (circulated to Board members prior to this meeting), would be submitted for consideration at the Board meeting in July 2016.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Updates noted, with a paper on the cost effectiveness of the Hartlepool and Stockton joint training programme for 2016-2017 to be considered at the Board meeting in July 2016.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
14/04/1617	21.04.16	Paper on the cost effectiveness of the Hartlepool and Stockton joint training programme for 2016-2017 to be submitted for consideration at the Board meeting in July 2016.	<b>LR</b>	08.07.16

<b>Ref No. 14</b>	<b>Multi-Agency Audit Programme</b>			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><b>MG</b> presented his <i>Multi-Agency Thematic Review and Audits: Proposed Programme for 2016/17</i> report. The performance report considered by the Board at its last meeting in March 2016 included an outline of a proposed programme of multi-agency audits - this report firms up these proposals, and seeks the Board's approval to the programme (which will be added to the work programme for the SLSCB Performance Sub-Group).</p> <p>The proposed programme comprises audits around Looked After Children (some of this work was already underway), early help, the toxic trio, and VEMT. In undertaking audits, consideration will be given to the fit between the priorities identified in Stockton and the Tees Performance Management Framework, which also includes provision for in-depth reporting on some of these topics, plus the opportunity for joint identification of shared thematic reviews and audits. Each area will undertake case file audits, and there will also be the opportunity for practice review discussions and reflection.</p> <p><b>DP</b> proposed the idea of Board members shadowing audits to increase understanding and outcomes - <b>MG</b> felt this could be facilitated.</p> <p>Board members agreed to the 2016-2017 proposals.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Proposed programme for 2016/17 Multi-Agency Thematic Review and Audits noted and approved.			

<b>Ref No. 15</b>	<b>CSE Audit (December 2015) Report</b>			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><b>RB</b> gave an overview of the circulated <i>Themed Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Audit - December 2015</i> report, which provided the findings of a third set of themed Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) case file audits which were undertaken in December 2015. The data was also compared with the information which has previously been provided to the SLSCB following two earlier themed CSE audits completed in October 2014 and April 2015.</p> <p>A total of 10 randomly selected cases were audited - this equated to 36% of the total number of children who featured on VEMT in December 2015. Nine of the ten cases were active to Children's Social Care (CSC), with the remaining child being active to the Family Support Team and therefore below CSC threshold. The outcome of the audits saw four</p>			

cases judged 'good', five judged 'requires improvement', and one deemed 'inadequate'. Analysis of the completed audits demonstrated that:

- Actions have been taken to ensure that the child from the case judged 'inadequate' has been seen to an appropriate level and is safeguarded. The relevant procedures are now being followed with documentation being completed to a better standard. It is worth noting that there are general concerns in respect of this Social Worker's practice which are being addressed with guidance from colleagues in Human Resources. The case has been re-allocated to a new Social Worker.
- The majority of the 'required improvement' audits raised issues in relation to the levels of supervision which were less frequent than the procedure requires. The majority of these children are Looked After, and it is evident that some Team Managers are continuing to follow the procedures for Looked After Children, even after a child has been made subject to VEMT (for these children supervision should be increased to monthly).
- A number of children within the 'requires improvement' judgement had documents that were either incomplete or were duplicated, and a number of missing episodes did not correlate with the data shared by the Police. The issue of data inaccuracy is one that has already been recognised, and in response, a temporary three-month secondment post has been developed in order to address this issue.
- In respect of all of the case file audits, there was evidence that the voice of the child was heard (albeit only superficially in the audit judged to be 'inadequate').
- There was no evidence to indicate that children had been made subject of VEMT inappropriately.

Recommendations arising from these audits were noted, including for the CSC Team Managers who attend the VEMT Practitioners' Group (VPG) to undertake increased scrutiny of those children and young people who are subject of VEMT in their areas in order to develop improved and consistent practice, and for staff to be reminded of the policies and procedures relating to children and young people at risk of CSE. A further themed CSE Audit (around June 2016) would be undertaken to ascertain progress.

**SM** highlighted the robust response to the 'inadequate' case, but expressed disappointment at the overall findings. **SM** has met with all Team Managers to inform them that this situation is not good enough, and sought assurance that they are familiar with the procedures required. Should any cases be judged less than 'good' in the next round of audits, a meeting with the relevant Team Manager will be undertaken, and there will be consequences. **LB** questioned whether the 'inadequate' case would have been picked up if not selected for audit.

**AS** commented that the audit document presented here was the best example of such practice across Tees, and with permission, would be taken to the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group to be shared as good practice. **AS** also questioned what the three-month seconded post would be doing in terms of addressing data inaccuracy - **RB** advised that this role would raise any data/practice/intelligence sharing issues, with some early findings expected to be relayed this week.

**PB** queried whether audits on CSE-related cases were being undertaken by other agencies. **DP** felt this could be an item for the SLSCB Development Day - is the focus of Board activity reflective/proportionate to its membership?

**DP** questioned how previous audits had influenced change. **JH** noted that 10 CSC audits take place each month which have highlighted some variable practice - this has been addressed via Action Plans and through capability routes. It should also be asked whether CSC is being hard on itself, as previous independent reports to the SLSCB have suggested that CSC practice is generally sound.

Agreement/ Outcome	CSE Audit (December 2015) Report noted and discussed - recommendations supported, with a further themed CSE audit to be undertaken and then presented to the SLSCB.
<b>Ref No. 16</b>	<b>South Tyneside – CSE Joint Inspection Letter</b>
Discussion	<p><b>DP</b> referred to the circulated letter regarding the recent joint targeted area inspection of the multi-agency response to abuse and neglect in South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough. This letter to all the service leaders in the area outlines the findings about the effectiveness of partnership working, and of the work of individual agencies, in South Tyneside. Key strengths, areas for improvement and next steps were detailed.</p> <p>From an LSCB perspective, there appeared to be particular focus on how CSE structures pick up issues, including children missing-from-education. <b>JH</b> assured Board members that missing-from-education processes in Stockton are robust, and noted a forthcoming LGA peer review on CSE (to be rolled out in September 2016) which the SLSCB may want to consider.</p> <p><b>AS</b> advised that the South Tyneside documentation presented today will also be discussed at the next Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	South Tyneside CSE joint inspection findings noted.
<b>Ref No. 17</b>	<b>17.03.16 Board Minutes for Accuracy</b>
Discussion	Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2016 were agreed as a true record.
Agreement/ Outcome	The minutes of the Board meeting held on the 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2016 be recorded as ratified.
<b>Ref No. 18</b>	<b>Tees CDOP</b>
Discussion	<p><u>a) Minutes of Meeting 22.01.16</u> The circulated minutes of the Tees Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2016 were noted. Attention was drawn to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 6.3 - a referral regarding this child death (322-JUN15-U-S) will be made to the SLSCB Learning &amp; Improving Practice Sub-Group (LIPSG) to consider if a Serious Case Review or Learning Review is required.</li> <li>• Item 9.1 - Rapid Response meetings are now in place, with CCG overseeing the administration of these.</li> </ul> <p><u>b) 2014 - 2016 Case Summary Recommendations &amp; Action</u> The circulated <i>Tees CDOP 2014 - 2016 Case Summary Recommendations &amp; Action</i> document was noted. <b>KA</b> reported an issue identified in a small number of cases where some Councils were not sharing information with School Nurses – this has since been clarified.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Tees CDOP documentation noted.
<b>Ref No. 19</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>
Discussion	<p><u>Board Member Observations</u> <b>JH</b> highlighted that only four Board member observations of strategies, conferences or training had been undertaken during 2015-2016, and challenged whether partners are aware of what is happening ‘on the ground’. These observations were put in place as a mechanism to make Board members more visible, and it was therefore agreed to revisit these arrangements (what can be observed, the observation process, required feedback)</p>

	<p>at the forthcoming SLSCB Development Day in June 2016.</p> <p><u>Tees Performance Management Framework Data Set</u>  <b>JH</b> sought clarification on the current situation regarding the Tees Performance Management Framework data set - there had been an expectation of progress since this was agreed back in December 2015. <b>DP</b> reported that conversations had taken place with <b>JG</b>, and there may be further interest in overseeing the Tees Performance Group – dialogue with <b>JG</b> remains ongoing. <b>PB</b> felt that even when the group is implemented, it will take some time before reports are fed through to the Tees LSCBs - as such, the SLSCB need to maintain their own performance mechanisms until the Tees group is fully established.</p> <p><u>SLSCB Review</u>  <b>JA</b> attended her first Select Committee in relation to the ongoing review of the SLSCB recently, and queried whether information will be fed back should any concerns be raised - <b>JH</b> advised that when the review is complete, feedback will be submitted to the SLSCB, and also noted that the committee have set their own questions, independent of her. For future meetings, it was suggested that some form of preparation for Board members prior to their attendance would be helpful.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted, with subsequent actions identified.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
15/04/1617	21.04.16	Review Board member observation arrangements at the SLSCB Development Day in June 2016.	<b>ALL</b>	16.06.16