








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)	✓ ✗ Apols
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 	Apols
Jane Humphreys (JH)	Director of Children's Services	Local Authority (SBC)	<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)			Apols
Margaret Harvey (MH)	Service Manager		CAFCASS	Apols

SLSCB Members	Title	Representing	Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair)	  Apols
Alastair Simpson (AS)	Detective Superintendent / Chair 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		Apols
Vacancy	Secondary Schools			
Kerry Coe (KC)	Head Teacher Primary Schools		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Needs Panel Primary Heads Group ARP Cluster 	
Joanna Bailey (JB)	Principal Stockton Sixth Form College		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor at Thornaby Academy Governor at The Grangefield Academy Campus Stockton Teaching Alliance 14-19 Partnership, Campus Stockton CPD Group Campus Stockton R&D Group Secondary Heads Group 	
Jean Golightly (JG)	Executive Nurse	Hartlepool & Stockton-on-Tees Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Tees CCG (Exec Nurse) Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board Member of NHSE Quality Surveillance Group meeting 	Apols
Trina Holcroft (TH)	Designated Nurse, Safeguarding Children & LAC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hartlepool SCB (full board, exec and LIPSG) CDOP Tees LSCBs Procedures Group Multi-Agency Looked After Partnership (MALAP Stockton) Stockton Performance Management Stockton LIPSG Hartlepool Performance and Quality Group Joint Training Group MACH SMB and Implementation Group Teeswide Designated Professionals Group NTHFT Steering Group 	
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)		
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) 	Apols

SLSCB Members	Title	Representing	Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair)	✓ ✗ Apols 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			Apols
Julie McNaughton (JM)	Accommodation Contracts Manager	Thirteen / Housing Provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tees Valley Choice Based Lettings Steering Group • My Sisters Place – Board • North East Homelessness Group • MAPPA Representative 	✓
Steve Rose (SR)	Chief Executive Officer Catalyst	Voluntary Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safer Stockton Partnership • Stockton 14-19 Partnership • Stockton Carers Implementation Group • Stockton Health & Wellbeing Partnership • Stockton VCSE Senior Leaders Forum • Stockton Voice • Stockton Youth Offenders Service Board • Tees Dementia Collaborative • Tees Valley Local Development Agencies Forum • Tees Valley Unlimited European Social Inclusion Task & Finish Group 	✓

Guests:		
Sarah Bowman-Abouna (SBo)	SBC - Assistant Director, Public Health	Public Health rep.
Cllr Carol Clark (CC)	SBC - Elected Member	Observer
Cllr Barbara Inman (BI)	SBC - Elected Member	Observer
Cllr Tracey Stott (TS)	SBC - Elected Member	Observer
Jon Green (JGr)	Police - Detective Superintendent	Observer
Karen Agar (KA)	TEWV - Associate Director of Nursing (Safeguarding)	Sub for Elizabeth Moody
Sharon Barnett (SBa)	Probation - Stockton NPS Manager	Sub for Julie Allan
Kevin Parry (KP)	Probation - CRC Operations Manager	Sub for Barbara Gill

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>KA was in attendance as the substitute for EM, SBa was in attendance as the substitute for JA, and KP was in attendance as the substitute for BG.</p> <p>JGr was accompanying AS in an observational capacity - it is intended that JGr becomes the new Police representative on the SLSCB when AS leaves his current role in December 2016.</p> <p>CC, BI and TS 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>JH arrived at the meeting at 9.45am, and SBo at 10.05am, due to prior personal/work commitments.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.

Ref No. 2	13.10.16 Board Minutes for Accuracy
<i>Discussion</i>	Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 13 th October 2016 were agreed as a true record.
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	The minutes of the Board meeting held on the 13 th October 2016 be recorded as ratified.

Ref No. 3	Action Log
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>a) Action Log</u> The circulated <i>SLSCB Meetings Action Log 2016 / 2017 (To Do / in progress)</i> was provided for information - PB advised that this document continues to be updated as evidence is received. There remains no major area of concern.</p> <p><u>b) 29a/07/1617 Updated Report</u> With reference to the circulated <i>Additional Information: The audit of Paediatric Assessment of Children subject to a protection plan for Neglect in Stockton-on-Tees between October 2015 - March 2016</i> report, TH reported the following updates after a request was made for further clarification on the original report (presented to the SLSCB in July 2016):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the cases related to Stockton children. • Out of the eight cases where it stated that the Social Worker was not present, three of these were initially not found on the RAISE system. Further re-checking of the demographic details has identified the correct child (although one child appears to have moved out of area), and these have been forwarded to Children's Services (see c) 29b/07/1617 Review of cases included in the H&SCCG Neglect Audit below). • Undertaking further exploration of this audit process has highlighted additional issues to be addressed. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A varied use of terminology when referring to the 'neglect medical' or 'paediatric assessment'. ○ Children's Social Care across the North of Tees do not collate the number of children referred for neglect medicals (not stored on the system in a reportable format). ○ Decision as to whether a child needs to be referred for a neglect medical is sometimes made at the first Core Group rather than the Initial Child Protection Conference.

Ref No. 3	Action Log
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The audit proforma does not capture all of the necessary information (i.e. Social Worker attended (yes/no); no option to capture who attended with the child and family). <p>It was recommended that these additional issues should be explored further at the Tees LSCBs Procedures Group (TPG), and that the 'Paediatric assessment for children/young people made subject to a child protection plan for Neglect' guidance should be revised accordingly. TH noted that a Task & Finish Group meeting is scheduled for the 25th November 2016 which will look at re-designing the audit tool (to be completed by January 2017 and brought back to the SLSCB).</p> <p>LR emphasised the importance of communication and expectation - when children go for a medical, Paediatricians need to be aware that the most appropriate person (not necessarily the Social Worker) is attending with the child.</p>
	<p><u>c) 29b/07/1617 Review of cases included in the H&SCCG Neglect Audit</u></p> <p>Further to the findings noted in the <i>Additional Information: The audit of Paediatric Assessment of Children subject to a protection plan for Neglect in Stockton-on-Tees between October 2015 - March 2016</i> report (see b) 29a/07/1617 Updated Report above), JH had provided a written response to PB relating to the eight cases where it stated that the Social Worker was not present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In two cases, there was no evidence on case files around who had attended (if anyone from Children's Social Services), and the staff involved have now left the Department. • In one case, a decision was made that no-one from Children's Services needed to attend - this decision has been discussed/addressed with the relevant Team Manager. • In three cases, the FIP Worker attended with the child and parents. • In one case, the Social Worker did attend the medical. • In one case, only the mother and child attended (in agreement with the Social Worker), as there were no concerns around mother's care - concern related to child's father.
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates noted.

Partnership Information

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
Discussion	<p><u>a) Updates from Board Members</u></p> <p><u>NTHFT</u></p> <p>LR reported staffing issues within the Trust's Safeguarding Team due to prolonged leave - this is having an adverse effect on the ability to commit to sub-groups (including Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC)), and attendance at such groups is currently being reviewed. A new staff member has been seconded into the team which will alleviate some of the pressure, but they will need time to become accustomed to their role.</p> <p><u>Police</u></p> <p>AS raised resource issues in relation to Police checks for Social Care, mainly due to the Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Children's Hub creating more work. Assurance was given that all urgent checks will be undertaken, and Court checks will be completed on time - communication will take place between the Police and Social Care regarding other requests, acknowledging the current backlog. DP queried if these pressures were due to abstraction issues - AS stated that the relevant teams were fully resourced, but that the workload of partner agencies had increased, with more information-sharing now taking place (a positive aspect). These developments will be further addressed at the Children's</p>

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
	<p>Hub governance group in the New Year.</p> <p><u>Local Authority</u> AM attended yesterday's Children and Young People's Partnership, which included a discussion on children who have parents in prison - the information provided around the behaviour of children in this situation was very insightful, and it may be pertinent to bring this issue to the SLSCB in the future.</p> <p>JH reminded Board members that both she and SM would be stepping down from their current roles at the end of 2016, and will be replaced by MG and Rhona Bollands (SBC Service Manager - Assessment & Fieldwork) respectively. Further updates were noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a caseload and staffing perspective, JH advised that no cases were unallocated as of last week, and that the challenges around the recruitment of experienced Social Workers are ongoing - a rolling advertisement is in place, and a new video has been produced using a number of SBC staff and Elected Members, outlining the benefits of working in Stockton (it was suggested that this video could be shown at the next Board meeting in December 2016). • The Action Plan derived from the Ofsted inspection (SIF) in May/June 2016 has been shared this week, and will be presented to SBC Cabinet next week. Joint Targeted Area Inspections (JTAs) are taking place in relation to domestic abuse. Although Stockton have recently had their SIF (Single Inspection Framework), a JTA or SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) inspection can take place in the same locality soon after - agencies cannot rest on their laurels. • The Children's Hub is going well. The next meeting in December 2016 will look at performance (including quality assurance), and partners have been asked to audit where work coming into the Children's Hub has gone - a report will then be submitted to SBC Cabinet in the New Year. JH will continue in her Children's Hub role after stepping down as Director of Children's Services. • CP numbers are over 300. Have previously looked into cases which have gone to ICPC, and found that 25% of these did not proceed to a plan - this raises concerns, particularly in light of the resources spent on Conferences. It was suggested that a multi-agency piece of work may be required here - MG felt there was a need to examine this issue from a performance perspective before bringing it back to the Board, and TH queried if there was any correlation with the effects of Signs of Safety use. • LAC numbers have significantly increased, and now total 421 (had been around 380 for some time) - some form of work is needed here. • 60 referrals were received into Children's Social Care last week, most of them involving domestic abuse. • Workloads are not reducing, and there has been an increase in high-end cases, with examples of families of four-six children being brought into the system. There have been significant requests for Police checks, which are not always responded to in a timely manner - as noted earlier, AS again acknowledged the backlog, which had been caused by the increased work that the Children's Hub had created. <p><u>b) Cleveland Police attendance at Strategy Meetings</u> AS provided an overview of the circulated <i>Cleveland Police attendance at Strategy meetings</i> report, which updated the SLSCB on Police involvement in Strategy meetings since the Ofsted inspection in May/June 2016. This report was also brought to the Board in response to the recent criticism of the Police by Ofsted.</p> <p>The report gave a background to the role of the Police in Strategy meetings, the previous approach of Cleveland Police in respect of Strategy invitations, and the views of Ofsted in relation to this approach following the Stockton inspection - a recommendation that the Police should be involved in all multi-agency Strategy discussions was subsequently put for-</p>

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues			
	<p>ward. Details of the Cleveland Police response to the Ofsted findings was documented - this highlighted that clear and sustained improvement had been made following the introduction of the Children's Hub, with an average attendance of 77% since the implementation of the Children's Hub (88% in September 2016), compared with the previous average of 47% between September 2015 and May 2016. DP asked what the Police's target was for attendance - AS advised that the aspiration is for 100% attendance, though Strategy meetings take place across all Tees areas, and some invitations are received at very short notice which can impact upon the ability to attend.</p> <p>KC reported the positive difference in terms of Police input to Strategy meetings that she had attended this year, and DP emphasised the added value brought to the table when the Police are in attendance, whilst congratulating Cleveland Police for their improvements.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	Partner updates noted, including the response by Cleveland Police to the Ofsted findings around their attendance at Strategy meetings (with subsequent improvements highlighted).			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
46/11/1617	17.11.16	Take the issue of the 25% of cases not resulting in a plan to the Performance Group for analysis, as well as continuing to review the ongoing increase in numbers of LAC.	MG	03.02.17

Minutes / Updates / Outcomes from Meetings

Ref No. 5	Tees LSCBs VEMT Strategic Group & Tees LSCBs Performance Group			
Discussion	<p>a) <u>Tees LSCBs VEMT Strategic Group - Running, Missing from Home or Care Protocol</u> AS referred to the circulated <i>Runaway or Missing from Home or Care (RMHC): Revised Tees Protocol</i> report, which sought endorsement of the revised protocol (developed by a Task & Finish Group of the Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group, and included within the report) by the four Tees LSCBs. This revised document describes the roles of different agencies before, during and after children go missing.</p> <p>In terms of adding value to this protocol, AS encouraged agencies to increase their level of awareness of those children who were in residential/foster care, in particular links to social networking sites which may shed some light on who children are speaking to and where they may be going to - in addition, consent for sharing their photograph can be determined in advance. There are good problem-solving structures in place (via VEMT Practitioners' Groups (VPGs)) to feed this information in, though the need for consistent use of language/definitions between the Police and Social Care was reinforced.</p> <p>MG commented that the protocol was a clear document, but noted that 'Appendix A - Return Interview good practice (Missing from Home/Care - Response/Interview)' appeared to be what Social Care has within its system - AS advised that this was included within the protocol as the Task & Finish Group thought that Stockton had the best form (a compatibility issue with the drop down lists was identified, and this will need to be looked at).</p> <p>LB sought assurance around appropriate updates being made to a child's record as new information/intelligence arises - AS stated that this should be taking place, and that all documentation should be kept up-to-date with notes of dialogue between the child, Police and Social Care.</p> <p>Reflecting on lower-level missing episodes, AM highlighted the views of some local residents who live near a Children's Home, who see a Police car and assume trouble. However, the reality was that the Police provide an excellent response to missing reports and take safeguarding very seriously, despite other pressures - Officers take the time to go into</p>			

Ref No. 5	Tees LSCBs VEMT Strategic Group & Tees LSCBs Performance Group			
	<p>the Homes and see the children, and, as Lead Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, AM was very appreciative of their support.</p>			
	<p>LR could not get a sense of Health (A&E) within this protocol, and questioned how Health would know if a child was missing. AS was happy to seek ways of strengthening the document around Health, though noted that hospital checks are always undertaken - children are not necessarily flagged on GP systems, but A&Es are covered by standard/repeated checks.</p>			
	<p>In light of this protocol being Tees-wide, SR asked if any Stockton-specific issues had been identified - AS advised that the SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group have been tasked with looking into data on missing episodes as Stockton appears to be an outlier across Tees. A simple explanation would be that Stockton has more Children's Homes than other Tees areas, but this should not used as an excuse - children in care are more vulnerable. A recommendation has been put forward that each Tees area submits a runaway/missing report for their respective Board on a quarterly basis - DP confirmed that the analysis of the SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group will be presented to the Board at a forthcoming meeting.</p>			
<p>MG noted that RMHC was picked up by Ofsted as an issue in Stockton, particularly in relation to repeated incidents within a short period of time - forms/documents are attempting to capture how many episodes are covered by one interview, and it was vital to ensure that a quality return interview is conducted at the appropriate time. If a child refuses an interview with the Social Worker, an independent interview (via Barnardo's) is offered instead. MG encouraged the Board to maintain a focus on RMHC, as there is a feeling that agencies have not previously been detailed/analytical enough in pulling together information/trends.</p>				
<p>DP observed that there was no place within the protocol for LSCB sign-off, and queried how this will be implemented - AS stated that, upon approval from LSCBs, the monitoring of its implementation will go to VEMT groups. The RMHC protocol was therefore endorsed by the SLSCB - similar to TPG processes, this document will need to be agreed by all four Tees LSCBs.</p>				
<p>b) Tees LSCBs Performance Group</p>				
<p>In the absence of JG, DP reported that work around the Tees Performance Management Framework (PMF) was going well, and noted the valued contributions from Ian Coxon (SBC Assistant Director - Business Support and Information) and Paul Diggins (SBC Improvement Manager - Business Support and Information). Quarter 2 data will be published in December 2016 and brought to the SLSCB in January 2017 for review - JG will provide a more detailed update (covering information in relation to running/missing from home/care) at the next Board meeting in December 2016.</p>				
Agreement/ Outcome	<p>Tees LSCBs VEMT Strategic Group - Running, Missing from Home or Care Protocol noted, discussed and subsequently endorsed. Tees LSCBs Performance Group updated noted, with more detailed developments to be provided at the next SLSCB meeting in December 2016.</p>			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
47/11/1617	17.11.16	Tees LSCBs Performance Group update to be provided at the SLSCB meeting in December 2016.	JG	15.12.16

EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE

Ref No. 6	2015/2016 CDOP Annual Report			
Discussion	<p>AS presented the circulated <i>Tees Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) Annual Report 2015-2016</i> which contained the following elements:</p>			

Ref No. 6	2015/2016 CDOP Annual Report			
	<p>➤ Introduction</p> <p>➤ Tees Child Death Statistics (April 2015 - March 2016)</p> <p>➤ Cases Reviewed and the outcomes of these cases</p> <p>➤ Child Deaths considered by Tees CDOP (April 2015 - March 2016)</p> <p>➤ Tees CDOP Budget</p> <p>➤ Future Challenges</p> <p>➤ Appendix 1 - Attendance at Tees CDOP Meetings (2015-16)</p> <p>It was acknowledged that clarification on the number of child deaths in 2015-2016 for Stockton was required as Tables 1 and 2 state 12, but Tables 3 and 4 state 13 (note: clarity was subsequently provided following this meeting - Tables 1 and 2 are in respect of the number of child deaths in 2015/16, whereas Tables 3 and 4 are in respect of the number of child deaths <i>reviewed</i> in 2015/16).</p> <p>With reference to the 'cases reviewed' section of the report, attention was drawn to the Safe Sleep Campaign - Tees Wide (3.1). AS highlighted that Stockton had seen potentially two deaths related to this issue, and LR questioned if there was any evidence of impact through this campaign (e.g. what were the statistics on this for the previous year?). DP considered that this should be an ongoing campaign that provides safer education, and that Midwives and Health Visitors have a responsibility here (LR noted that these staff do address this issue as part of their standard practice) - can Tees CDOP be asked for evidence of impact? AS felt that it may be difficult to gauge a campaign's effectiveness when dealing with such small numbers, with MG adding that there is often criticism of the CDOP process, despite each case involving unique and special circumstances. SR furthered that if an unexpected death arises from neglect/abuse, agencies need to understand this (particularly in relation to other children within the family).</p> <p>The successful implementation of the Tees Rapid Response procedure was also highlighted (3.1) - this followed robust challenge by the Tees CDOP and four Tees LSCBs, and sets in place procedures for ensuring that unexpected child deaths are responded to appropriately and in a timely manner. This process is essential to ensure the safeguarding of any siblings and support to families is considered as a priority.</p> <p>DP focused in on the key area of deaths that CDOP deemed to have modifiable factors (Table 8) - the Board should be particularly interested in these. There appeared to be a conflict here in that Stockton had two such cases, yet there were no recorded Serious Case Reviews (SCRs)/Learning Reviews undertaken. These cases are discussed at the SLSCB Learning & Improving Practice Sub-Group (LIPSG), and reviews are recommended. DP suggested that future LIPSG reports to the Board should clearly state which cases had modifiable factors, and what was done (e.g. SCR/Learning Review) in response to these - LIPSG to ensure that all modifiable factors are addressed in decision-making processes.</p> <p>The 'future challenges' section was noted, specifically the requirement for CDOP funding to be secured beyond 2017 - this will feed into discussions around the future of CDOP, and where it should sit in the context of the Tees LSCBs. It was also noted that TEWV are not currently represented at CDOP - do they feel disempowered in light of this, or are they happy to be invited in where necessary? KA agreed to liaise with TEWV colleagues to ascertain their position.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	Tees Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) Annual Report 2015-2016 noted and discussed.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
48/11/1617	17.11.16	Liaise with TEWV colleagues in relation to thoughts on TEWV not being current members of the Tees	Karen Agar	15.12.16

Ref No. 6	2015/2016 CDOP Annual Report
	CDOP, and whether this should change.

2015/2016 Assurance Reports & Challenge, Impact and Improve

Ref No. 7	Procedures for Consideration by the Tees LSCBs
Discussion	<p>a) Safeguarding in Education Establishments</p> <p>DM gave an overview of the circulated <i>SLSCB Quality Assurance Report: Education 2015/2016</i>, which set out the work to prioritise safeguarding across the education sector to demonstrate the assurance that Working Together 2013 and the revised Keeping Children Safe in Education 2016 guidance is in place, and the requirements of the Section 11 audit are met. The report covered the activity of the Local Authority from April 2015 in working with all educational establishments: Children Centres, early years settings, schools (including academies and the independent sector), sixth form colleges and Further Education providers.</p> <p>Progress achieved in 2015/2016 was recorded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Safeguarding Forums</i>: Continue to be delivered every term, and attendance is very strong. The agendas include key objectives for education as well as messages from the Safeguarding Board. Evaluations from the sessions are positive. • The offer for early years providers, private and voluntary settings and childminders, remains robust. In line with the Safeguarding Forums for schools and colleges, termly Network Manager’s Meetings are held (Managers from private nurseries/pre-schools and out-of-school clubs). Termly Network Childminder Meetings are also held and termly newsletters for all childcare providers/early years within schools are provided. • <i>Safeguarding Briefings</i>: Notes have been sent within the year - these include briefings, messages from Board meetings, and resources for schools and settings to use. All are distributed to Designated Safeguarding Leads and are logged centrally to view (link provided within the report). • <i>Single-agency training</i>: Robust programme of single agency training continues to be delivered. Discrete events have been held for governors, early years providers, Designated Safeguarding Leads and Designated Teachers (for Looked After Children). There is a regular programme of training that covers networks, courses for new colleagues, top-up sessions, safer recruitment courses and focus sessions. <p>Additional work with schools included the launch of Operation Encompass (enormously welcomed by schools as the information of domestic abuse enables them to better support the child in the immediate term, and the family), the commissioning of Chelsea’s Choice (productions raising awareness of the issues relating to sexual exploitation, and to give young people some skills and knowledge to be able to protect themselves from this form of abuse), and a schools survey (conducted with Year 8 and 10 students, and involving issues around e-safety, bullying, emotional health and wellbeing and relationships).</p> <p>The Ofsted inspection in May/June 2016 provided a very robust evaluation of the work in education around safeguarding - the judgement of ‘good’ was a clear endorsement of the context. One area for further work arose - this was to support schools to secure attendance of all pupils in full-time appropriate education, and monitor very robustly those not in full-time education and on part-time provision.</p> <p>Next steps for 2016/2017 were noted, including work with schools to improve the provision for young people’s emotional wellbeing and mental health in line with the Future in Mind programme outlined above, ensure the recommended actions from the Ofsted inspection are addressed, and respond to the intelligence analysed on school and setting referrals to the Children’s Hub to inform intervention with schools and future training - a forthcoming meeting has been arranged between the Hub, DM and education leads.</p>

Ref No. 7	Procedures for Consideration by the Tees LSCBs
	<p>AM commended DM on the fantastic work undertaken within education in relation to safeguarding, and advised that the views of young people from the Youth Assembly will be sought to ensure the voice of the child is reflected in the types of future programmes delivered - feedback from the schools survey showed that a lot of information is made available to young people, but the impact of this is not always effective.</p> <p>In light of the success of Chelsea's Choice, SR queried if a similar programme could be made available to the Community Sector - PB stated that all Board members were invited to attend the school's productions, and felt that future programmes (which could include issues around cyber-bullying and e-Safety) could be broadened to include wider agencies (though JH noted that funding implications would need consideration, as the Local Authority previously provided 50% of the production fees). AS added that schools should have seen the value of this production, therefore it should be followed up as a rolling programme for other children - LC considered that this material should be fed into the school curriculum if it so effective. SR also questioned whether those schools who do not engage in this, and other safeguarding activity (e.g. Forums, training), are tracked - DM confirmed that such education providers are closely monitored.</p> <p>DP commended the critical work of going into schools and addressing issues raised directly with the young people themselves, particularly those who do not feel valued or cared for by their educational establishment. However, it was now the fundamental role of the SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group to carry this work (CSE, e-Safety, etc.) forward, who should co-ordinate a response on behalf of the Board. As such, this report should be referred to the VEMT Sub-Group for development.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	<p><i>SLSCB Quality Assurance Report: Education 2015/2016</i> noted and discussed - agreement that this should be referred to the SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group to co-ordinate a response to the report's findings on behalf of the Board.</p>

Ref No. 8	Section 11 Peer Reviews
Discussion	<p>DP introduced this item, reminding Board members of the Section 11 reports that were presented at the SLSCB meeting in March 2016, and the subsequent decision to proceed to a peer review involving the 'pairing-off' of selected Board members from each agency represented at the Board. The rationale for this process was to seek assurance on the accurateness and validity of the Section 11 data originally provided, with feedback on the findings being presented today.</p> <p>Each peer review pair were invited to highlight the key issues that arose from their scrutiny of each other's Section 11 information - other Board members were then open to ask any pertinent questions around this feedback. DP also requested views on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Did this peer review process work? ➤ Does this process give the Board assurances? ➤ What impact has it had/will it have? ➤ If the Section 11 information highlights areas for improvement/development, how will this be captured? <p>To provide some context to the peer review feedback, the <i>SLSCB S11 Standards, Elements & Grade Descriptor (Appendix 1)</i> and <i>SLSCB Standards & Elements in Chart Form (Appendix 4)</i> documents were circulated.</p>
	<p><i>Paired for Scrutiny</i></p> <p><u>SBC Housing (JE) & HAST CCG (TH)</u></p> <p>Further to the summary of the scrutiny assessment provided within the circulated report,</p>

Ref No. 8	Section 11 Peer Reviews
	<p>the following comments were recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement from both agencies that this was a very useful exercise, despite the challenges of the CCG not having direct contact with children. • Audit tool used to submit information was too long. • CCG produced a small Action Plan in relation to the Section 11 audit, but this has drifted somewhat - can bring this to the Board if required. PB noted that if the right Section 11 model can be found, those areas that need addressing can be identified across all agencies and presented to the SLSCB. • PB reported that the Ofsted inspector was very interested in how the Board were conducting Section 11 audits, though she did acknowledge that the document from which the standards came from is confusing - there is not an expectation that all agencies would be Grade 4 (this needs to be explained within any analysis). <p><u>National Probation Service (JA) & NTHFT (LR)</u> Further to the changes made to Section 11 scores detailed within the circulated report, the following comments were recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This process enabled constructive challenge, despite Probation primarily serving adults as opposed to children. It also enhanced relationships with the other agency involved in the peer review. • Challenged each other and ourselves as part of the discussion - reduced some scores and noted work to be done. • Audit tool itself was not helpful or easy to complete, but would support this process in the future. • Probation carrying out further work with sex offenders in relation to grooming, and involved in a local research project which may provide useful information around how certain young people are targeted (60 perpetrators to be identified - looking specifically at internet grooming) - DP encouraged a link here to the Tees e-Safety Group. <p><u>SBC Children's Social Care (JH) & TEWV (KA)</u> Further to the summary of the scrutiny review (including changes to original grading's), provided within the circulated report, the following comments were recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of grades were increased for SBC - it was felt that these had been under-scored originally, a belief that had been backed-up by the findings of the Ofsted inspection in May/June 2016. • Quality of supervision was still an issue across both agencies, hence the downgrading of the original scores. • Audit documentation not user-friendly, but the challenge of this information was useful, and gave the opportunity to be more realistic and probe certain issues. • PB asked Board members if the online audit tool itself was a problem, or if there was more of an issue with regards the questions being posed - it was felt that agencies were answering/interpreting the questions in different ways, and that it would have been useful to highlight which areas of the Section 11 document were applicable/not applicable to each agency (not being able to answer a question, or giving a lower grade, is not necessarily a negative). <p><u>Police (AS) & Public Health (Jane Smith (SBC Early Intervention Manager - Public Health))</u> Further to the changes made to Section 11 scores detailed within the circulated report, the following comments were recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police were downgraded following this scrutiny assessment, whereas Public Health were upgraded. • In relation to standard 1.3, Police as an organisation have not been shaped around the voice of the child, though work has been undertaken in relation to this. It is not about

Ref No. 8	Section 11 Peer Reviews
	<p>Senior Managers not taking safeguarding seriously (they do), it is more that the Police do not routinely engage in dialogue with children - the culture is one of responding to complaints, not pro-actively looking for the views of children (think about this in future).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large part of the Public Health remit is to commission other services - they have done all they can to ensure safeguarding issues are built into contracts. • LR felt that assurance was required in terms of commissioned services doing what they should be doing within their contracts - may be useful to examine in the future. <p>SBo noted that such analysis forms part of the overall evaluation process cycle.</p>
	<p><i>Individual Review Scrutinisers</i></p> <p>Thirteen Housing Group (JM) - scrutiny by DM & KC Further to the summary of the scrutiny review provided within the circulated report, the following comments were recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review a useful process, despite the person who completed the Section 11 return for Thirteen not being available (JM did not complete the original Section 11 document, but would be more involved in future submissions). • In some cases, through discussion, it was felt the grade given was underscored. • Further actions were identified - links to schools to be developed, and re-assessing procedures to ensure actions are embedded. • Thirteen is very much an adult-driven service, and would not necessarily have direct dialogue with children. <p>Probation CRC (BG) & NHS England - scrutiny by MG Further to the key issues identified within the circulated report, the following comments were recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process of reviewing the views of organisations who may not fit neatly into the current tool, and to seek their views on the Section 11 process generally, was helpful in drawing out some issues for consideration by the LSCB. • For those partners covering a wider geographical area, then some form of simple self-assessment and statement of assurance may be more appropriate, as this would form part of such organisations' QA activity and would potentially be more effective in that it would enable a more thorough appraisal than that undertaken for each LSCB's different Section 11 process.
	<p>With reference to the comments around the Section 11 process, Board members were asked for their thoughts on the future arrangements for this audit work.</p> <p>JH felt that Section 11 forms part of an overall process in the SLSCB seeking assurances from agencies, but the challenge remains around the Board being provided with information from <i>all</i> partners - Section 11 is one way of obtaining this evidence, but not the only way. AS added that Section 11 is useful as an annual internal health-check, and the subsequent scrutiny around this has helped provide some assurance for the SLSCB - the process could certainly become slicker for the next audit, though if the Board keeps trying alternative approaches to Section 11, this may result in reduced value. LC thought that undergoing a similar process a second time may be easier, as it should be more familiar.</p> <p>Reflecting on the recommendations of the Wood Review (which suggests that the Local Authority, NHS and Police would form the basis of the 'core' function of future arrangements), LR questioned if some agencies would be excluded from this audit process if these are fully implemented. PB stated that Section 11 is a statutory requirement for all agencies, and all partners who work with children must undergo a Section 11 audit. TH endorsed a future process that cuts across Tees for those agencies that are represented on more than one LSCB.</p>

Ref No. 8	Section 11 Peer Reviews			
	<p>DP surmised that the current Section 11 audit process was positive in relation to outcomes, and there was clear support for the peer-review which scrutinised agency grading's. Questions had been identified around what is being done when scores have been reduced (linked to Action Plans), and whether this current process should be pushed forward on a Tees-wide basis (it was noted that for those agencies working across boundaries, the requirement for a single Section 11 submission would be honoured). Board members agreed that the current process should therefore be refined rather than changed.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	<p>Section 11 peer review feedback noted and discussed, with particular emphasis on the current audit process, and whether this was appropriate. Agreement that the current process should be refined rather than changed for future Section 11 audits.</p>			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
49/11/1617	17.11.16	Refine the Section 11 audit process, and act as the lead LSCB Business Manager for this piece of work.	PB	30.06.17

ENABLING CHANGE

Ref No. 9	SLSCB Priorities & Working Arrangements 2016-18			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>DP introduced the circulated <i>SLSCB Priorities & Working Arrangements 2016-18</i> report, which sought the Board's approval for a revised set of priorities and working arrangements following the SLSCB Development Day in September 2016 (MG was thanked for his efforts in pulling this report together). Specific attention was drawn to the draft proposals put forward for consideration:</p> <p><u>a) A new vision and values</u> The draft vision is suggested as:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>'The Board will strive for excellence in all that it does to ensure that children and young people within the Borough of Stockton on Tees are kept safe from harm by ensuring the effectiveness of what is done in the Borough to prevent harm and protect children.'</i></p> <p>DP felt that the Board needed something more than just a statutory statement, and advised that the proposal above would replace the current statement in the SLSCB Constitution. JH suggested that this proposal should be slightly re-worded as it excludes Stockton-on-Tees children placed out-of-area.</p> <p>A draft set of values was set out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wellbeing and safety of CYP will be at the centre of all our activity. • We will work to gather in a spirit of mutual respect and constructive challenge to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure co-ordination ○ Bring effective challenge ○ Enable change • We will be open in what we do and how we do it. • We will be a learning organisation and will develop in response to evidence and best practice. • We will work closely with other partners within the Borough, and where appropriate, further afield to deliver our vision and priorities. • Each Board member will fully contribute to achieving the vision and priorities of the Board. <p>DP noted that these values are more personal, and differentiate from those of an individual agencies commitment to safeguarding. Board members subsequently agreed to the pro-</p>			

Ref No. 9	SLSCB Priorities & Working Arrangements 2016-18
	<p>posed set of values.</p> <p><u>b) Outline priorities</u> Reflecting on the Wood Review implementation (now being suggested for 2020), the SLSCB has work to do - priorities would be based on two outcome priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Preventing Harm</i>: tackling the root causes of neglect, with a focus on domestic abuse, drugs and alcohol and parental mental health. The key role of the Board will be to assure itself that the right structures and capacity is in place to address the impact of these issues on children and families: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domestic Abuse (led by MG - Chair of Domestic Abuse Steering Group) ○ Mental Wellbeing (led by TH - has discussed this with KA, and are scoping what is out there that is effective. Hartlepool have a sub-group looking at mental health services (not just TEWV) - may be useful to look at this from a North Tees perspective, and bring back any Stockton-specific issues to the SLSCB. Mental health and wellbeing is a priority for the Health and Wellbeing Board - can link in with this partnership too) ○ Substance misuse (led by SBo - Public Health taking the lead, and work has been done via the Health and Wellbeing Board which the SLSCB can look at linking in with) ○ Early Help (led by MG) <p>DP stated that it is the role of the Board to seek assurance that the above areas are being effectively addressed, and that duplication of work is avoided. SBo added that consideration should also be given to how these four factors join up (e.g. poverty).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Protecting vulnerable children</i>: reducing the risks of children and young people who are VEMT or at risk of being VEMT, led by Rhona Bolland (incoming SBC Assistant Director - Safeguarding & Looked After Children). <p>The Board will adopt a third 'business improvement priority', which is about how it undertakes the roles of ensuring co-ordination, effective challenge and enabling change across its activities. The focus of this work will be the development and analysis of a self-assessment process, and the key elements in this approach will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Ensuring the voice of the child continues to be embedded across all activity and agencies. b) Reviewing approaches to information sharing as this is a persistent issues, raised again at the development day. c) Learning and improvement framework to strengthen the links between practice reviews, the use of performance data and training. d) A governance review to address the national review, structures of sub groups and the options for introducing an executive structure. <p>SR has been invited to be the lead of the above business improvement priority, and will co-ordinate a Task & Finish Group to oversee this (Board members were encouraged to forward any views on how the group should operate to SR). SR will also become the new SLSCB Vice-Chair in light of the forthcoming departure of AS from the Board.</p> <p><u>c) Establishment of an Executive Group</u> It is proposed that the SLSCB pilot the creation of an Executive Group to support streamlined decision-making - this will also act as a shadow group in view of the recommendations from the Wood Review. The group would consist of the SLSCB Independent Chair, SLSCB Business Manager, Local Authority Lead, Police Lead, CCG Lead, and Chairs of Priority Groups where not already represented. JH suggested the addition of a Board Lay</p>

Ref No. 9	SLSCB Priorities & Working Arrangements 2016-18			
	<p>Member to Executive Group - this was agreed (and was acknowledged as an omission from the report).</p> <p>The main purpose of the group would be to facilitate effective Board meetings and the prioritisation of business - the group would be accountable to the Board, with minutes shared. It is proposed that the Board and Executive Group each meet six-weekly with a three week gap between each to ensure there is not an increase in the number of meetings. Planned implementation would be April 2017, and would be kept under review.</p> <p>Further comments regarding the draft proposals above were noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS felt that one of the strengths of the SLSCB was the level of representation and discussion from all agencies. Although the concept of more meetings is not ideal, if there is greater focus and less time spent overall, this can be justified. TH had reservations around additional meeting requirements, and highlighted the lack of Trust representatives on the proposed Executive Group - this may need more thought, as Health structures are large and complex. • MG queried how the Board can ensure its sub-groups are working effectively - they can sometime operate as stand-alone groups, and issues have been raised in relation to the Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Joint Training Group (HSJTG) and Learning and Improving Practice Sub-Group (LIPSG). In terms of the former, LR advised that proposals will be brought to the next Board meeting in December 2016 around training priorities - how does the Board ensure training meets SLSCB priorities? DP noted that there are two strands of training involved here - Board members' needs and those of the wider workforce. • SR urged all those not part of the Executive Group to hold them to account - similarly, DP will need to ensure that the disempowerment of non-Executive Group Board members is avoided. In theory, there should be more time for the bigger issues to be discussed at Board meetings, and agencies need to commit to make the Executive Group work for the benefit of children, rather than thinking of the impact on themselves. DP added that the Board should be served by the Executive Group, and that if things start to drift from this, agencies should hold him to account. <p>Board members agreed to the implementation of the draft proposals (subject to the identified minor amendments), which, as previously noted, would be kept under review following implementation in April 2017.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB priorities and working arrangements draft proposals noted and discussed, with agreement to implement these (subject to minor amendments) from April 2017.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
50/11/1617	17.11.16	Amend the proposed SLSCB vision statement to include Stockton-on-Tees children placed out-of-area.	DP	15.12.16

Ref No. 10	Outline SLSCB Business Plan 2016 / 2018			
Discussion	Reference was made to the circulated draft <i>SLSCB Business Plan 2016-2018</i> , which had been provided for information, setting out the core purpose of the SLSCB, its principles, and the context and monitoring of the Business Plan. This document will go to other partnerships once it has been printed (currently with the SBC Design and Print department).			
Agreement/ Outcome	<i>SLSCB Business Plan 2016-2018</i> noted.			

Ref No. 11	Actions, Impact, Evidence & Difference
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>As per the end of the last SLSCB meeting, 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: Section 11 audits - have identified that the peer scrutiny exercise should continue. • KC: Section 11 audits - evidence that agencies have gone back and done things differently following the audit findings. • AM: Voice of the child - further evidence has emerged in relation to how this is captured, though more input is needed from partners to ensure this is not all Local Authority-led. • SR: Police report regarding Strategy attendance - demonstrated changes in culture following criticism. • LB: impressed with the information around education Safeguarding Briefings. • LC: no unallocated cases (as of last week), and staff recruitment being addressed using a different approach to the norm. <p>DP added that the Runaway or Missing from Home or Care reports will make a difference if implemented properly, and noted potential developments in TEWV becoming more involved in CDOP.</p> <p>Following attendance at this (and the last) Board meeting, and further to observations at a recent Durham LSCB meeting, TS commended Board members for the level of input evident from all partners, and thanked DP for allowing SBC Elected Members to attend the SLSCB meetings.</p>
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.

OTHER

Ref No. 12	Any Other Business
<i>Discussion</i>	Nothing to report.
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.