





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;"> ✓ ✗ Apols </div>
Dave Pickard (DP)	LSCB Independent Chair	SLSCB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LSCB Chair Hartlepool 	✓
Pauline Beall (PB)	Business Manager		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MALAP (Multi Agency Looked After Partnership) Stockton VCSE Safeguarding Forum 	✓
Leanne Bain (LB)	Lay Member		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAPPA SMB (Lay Member) 	✓
Lesley Cooke (LC)	Lay Member		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Ravens Trust Catalyst 	✗
Deborah Wray (DWr)	Lay Member		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Bowesfield Primary School 	✓
Jane Humphreys (JH)	Director of Children's Services	Local Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) HWB Adult Partnership HWB Children's Partnership SMB – Public Protection Safer Stockton Partnership 	✓
<i>Vacancy</i>	Director of Adults and Health			
Martin Gray (MG)	Assistant Director - Early Help, Partnership and Planning / Chair SLSCB Performance Sub-Group		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HWB Children's Partnership Children & Young People Health and Wellbeing Commissioning Group MALAP (Multi Agency Looked After Partnership) Stockton YOS Management Board 	✓
Diane McConnell (DM)	Assistant Director - Schools and SEN		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAF Board Convener of the Safeguarding Forum for Education Settings Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group 	✓
Shaun McLurg (SM)	Assistant Director - Safeguarding and Looked After Children / Chair Tees LSCB's Procedures Group / Chair SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children & Young People Health and Wellbeing Commissioning Group Spark of Genius Children's Homes 	Apols
Jane Edmends (JE)	Strategic Housing Manager		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stockton Early Help Partnership Group Housing and Neighbourhood Partnership (Thematic Group) 	✓
Cllr Ann McCoy (AM)	Lead Cabinet Member - Children and Young People (Participating Observer)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Tees, Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust (TEWV) 	✓
Neil Schneider (NS)	Chief Executive (Participating Observer)			✓
Margaret Harvey (MH)	Service Manager	CAFCASS		✗

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

SLSCB Members	Title	Representing	Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair)	  Apols
Julie Allan (JA)	Head of Cleveland Area – National Probation Service (NE)	Probation Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middlesbrough LSCB • Redcar and Cleveland LSCB • Hartlepool LSCB • South Tees YOS • Stockton YOS • Hartlepool YOS • YOS Management Board • LCJB • Local Public Service Board • Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board • Tees Adult Health and Wellbeing Board • Strategic DV and Abuse Strategic Group • Contest Gold • Stockton Scanning and Challenge • ETE/OSE Board • Tees Strategic VEMT Group 	Apols
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"> • Tees Valley Choice Based Lettings Steering Group • My Sisters Place – Board • North East Homelessness Group • MAPPA Representative 	Apols
Steve Rose (SR)	Chief Executive Officer Catalyst	Voluntary Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safer Stockton Partnership • Stockton 14-19 Partnership • Stockton Carers Implementation Group • Stockton Health & Wellbeing Partnership • Stockton VCSE Senior Leaders Forum • Stockton Voice • Stockton Youth Offenders Service Board • Tees Dementia Collaborative • Tees Valley Local Development Agencies Forum • Tees Valley Unlimited European Social Inclusion Task & Finish Group 	

Guests:		
Anne-Marie Cartwright (AMC)	SBC - Attendance & Exclusion Manager	For item 6c
Cllr Carol Clark (CC)	SBC - Elected Member	Observer
Jon Doyle (JD)	SBC - Deputy Team Manager	For item 6g
Jo Lee (JL)	SBC - Service Manager, LAC Resources	For item 6f
Patti Sanderson (PS)	SBC - Team Manager	For item 6h
Kim Staff (KS)	SBC - Service Manager, Independent Review/WD	For item 6e
Sharon Stevens (SS)	SBC - Attendance Co-ordinator	For item 6b
Cllr Tracey Stott (TS)	SBC - Elected Member	Observer
Judy Trainer (JT)	SBC - Team Leader, Electoral Services & Scrutiny	Observer
Rachael McLoughlin (RM)	NTHFT - Named Nurse, Out of Hospital Care	Sub for Lindsey Robertson
Sharon Barnett (SB)	Probation - Stockton NPS Manager	Sub for Julie Allan

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

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

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

ENSURING CO-ORDINATION**Governance**

Ref No. 1	Attendance, Apologies & Quoracy
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>RM was in attendance as the substitute for LR, and SB was in attendance as the substitute for JA.</p> <p>CC, TS and JT were in attendance as part of the ongoing Children and Young People Select Committee scrutiny review of the SLSCB, and were welcomed to this Board meeting.</p> <p>JE and NS left the meeting at 11.00am.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.

Ref No. 2	18.08.16 and 15.09.16 Board Minutes for Accuracy
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 18th August 2016 were agreed as a true record, subject to the following amendment:</p> <p><u>Ref No. 5 (Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Authority: Amend the last sentence of the third paragraph to reflect that the Director of Children's Services will continually seek to ascertain any issues from a CAFCASS perspective in relation to Children's Social Care involvement in care proceedings. Remove the action linked to the original wording (ref. 35/08/1617). <p>Notes of the Board Development Day held on the 15th September 2016 were agreed as a true record.</p> <p>DP thanked Board members for their attendance at last month's SLSCB Development Day, and advised that, in response to the resounding feedback for more group-orientated work, this Board meeting will be taking on a slightly different format (see agenda item 6).</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	The minutes of the Board meeting held on the 18 th August 2016, subject to the identified amendment, and the notes of the Board Development Day held on the 15 th September 2016 be recorded as ratified.

Ref No. 3	Action Log
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>With reference to the circulated <i>SLSCB Meetings Action Log 2016 / 2017 (To Do)</i>, PB advised that there continued to be no areas of concern at present. However, due to a period of leave, PB had been unable to obtain any updates beyond the 3rd October 2016, therefore a more accurate position in relation to the Action Log would be provided at the next Board meeting in November 2016.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Updates noted.

Partnership Information

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>Local Authority</u></p> <p>JH reported that the number of Child Protection (CP) cases is now 304, and the number of Looked After Children (LAC) cases has reached 407 - significantly higher than for many years. 25% of LAC cases involve young people placed with family/friends at home. In</p>

terms of Social Worker recruitment/retention, there are currently 17 vacancies (currently covered by agency staff) - this includes vacancies for Deputy Manager posts in the Field-work Teams. It remains a challenge to recruit experienced staff, therefore a difference approach will be undertaken next month around the way in which Stockton/Local Authority is marketed. Most Social Care teams are operating at maximum capacity regarding case-loads, with all cases bar one currently allocated. Responding to a question from **DP** which asked if the Board can aid the present situation, **JH** noted the regional work being done around the recruitment of staff and impact of agencies - Her Majesty's Revenues and Customs (HMRC) may be bringing in additional requirements for agencies regarding full payments similar to that which the Local Authority has to incur.

From a Housing perspective, **JE** highlighted the recent government announcement regarding supported living funding - an element of this is being passed to the Local Authority to administer, though it is not yet known what the level of funding will be. A consultation paper is expected, and the SLSCB will be updated accordingly on any developments.

MG drew attention to a recent Domestic Abuse event that was held in conjunction with the Health & Wellbeing Board (HWB) and Children & Young People Partnership (CYPP) - a Steering Group will meet in the near future to build on the discussions from this event. The Children and Social Work Bill was also noted, which will address the proposed replacement of LSCBs, and issues around LAC and Social Work reform - Board members were encouraged to keep an eye on developments, which will also need to be brought to a future SLSCB meeting for consideration.

Education

DWo advised that a forthcoming regional meeting would be taking place with Independent School colleagues to discuss safeguarding issues.

DM reported on last week's Education Forum, which focused on the threshold document. **DM** had also met with colleagues at the Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Children's Hub to work through training issues.

Voluntary Sector

With reference to the *Developing the assurance role for the Board* handout that had been provided to Board members at this meeting (see agenda item 6), **SR** commented that this was a very helpful briefing, and commended all those involved in its production. The latest Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Safeguarding Forum took place earlier this week - **SR** was not present, but **PB** noted that it was a positive event, which agreed to look into enhancing the ways in which the Voluntary Sector can feed into the SLSCB (via discussions with **SR**).

Probation

BG advised that additional safeguarding training would be taking place for Probation staff in January 2017, along with a roll-out of domestic abuse training in the new year too.

HAST CCG

In relation to the vacant Designated Doctor post (previously the role of former Board member, Kailash Agrawal), **TH** reported that this role remains unfilled, and will be going out to advert shortly (NHS England are aware of the situation). **JH** queried if this was a statutory post - **TH** confirmed that it is, and that Hartlepool have a separate Designated Doctor due to geographical reasons (the vacant post covers Middlesbrough, Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees).

Agreement/
Outcome

Updates noted.

Minutes / Updates / Outcomes from Meetings

Ref No. 5	Tees CDOP
Discussion	<p>Reference was made to the circulated <i>Minutes of [Tees] Child Death Overview Panel Meeting</i>, dated the 29th July 2016. It was agreed that these minutes should be reviewed by the SLSCB Learning & Improving Practice Sub-Group (LIPSG), with any learning points to be identified and brought back to a future Board meeting.</p> <p>One question was raised in relation to item 3.3 (Item 5.4 - Case Ref: 336/OCT15/U/S) - JH sought assurance that LIPSG were dealing with the issue regarding recent communications between CDOP and the Local Authority pertaining to other children related to the one being considered in this particular case. PB advised that this has been discussed within LIPSG and is being addressed.</p>
Agreement/Outcome	Tees CDOP minutes of the 29 th July 2016 meeting noted - agreement that these should be reviewed by the SLSCB LIPSG, with any identified learning to be brought back to Board.

EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE

Ref No. 6	2015/2016 Assurance Reports & Challenge, Impact and Improve
Discussion	<p>DP introduced this item, explaining that each of the respective assurance report authors will give a short presentation, before being allocated to one of the groups of Board members/substitutes/guests for questioning and discussion. Groups will then be asked to provide feedback on any key issues that were identified or concerns that were raised.</p> <p>To help Board members to consider their assurance role, a <i>Developing the assurance role for the Board</i> handout was provided to all groups - this sought to support Board members in understanding the SLSCBs role in assuring itself that things are being done, as opposed to doing things itself. A checklist for Board members to ask themselves, as well as a checklist of issues to consider in seeking assurance from presenters/authors, was included. DP thanked MG for pulling this first attempt together, and hoped it would be a useful tool in the subsequent group discussions.</p>
	<p><u>a) Safeguarding in Education Establishments</u></p> <p>It was agreed that this item would be deferred until the next Board meeting in November 2016.</p>
	<p><u>b) Children Missing Education</u></p> <p>SS gave an overview of the circulated <i>Children Missing Education Annual Report</i>. Key points of note included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 162 Children Missing Education (CME) referrals to the Attendance and Exclusion Team during the period 1st September 2015 to 20th July 2016 - this is a decrease of 71 referrals compared to the same period in 2014-2015. • The majority of referrals were received from our maintained schools and academies, however, referrals were also received from the School Admissions Team, the 0-25 SEN Team, First Contact, Housing and other Local Authority CME Officers. • From the 162 pupil referrals made, 156 children have been successfully traced at the time of writing this report. The 6 outstanding cases (3 of which are children of primary school age; 3 of secondary - none of these are white British) continue to be investigated, and as per procedures, information has been shared with School Health, VEMT, Police, and CME Officers from other Local Authorities where we have information that the child may be resident. The children have also been reported on the national School to School database (S2S). • Problems emerging in relation to children of families applying for asylum.

c) Home Education

AMC presented the circulated *Elective Home Education* report, which included details of the SBC Elective Home Education policy and process. Key points of note included:

- As of the end of July 2016, the Local Authority had notification of 101 children being home educated - these 101 children are from 73 families. This figure has more than doubled since 2009-2010, when 39 children were on the register. Last year, the figure stood at 79 pupils.
- Currently there are 76 children being home educated. 15 children had returned to education at a mainstream, special school, or alternative provision provided by the Local Authority, and a further 10 pupils have been removed from the EHE register as they were no longer of compulsory school age as of June 2016.
- The reasons given by families for opting out of school vary widely - the increase in publicity regarding home education over the last academic year, with a number of 'celebrities' stating that they home educate their children, was noted.
- Have not had to use a School Attendance Order - have worked with parents if concerns have been apparent. Vast majority of parents/families engage - speak to them regularly, no issues in gaining access to their children, and want to know if they are going about home education in the right manner. Three families have not allowed access into their home, but professionals do communicate with them, and show evidence of their children's work (a statutory requirement).
- Since the implementation of the Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Children's Hub, a response on whether a child is known to Social Care has not been as prompt - is there any way in which this can be addressed?

d) Questions, Challenge & Assurance on a), b) and c)

Discussion ensued on both the presented reports as follows:

Children Missing Education

JH requested further assurance outside this meeting regarding specific details of the six untraced cases, including confirmation that these have been shared with the Police and VEMT. As far as the latter is concerned, **AS** stated that it is easier for VEMT to assist if children remain local, but is more difficult to have any impact on those who return to their own country (if from overseas). From a Police perspective, ensuring that Operation Shield forms are submitted once it is known a child is missing remains critical, and any CME case should come to the Police so that information can be shared nationally (in case a family turns up elsewhere).

With regards to the updated CME policy, **DM** reported that this had been shared at a recent Stockton Schools Safeguarding Forum, and included a new element whereby schools are to meet with young people face-to-face prior to any long-term holiday being taken.

AM asked if co-operation from the Home Office/DWP is forthcoming when trying to trace CME cases - **SS** confirmed that co-operation does take place, and that representatives from these agencies are part of the VEMT team. **MG** sought clarity around the threshold between children who go missing frequently (e.g. poor school attendance) and CME cases - the latter are those pupils who have gone from school, moved to another part of the authority, and cannot be contacted.

DP questioned whether agencies are satisfied that schools could decide what constitutes an urgent safeguarding issue - is there an escalation process to Director level if concerns are present? **SS** advised that involvement of other agencies is examined when a referral is made, but that CME referrals should not be used for safeguarding concerns - a SAFER Referral Form should be used instead, and schools are aware of this. Escalation routes take place through Joanne Mills (SBC SEN & Engagement Service Manager), and then onto **DM**, where necessary.

Although no national CME data was available for comparison, there are some Local Authorities who share information unofficially. A regional CME group has highlighted that Stockton-on-Tees has extremely low numbers of untraced children (some areas have over 100 cases untraced), and Ofsted were impressed by how low the Stockton numbers were.

Elective Home Education

Referring to the data provided within the report, **JH** felt it would be useful to have information around the length of time children have been home educated. Regarding the three families who have not allowed access into their home, **JH** queried if anyone from any agency had been inside the house - a discussion outside this meeting was required. As Chair of the Children's Hub Strategic Management Board, **JH** was unaware of the issue around response times - this should be escalated to **DM** in the first instance.

AS asked whether professionals get the opportunity to speak to the child prior to any home education arrangement being put in place - **AMC** noted that the child is seen during the initial home visit following notification of a parents intention to home educate, and that their views are sought as part of the completion of the Initial Plan.

With further reference to the three families who have not allowed access into their home, **LB** questioned what evidence is gathered around these children's education - work is collected and assessed on an annual basis, and it is important to ensure that a child is not disadvantaged compared to their peers. **AM** noted that schools/colleges are inspected rigorously, and asked if there was data on what home-schooled children go onto achieve.

TH queried if SEN/EHCP cases are being picked up, as parents do not always identify these themselves - assurance would be needed around how parents meet the needs of such children.

DP thanked both **SS** and **AMC** for presenting their reports and answering subsequent questions raised by Board members.

e) IRO Report (CP & LAC) 2015 / 2016

KS presented the circulated *Independent Reviewing Officer Annual Report 2015/2016*, which gave an overview of the work undertaken by the IRO service, and its outcomes. It also provided quantitative and qualitative information, and highlighted areas of good practice, as well as areas which require improvement. It described areas of work which the service has prioritised during the year, and identified priorities in the year ahead. The report considered the following areas:

- Recommendation
- Role and Function of the Service and Legal Context
- Staffing
- LAC Activity and Key Performance Indicators
- Adoption and Permanency
- Child Protection Activity and Key Performance Indicators
- Foster Care Reviews
- Management Oversight and Quality Assurance
- Planned Developments and Key Priorities for 2016/17
- Summary and Impact of Work over the Last Year

f) LAC Out of Borough Placements Report 2015 /2016

JL provided an overview of the circulated *Report for Stockton on Tees Local Safeguarding Children Board in respect of Looked after Children Placed out of Area 1st April 2015 / March 2016*, which included the following elements:

- Background
- Location of Placements outside the Borough

- Age Profile of Placements outside the Borough
- Ethnicity of Placements outside the Borough
- Profile of Placements
- Fostering
- Placement with Parents
- Educational Arrangements
- Monitoring Placement Arrangements
- Summary
- Moving Forward
- Recommendation

g) Missing or Running Away from Home or Care Report 2015 / 2016

JD (on behalf of the author, Rhona Bolland (SBC Service Manager, Assessment and Fieldwork), who was unable to be in attendance) presented the circulated *Children Running or Missing from Home or Care (RMHC)* report. This document provided the SLSCB with information regarding children who have been RMHC between the 1st April 2015 and 30th June 2016 (2015-2016 and quarter one of 2016-2017), and contained the following:

- Introduction
- Recording and responding to missing children
- Missing and absent children 2015/16 and Q1 2016/17
- Return interviews 2015/16 and Q1 2016/17
- Information about missing/absent episodes in Q1 of 2016/17
- Strategies used to attempt to reduce episodes of missing
- Conclusion
- Recommendations

h) Children with Disabilities / Complex Needs Report 2015 / 2016

PS (on behalf of the author, Jackie Ward (SBC Service Manager, LAC and Complex Needs), who was unable to be in attendance) gave an overview of the circulated *Disabled Children Annual Assurance Report 2015/16*, which informed the SLSCB about the arrangements in place to respond to the needs of disabled children in Stockton. The report included the following areas:

- Recommendation
- Legislative background
- Research
- Ofsted Protecting Disabled Children: Thematic Inspection 2012
- Survey of LSCBs 2015 (published July 2016)
- Services for disabled children in Stockton
- Data
- Audits
- Ofsted SIF Inspection May 2016

i) Private Fostering Annual Report 2015 / 2016

MG (on behalf of the author, Jill Anderson (SBC Service Manager, Early Help), who was unable to be in attendance) provided details of the circulated *2016 Annual Private Fostering Progress Report*, which contained the following elements:

- Introduction
- Synopsis
- Private Fostering Statistics 2015 / 2016
- Private Fostering Communications Strategy and Statement
- Documentation/Publicity
- Thematic Audits and Monitoring of Private Fostering
- Satisfaction Surveys
- Training

- Tees-wide Private Fostering Group
- School Admissions
- Ofsted
- Recommendation

j) Group Work on e) to i) - Questions, Challenge, Assurance & Feedback

Each of the presenters were allocated to a group of Board members/substitutes/guests as shown below:

Table 1		Table 2		Table 3		Table 4	
KS		JL & MG		JD		PS	
JE	SR	MG	BG	LB	EM	DWr	SB
AM	RM	DM	JT	NS	CC	JH	TS
KC	AMC	TH		AS	SS		
				DWo			

Feedback from the group discussions was noted as follows:

Table 2	JL & MG	MG / DM / TH / BG / JT
---------	---------	------------------------

Private Fostering

- Understanding materials/communications (being refreshed).
- Lot of focus for a relatively small number of cases (though a clear rationale for this).

LAC Out of Borough Placements

- Understandable and helpful summary.
- Challenges around moves to regional adoption structures.
- Noted that work done around family/friends placements.
- Decision-making panels - could look to streamline.
- Increased demand on foster care placements.

JH observed that there was no section within this report around who the decision-makers and regulators are. **JH** makes the decision on all out-of-borough placements - agreed for this to be added into the report for clarity.

SR highlighted those children coming into Stockton-on-Tees from outside the area, and queried if a report on these young people should also be presented to the SLSCB, particularly as the media would likely question the Board should an incident occur involving such a case. **JH** re-iterated that these children are the responsibility of the Local Authority who place them in Stockton, and that she should be consulted on such placements - this, however, does not always happen. Periodic updates are requested from other Local Authorities, and a paper has been previously brought to the SLSCB regarding LAC in residential accommodation.

Although the statutory responsibility lies with the placing Local Authority, **BG** asked whether agencies in Stockton still have some form of responsibility for all young people in this area - **DP** felt that partners do indeed have a generic obligation for every child locally.

Table 4	PS	DWr / JH / SB / TS
---------	----	--------------------

Children with Disabilities / Complex Needs

- Good report, fully understood, with jargon explained.
- Focus on voice of the child, and the tools used to capture this.
- Should have included references to cases considered for a Serious Case Review (SCR) at the SLSCB LIPSG.
- Team will be examined in more detail during the Special Educational Needs and Disa-

bility (SEND) inspection - how are they preparing for this?

TH flagged the issue of Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) links to LAC plans, which came up in the recent Hartlepool SEND inspection - **JH** advised that Danielle Swainston (HBC Assistant Director, Children's Services) will be attending Stockton's SEND inspection planning meetings, and that an input from Health colleagues would be helpful too.

Table 3

JD

LB / NS / AS / DWo / EM / CC / SS

Missing or Running Away from Home or Care

- Stockton is a significant outlier in relation to children going missing.
- Key is to understand push-pull factors - not currently successful in having these conversations.
- Lot of work to do around this - need to grasp the issue and be better at engaging with these young people.

In order to make progress on this important area, **AS** offered to be part of a potential Stockton group which considers how this is addressed.

JH had been privy to some Tees data in relation to missing episodes, and noted that incidents involving Stockton LAC were not out of line with other Tees authorities. Non-LAC missing episodes will form part of discussions at the forthcoming regional Director of Children's Services (DCS) meeting next Friday.

TH noted that quarter 2 data correlates with school holidays, and questioned whether there were enough community facilities to keep young people active/concentrated during this time. **AM** commented that youth provision in Stockton is currently being reviewed, and any issues connected with school holidays will be considered.

With reference to paragraph 4.8 of the report, **DWo** highlighted the role of the Early Help Assessment Team, and their work on a process whereby the reasons for children going missing can be recorded - data from this process may prove very useful.

Table 1

KS

JE / AM / KC / SR / RM / AMC

IRO Report (CP & LAC)

- Productive discussions on this very comprehensive report - **KS** commended.
- Voice of the child heard at all stages.
- Positive steps regarding the Mind Of My Own (MOMO) app - helps young people express their views more clearly, and get more involved in meetings.
- Question around what IROs are doing to improve situations.
- Introduction of Signs of Safety a crucial factor.
- CiN cases not being fully developed before getting to CP stage.

JH drew attention to the lack of information regarding agency attendance at Conferences - it is important for the Board to be sighted on this. It was noted that attendance data is included in the current performance data-set, and will be reported back to the SLSCB (a meeting of the SLSCB Performance Sub-Group is scheduled for this afternoon).

DP queried why so many children in Stockton are on a CP plan for two years or more, and/or have a second or subsequent plan - these questions should be asked within the report, even if they cannot be answered. **JH** gave assurance that the reasons for this are known, and proposed the addition of a paragraph to the report - this was agreed. **KS** added that these issues are looked at in SBC Performance Clinics, and that domestic abuse plays a major factor in cases coming back to Conference.

	Noting previous Board discussions in relation to understanding the difficult decisions that IROs have to take (having to balance risks), AS asked if it would be useful to have IROs anonymise cases and let the Board see the decisions made. Knowledge of this could then be fed into the SLSCB multi-agency audits.			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	2015/2016 Assurance Reports noted and discussed, with key issues identified, along with areas for development/improvement. Additions agreed for both the LAC Out of Borough Placements report and IRO (CP & LAC) report.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
41/10/1617	13.10.16	Review the six untraced CME cases.	JH	17.11.16
42/10/1617	13.10.16	Review the three Home Education cases where the families are not allowing access into their home.	JH/DM	17.11.16
43/10/1617	13.10.16	Add paragraph to the <i>Report for Stockton on Tees Local Safeguarding Children Board in respect of Looked after Children Placed out of Area 1st April 2015 / March 2016</i> clarifying who the decision-makers and regulators are.	Jo Lee	31.10.16
44/10/1617	13.10.16	VEMT Sub-Group to review why Stockton is an outlier across Tees in relation to Missing or Running Away from Home or Care.	SM	17.11.16
45/10/1617	13.10.16	Add paragraph to the <i>Independent Reviewing Officer Annual Report 2015/2016</i> reflecting reasons for the numbers of children in Stockton being on a CP plan for two years or more, or having a second or subsequent plan.	Kim Staff	31.10.16

Ref No. 7	<i>Procedures for Consideration by the Tees LSCBs</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>a) Unexpected Child Deaths</u> Consensus to approve recommended from the returns received. Suggested amendment made by a Board Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2: Add the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Deaths where the immediate cause of death is unclear ○ Deaths where criminal acts are suspected. • 6.4: Add the following at end of section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NB. Where a criminal investigation is underway, all those present should be advised that a record of the meeting will be made and may subsequently be used in criminal proceedings. <p><u>b) Assessing and Responding to the Impact of Domestic Abuse on Children</u> Consensus to approve is recommended from the replies received.</p> <p><u>c) Children Entering and Leaving the UK</u> Generally, consensus to approve this procedure was recommended. There were however some comments put forward that need to be taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) It may be of benefit to have some clarity at the beginning of the process on how a practitioner is aware of a child entering the UK and being placed in the area. I assume there must be a referral process from the agency placing the child? It does beg the question of whether we are aware of all those who this policy applies to who are in our area? ii) It appears to be less a procedure and more a general guidance note on some of the issues and considerations to be taken into account. iii) After fifth paragraph insert:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where there is a concern that the child may be a victim of trafficking, an NRM referral should be submitted to the UKHTC. Any information from the child in respect of route and method of entry into the country, identity or contact details of facilitators and method of approach to child in home country should be submitted on an Operation Shield form to Cleveland Police intelligence hub at force.intelhub@cleveland.pnn.police.uk. <p>iv) Unaccompanied Children and Young People - after second paragraph insert:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where there is a concern that the child may be a victim of trafficking, an NRM referral should be submitted to the UKHTC. Any information from the child in respect of route and method of entry into the country, identity or contact details of facilitators and method of approach to child in home country should be submitted on an Operation Shield form to Cleveland Police intelligence hub at force.intelhub@cleveland.pnn.police.uk. <p>v) Children and Young People leaving the UK unexpectedly - insert after last paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where schools become aware of an intention to take children on extended leave abroad, they should seek to speak to the child in advance of departure to ascertain the child's views of the intended trip, and consider whether the child has concerns around the trip, such as forced marriage. Schools should also speak to children following their return to assess if anything happened to them whilst abroad that has caused them concern.
	<p><u>d) Complaints Against the LSCB</u> Consensus to approve recommended from the returns received. Suggested amendment made by a Board Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am happy to endorse the procedure, however, as the policy will be public-facing, it may benefit from a paragraph explaining the role of the Independent Chair (to provide assurance of their true independence). Also, as the complaint escalation procedure is via the Council Chief Executive, a similar line regarding the hosting arrangements for LSCBs might be useful.
	<p><u>e) Parent / Carer Substance Abuse Procedure</u> Consensus to approve recommended from the returns received. One suggested amendment made by a Board Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to CAF and Foetal Alcohol Syndrome need updating (to Early Help Assessment and Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder respectively).
	<p><u>f) Guidance Assessing the Impact of Substance Abuse</u> Consensus to approve recommended from the returns received. The following suggestions were made, which the Board Member advised did not alter their recommendation to approve adoption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content is fine, but the terminology would benefit from a consistency check (substance misuse/abuse/use, etc.). • References to CAF and Foetal Alcohol Syndrome need updating (to Early Help Assessment and Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder respectively).
<p><i>Agreement/ Outcome</i></p>	<p>All of the above procedures were considered by the SLSCB (comments noted) and subsequently approved.</p>

ENABLING CHANGE

<p><i>Ref No. 8</i></p>	<p><i>Children & Vulnerable People in Custody Report from Working Group</i></p>
<p><i>Discussion</i></p>	<p>With reference to the circulated <i>Children and Vulnerable People in Custody Working Group</i> report, AS explained that, in response to a 2015 HMIC thematic inspection on the</p>

welfare of vulnerable people in Police custody, a working group was created which would report to Tees LSCBs on progress of the Action Plan which was formed in response to the inspection findings. Included in this report were the following elements:

- Introduction (including a Summary of Findings)
- Purpose of Report
- Terms of Reference (Working Group)
- Summary and Conclusions
- Summary of Recommendations

The terms of reference were divided amongst members given their professional background and experience, resulting in differing methodologies, report structures and, where there is overlap, linking of specific terms of reference:

- 1) To assess the extent to which children and vulnerable people are being brought into Police custody when other alternatives could or should be available.
- 2) To report specifically on the effectiveness of the street triage service for vulnerable persons with potential mental health issues.
- 3) To benchmark Cleveland against national averages regarding proportion of children and those with mental health issues brought into custody.
- 4) To consider the feasibility of schemes to divert children and vulnerable people from custody cited in the report.
- 5) To review treatment of children and young people whilst in the Police custody centre.
- 6) To look at time spent in custody and provide feedback regarding avoidable delays.
- 7) To examine, specifically, the extent to which children and young people have their detention extended due to waiting times for appropriate adults and to make recommendation regarding improvement.
- 8) To audit compliance with Tees procedures and national recommendations regarding transfer of children to local authority accommodation.
- 9) To review the availability and effectiveness of diversionary schemes in the custody of office and to consider useful extensions or additions to current provision.
- 10) To assess the Police pre-release checklist and consider opportunities for development.
- 11) To review problem solving activity in relation to children and vulnerable people who are repeatedly arrested (frequent fliers).
- 12) In respect of all of the above, to consider the availability of management information from across agencies that would assist in the development and monitoring of improvements in this area.

Particular attention was drawn to the summary and conclusions at the end of the report:

- There has been a large amount of positive progress in many of the areas highlighted, including street triage, and liaison and diversion.
- Of significant note are the dramatic reduction in section 136 arrests, and development of the relationship/services provided at Roseberry Park.
- High and increasing levels of Police calls to care homes in Cleveland.
- Reduction in numbers of arrests for young people, and increase in voluntary attendance.
- Positive work by YOS/RJ co-ordinator.
- Effective service provided by arrest referral teams, but could be developed/reviewed.
- Delays experienced by vulnerable people, particularly juveniles waiting for appropriate adults.
- Young people are routinely remanded into Police custody rather than into the care of the Local Authority.
- Lack of formal data feedback
- Positive progress in terms of risk assessment post release from custody and voluntary attenders.

	<p>The recommendations listed below are those referencing LSCBs which, when included in the compiled Action Plan, will be considered similar to those presented to the other agencies identified in the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Safeguarding Boards should receive an annual report from Cleveland Police showing the numbers of children and vulnerable people in custody. ➤ LSCBs should note and endorse the new guidance / flow chart for care homes and monitor the number of reported offences committed in care settings. ➤ Independent Custody Visitors should ensure that young people in custody are interviewed as part of their visit. Annual reports should be circulated to Safeguarding Boards. Consider circulation of future reports at Safeguarding Boards. ➤ Safeguarding Boards should review the provision of appropriate adults to children and vulnerable people in custody and seek assurance from the OPCC and Local Authorities that effective and timely provision is in place. ➤ LSCBs should work towards full compliance with the concordat on children in custody. ➤ LSCBs should continue to receive reports on number of children remanded in police cells overnight. ➤ Secure accommodation providers should be challenged by Local Authorities and Safeguarding Boards where beds are available but they indicate they will not accept children due to staffing issues. ➤ Partnership data reports are endorsed, produced and reported annually to LSCBs and TSAB. ➤ The Tees LSCBs Performance management Group should consider ways by which CVPIC reports can be produced more efficiently once the approved core dataset work is complete. <p>Noting that Stockton provide the EDT service on behalf of the five Tees Valley Local Authorities, JH referred to the instances of young people being interviewed at 1.00am - this was inappropriate. In addition, there were a few inaccuracies evident within the report - AS advised that all Local Authorities had been invited to attend the Working Group to provide input, though JH stated that the person sent from Stockton was there to help provide EDT information, and was not delegated to make decisions.</p> <p>SR expressed concern regarding the situation where young people in care are responded to quicker than those who are in their own homes, and JL noted a reducing criminalisation for LAC paper which will be presented to the Youth Offending Team (YOT) Board in November 2016.</p> <p>It was agreed to defer recommendations until AS/JH had consulted with each other, and if necessary, for it to be considered at sub-regional DCS/Independent Chairs meeting.</p>
<p><i>Agreement/ Outcome</i></p>	<p>Children and Vulnerable People in Custody Working Group report noted, including recommendations for LSCBs.</p>

<p>Ref No. 9</p>	<p>Actions, Impact, Evidence & Difference</p>
<p><i>Discussion</i></p>	<p>DP challenged Board members to identify the impact this meeting had made in terms of safeguarding children – the following views were expressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TH: out-of-borough placement panels - has identified further work in relation to these. • BG: will take back information regarding Private Fostering - will ensure Probation involvement is reported back into the Board. • DM: scrutiny around CME, particularly around the three families not allowing professionals into their home - helpful challenge here. • DWR: CME - issues when children are not seen (just their work). How do we know they have done the work being presented? Questions around the quality of home education/educators - should it even be allowed?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EM: missing-from-home issues significant - will be taking back specific challenges relating to Stockton. <p>Summarising the key points discussed at this meeting, DP added a number of other issues of significance, namely the profile-raising of Operation Shield intelligence forms, reviewing home education outcomes, regional adoption structures, streamlining out-of-borough placement panels, reassurance around the forthcoming SEND inspection, and running/missing from home/care (something here about operational VEMT processes - where does scrutiny take place?).</p> <p>AM commented that it was important to catalogue what all partners learn from SLSCB meetings in order to ensure the Board's effectiveness as a partnership.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.

OTHER

<i>Ref No. 10</i>	Any Other Business
<i>Discussion</i>	Nothing to report.
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.