

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) 	✓
Deborah Wray (DWr)	Lay Member		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Bowesfield Primary School 	Apols
Martin Gray (MG)	Director of Children's Services	Local Authority (SBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MALAP (Multi-Agency Looked After Partnership) Tees Valley Education, Employment and Skills Board Transforming Tees Executive Group Health and Wellbeing Board YOT Management Board 	Apols
Rhona Bollands (RB)	Assistant Director - Safeguarding and Looked After Children / Chair SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group			Apols
Sarah Bowman-Abouna (SB)	Assistant Director - Public Health			Apols
Diane McConnell (DM)	Assistant Director - Schools and SEN		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convener of the Safeguarding Forum for Education Settings Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group 	✓
Jane Edmends (JE)	Housing Services Manager		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing, Neighbourhood and Affordable Warmth Partnership (Thematic Group) Stockton VEMT Sub-Group Stockton LIPSG Stockton MALAP (Multi-Agency Looked After Partnership) 	Apols
Cllr Ann McCoy (AM)	Lead Cabinet Member - Children and Young People (Participating Observer)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Tees, Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust (TEVV) 	✓
Neil Schneider (NS)	Chief Executive (Participating Observer)			Apols
Margaret Harvey (MH)	Service Manager	CAFCASS		✗
Anne-Marie Salwey (AMS)	Detective Superintendent / Chair SLSCB LIPSG	Cleveland Police		✓
David Woodward (DWo)	Independent Schools - Deputy Headmaster, Yarm School	Education Establishments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Schools Inspectorate (ISI) Compliance and EQ Inspector. HMC North East Pastoral Group. 	✓
Gill Booth (GB)	Secondary Schools - Executive Headteacher, Ian Ramsey Academy (and Venerable Bede)			Apols

SLSCB Members	Title	Representing	Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group, etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair)	✓ ✗ Apols
Kerry Coe (KC)	Primary Schools - Head Teacher, St John the Baptist CE VC Primary School		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Needs Panel Primary Heads Group ARP Cluster Joint Commissioning group (SEN and Health) School to School Support Group (Campus Stockton) Mentor for new HT 	Apols
Joanna Bailey (JB)	Post-16 Education - Principal, Prior Pursglove and Stockton Sixth Form College		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vice-Chair of NET Stockton Secondary Hub Governor at The Grangefield Academy Campus Stockton Teaching Alliance 14-19 Partnership, Secondary Heads Group SCITT Board Member Governor at Errington Primary, Marske SFC rep for Sutton Trust (social mobility) 	✓
Jean Golightly (JG)	Director of Nursing & Quality	Hartlepool & Stockton-on-Tees Clinical Commissioning Group (HAST CCG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Tees CCG (Director of Nursing & Quality) Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board Member of NHSE Quality Surveillance Group meeting Chair of Tees LSCBs Performance Management Framework 	✗
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) 	✓
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 Safeguarding Adults Board North Yorkshire Adult Safeguarding Board North Yorkshire Children's Safeguarding Board (Member of other Safeguarding Boards but send deputies on regular basis) 	✓
Julie Allan (JA)	Head of Area Cleveland Cluster, North East Division	Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service	<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

SLSCB Members	Title	Representing	Other Interests: Stockton-on-Tees or Tees Valley Partnerships, Boards, Group, etc. (Ch. denotes Chair, VCh Vice-Chair)	✓ ✗ Apols
John Graham (JGr)	Director of Operations -	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 	✗
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:		
Tanya Braun (TB)	SBC: Consultant in Public Health	Sub for S.Bowman-Abouna
Sharon Barnett (SB)	Probation: Stockton Team Manager (NPS)	Sub for Julie Allan
Jane Humphreys (JH)	SBC: Transformation Team	For item 4
Cath Galloway (CG)	Cleveland Police: VEMT	For item 5
Melanie Douglas (MD)	SBC: Service Manager, Fieldwork and Assessment	For item 5
Tanya Evans (TE)	SBC: Youth Support Team Manager	For item 5

Minute-Taker:	Nigel Hart – SLSCB Business Support
----------------------	-------------------------------------

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

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

ENSURING CO-ORDINATION

Governance

Ref No. 1	Attendance, Apologies & Quoracy
<i>Discussion</i>	TB was in attendance as the substitute for SBA . SB was in attendance as the substitute for JA .
<i>Agreement/Outcome</i>	Noted.

Ref No. 2	Executive Minutes for Information – 20.04.17
<i>Discussion</i>	Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 20 th April 2017 were noted for information although they had not as yet been ratified by the Executive. DP summarised the key messages arising from this first meeting of the Executive were first and foremost not to disempower the Board but to allow it to concentrate on thematic areas; and secondly, to facilitate and review the work of the Sub Groups.
<i>Agreement/Outcome</i>	Noted.

Ref No. 3	Board Minutes for Accuracy – 16.03.17
<i>Discussion</i>	Minutes of the Board meeting held on 16 th March 2017 were agreed as a true record.
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	The minutes of the Board meeting held on 16 th March 2017 be recorded as ratified.

Ref No. 4	Action Log
<i>Discussion</i>	The circulated SLSCB Meetings Action Log 2016/17 was provided for information. PB advised that as a result of recent feedback received and other matters scheduled for consideration at the Board today, there were no areas of concern.
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Action Log update noted.

Effective Challenge

Ref No. 5	Childrens Hub Update & Thresholds
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>JH provided an overview of the first six months' operation of the Children's Hub which became operational from 1st June 2016.</p> <p>During this time, the Ofsted inspection had noted that it had already led to 'earlier and more effective identification of risk, improved information sharing and joint decision making' and the key highlights from its first performance report were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage of enquiries passed to the Assessment Team that were closed as No Further Action prior to assessment has reduced from baseline of 10.2% to 4.77%. • The percentage of Social Care Assessments resulting in No Further Action has reduced from a baseline of 21.83% in 2015/16 to 8.77% up to Q2. • Percentage of dashboard cases resulting in No Further Action is 27.82%. • Percentage of cases leading to Pathway to Early Help 13.77% – this has reduced from 2015/16 figure, and needs to be considered alongside number of cases referred direct to Early Help. • Percentage of cases resulting in Pathway to Single Agency is 4.45%. • Percentage of Re-referrals within 12 months of the previous referral is 19.8%. • Percentage of all Referrals, including Early Help with an outcome/decision within one working day is 72%. A piece of work is to be undertaken to ensure all Social Care cases are responded to in one day. • Police Chub attendance at Strategy discussions/meetings is 96%. • Health Chub attendance at Strategy discussions/meetings is 88%. <p>A number of Qualitative Audits had also been undertaken which included a 20% dip sample of cases to ensure that the referrals and actions had been completed. A review was also undertaken of those referrals that had resulted in No Further Action (NFA) with a</p>

Ref No. 5	Childrens Hub Update & Thresholds			
	<p>number found where NFA was the incorrect outcome and suggestions that in some cases contact had not been made with the children. This highlighted a lack of understanding regarding referral thresholds with referrals from Early Help a particular concern. A further more detailed review of NFA's and outcomes would be included within the next performance report.</p> <p>North Yorkshire C.C. were currently carrying out an external review of our Hub arrangements to assist our own assessment and the results of this were expected next week.</p> <p>The number of contacts received had increased from 6,000 in 14/15 to 8,000 in 16/17 which had highlighted an obvious demand on available resources which would now be reviewed.</p> <p>DP advised that it was incumbent on all agencies to take appropriate action to demonstrate that they were increasing their knowledge and awareness all round of referral thresholds.</p> <p>LR noted that there were some different parameters/processes operated by Stockton and Hartlepool in the delivery of health, which would form part of planned future discussions around commissioning, as well as the necessary work to increase awareness of thresholds in A&E and other areas of Health.</p> <p>Work was also to be undertaken with schools via the Schools Forum to ensure that schools refer any concerns to the Hub promptly and that they refer any out of hours referrals to the EDT.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	The overview of the first six months' operation of the Children's Hub be noted.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
01/05/17/18	11.05.17	All agencies to take appropriate action to demonstrate that they were increasing their knowledge and awareness of referral thresholds and a report demonstrating the action taken be submitted to this Board.	PB to co-ordinate	31.08.17

Ref No. 6	VEMT Thematic Challenge			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>i) Missing Report (69/03/1617)</u></p> <p>JH summarised the findings of her commissioned work, in conjunction with Cleveland Police, examining all of the missing children episodes for July 2016 that were alleged to have been reported in relation to children who lived in Stockton Borough; or were placed there by another Local Authority as a Looked After Child. The review considered the policies and procedures in place at that time, in the knowledge that some of these had subsequently been updated in relation to children that go missing.</p> <p>130 episodes of missing were noted for the period looked at, concerning more than 50 children. These were divided into the following categories and the review looked at each individual episode and the circumstances reported:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Children/young people not known or closed to the local authority; or other LAC; ii) Children in Need or subject to Child Protection Plans; iii) Stockton Children Looked After. <p>The top level highlights of the review were noted as follows:-</p>			

Ref No. 6	VEMT Thematic Challenge
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a lot of the cases examined, it was questionable whether they should instead have been regarded as absent, rather than missing and 'at risk'; • Were the Police/Local Authority spending too much time on the 'wrong' children and young people; • The response by both the L.A. and Police in most cases was timely; • The majority of Police missing information tallied with the Local Authority information; • The majority of missing interviews were undertaken by the young person's social worker, although in a small number of LAC cases they were undertaken by a Barnardo's member of staff. The quality of the latter return interviews was not of a good standard; • The L.A. was actually seeing a lot more children/young people than were being recorded as these discussions were recorded on a different document. This was not recognised by the missing interview numbers; • There was no evidence to suggest that the children had been offered the opportunity to speak to NYAS or Childline if they did not wish to speak to their social worker; • There was a lack of clarity about whether to record that a missing interview had taken place. If a worker goes out to see a young person and has a brief discussion, often this was classed as no interview having taken place, when it was suggested that it instead should be recorded; • There was a lack of clarity within the Police as to which Local Authority to report LAC children missing – home L.A., host, or both? The procedure was that the Police should notify the L.A. where the child is 'living' and if that is a LAC child from another L.A., it is the responsibility of the host L.A. to notify the home L.A.. It was questioned whether this was happening; • It remained in question whether staff from within the L.A. and Police were clear about their procedures and which documents to use; • The North East/Tees agreement to share interviews of LAC children placed on other LA areas did not appear to be working. <p>CG advised that in the time since the review period, much had changed with regard to Cleveland Police approach to VEMT with many of the processes and forms changed subsequently and uniformity of their use constantly being looked at. Significantly a new VEMT team had been created from July 2016 under her direction as part of the Police's Protecting Vulnerable People unit that would provide 24/7 coverage with the remit of tackling child sexual exploitation, missing from home and human trafficking.</p> <p>The findings reported within the review of episodes in July 2016 would now be considered by a Task & Finish Group reality checking the sharing of information prior to a future report to the Tees Valley Strategic VEMT Group and then to the SLSCB.</p> <p>ii) <u>VEMT Assurance Presentation</u></p> <p>The Board considered the following information to inform their planned round table discussions seeking reassurance that appropriate systems and processes were in place in support of VEMT:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the children identified as VEMT within Stockton for the period 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017; • Summary of the children who had been recorded by the Police as missing or absent from home or care for the period 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017; • Findings from a further themed Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) case file audits conducted in February 2017 and compared to the results of three previous audits. <p>The data highlighted the high number of children/young people recorded as missing in</p>

Ref No. 6	VENT Thematic Challenge
	<p>Stockton and included a summary of the purpose and progress of the VEMT Practitioners (VPG). All agencies were represented on the VPG and their views taken on board. There was shared agreement by all that effective engagement with children/young people was key to effective support for those in VEMT and those recorded as missing.</p> <p>Group discussions then took place to establish members views on whether the current systems and procedures provided reassurance with the following feedback noted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was reassurance that appropriate systems were in place to allow the dissemination of information between all agencies; • The ability for social Workers to recognise push and pull factors at an early stage was a key learning area; • Education was essential to increasing awareness of VEMT and gathering more intelligence around both victims and perpetrators; • The Schools Forum was considered an appropriate place within which to enhance learning by exploring specific case studies; • The Prevention agenda was a key component of the Tees Strategic VEMT and it was vital that the language used for children, parents, carers etc was appropriate; • Discussions were currently on-going to improve the co-ordination of commissioning appropriate training; • There appeared a lack of flexibility in the protocols applied within care homes forcing episodes of missing to be reported if it triggered a particular a time period without consideration of circumstances; • Many of the cases recorded contained no real evidence of risk with a lot of officer time spent; • Early Help and identification is significant in supporting children/young people who may otherwise be subject to VEMT.
Agreement/ Outcome	<p>The Board accepts the complexity of the issues faced in response to VEMT and supports agencies in carrying out appropriate risk assessment including an approach to 'push back' and challenge children/young people, parents, carers and other agencies where deemed appropriate.</p>

Partnership Information

Ref No. 7	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
Discussion	<p><u>TEWV</u> EM advised that the Trust had received a 'Good overall' rating following an unannounced CQC inspection. No actions had been identified re safeguarding and the report was due to be published on the 12th May 2017.</p> <p><u>SBC</u> AM reported that the Domestic Abuse Strategy would be considered for endorsement by Cabinet on 18th May 2017.</p> <p><u>Voluntary Sector</u> SR referred to discussions that had taken place at the VCS Safeguarding Group around adult vulnerability. The training needs of both the VCS and public sector were discussed and it was noted that A Way Out were an excellent example of an organisation working well re their safeguarding arrangements.</p> <p>It was noted also that the VCS intended to work with Youth Direction as part of the prevention agenda with a presence across the Borough. A report would be submitted to this Board in due course.</p>

Ref No. 7	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues			
	<p><u>Education</u> JB referred to discussion at the last Executive meeting (Ref 5/20/04/17) regarding the vulnerability of a child that had been excluded from school on a Friday afternoon with no support in place at all over the weekend.</p> <p>In this particular case all agencies appeared to have acted correctly however, the offer of support from Early Help had been refused. The relationship between the school and their carer had broken down leaving the pupil traumatised which led to the exclusion. DP advised that failure to engage with Early Help was a common problem often leaving no satisfactory other course of action. The Board would be happy to consider this further as a concept, rather than examine individual cases. DMc advised that she would be happy to investigate individual cases of concern. An Exclusions conference was scheduled to be held this Summer which could potentially revise priorities and she would report the conclusions to the September meeting of this Board.</p> <p>DW referred to the positive engagement by teachers and pupils within the Future in Mind programme.</p> <p>DMc reported that Ofsted had published the findings of its safeguarding inspection at Northfield School examining the factors around 3 recent suicides at the school. The inspection fully endorsed the conduct of the school.</p> <p><u>Health</u> DC advised that the Wood Report on local safeguarding arrangements had been considered as part of a DfE session at the recent National Safeguarding Conference in Health, emphasising the duty placed by the reforms on local authorities, C.C.G's and the Chief Constable with effect from April 2019. PB agreed to circulate the safeguarding elements of the Children & Social Work Act. DP reiterated that this should not detract from the aims and priorities of this Board, responsibilities that would be in place for at least the next two years.</p> <p><u>Police</u> AMS advised that HMIC were currently conducting a C.P. Inspection that was scheduled to last a further two weeks. This entailed examination of case file audits, focus groups and interviews and she would report on the outcome to a future meeting of this Board.</p> <p>A further opportunity for Board members to visit Cleveland Police was available on the 17th May. LB confirmed that she had found her earlier visit to have been extremely beneficial in assisting her understanding of relevant policies, procedures and systems that were in place.</p> <p><u>NTHFT</u> LR reported that the Training Group had met on Monday and would be finalising its proposals, which was based around the delivery of 6 or 7 courses aligned with the Boards overall priorities, which would be discussed at its next meeting.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates noted.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
02/05/1718	11.05.17	Safeguarding in Education Reports to SLSCB in September to include Exclusions.	DMc	31/08/17
03/05/17/18	11.05.17	The safeguarding elements of the Children & Social Work Act be circulated to all partners for information	PB	21/05/17

Ref No. 8	Minutes / Updates / Outcomes from Meetings			
Discussion	Members noted the following updates:-			

Ref No. 8	Minutes / Updates / Outcomes from Meetings			
	<p>a) Children & Young People Partnership (CYPP) – under 18 conception rate data – deferred;</p> <p>b) Examination of the hospital data/self-harm - to be circulated to members;</p> <p>c) NTHFT Work Plan in relation to the CQC 'Not Seen Not Heard' report - to be circulated to members.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Updates noted.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
04/05/17/18	11.05.17	The updates presented at the meeting (Examination of the hospital data/self-harm & NTHFT Work Plan in relation to the CQC 'Not Seen Not Heard' report) to be circulated to members.	PB	21.05.17

Ref No. 9	Children & Vulnerable People in Custody Working Group – Action Plan			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>The Recommendations and Actions arising from the Children & Vulnerable People in Custody Working Group were circulated and noted by the Board.</p> <p>AMS advised that a meeting was due to be held today specifically to look at accessibility to EDT out of hours.</p> <p>A report outlining progress regards implementation of the Action Plan would be submitted to the Board in due course.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Children & Vulnerable People in Custody Working Group update noted.			

ENABLING CHANGE

Ref No. 10	Effectiveness of SLSCB			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>SR summarised the findings of the circulated report reviewing the working practices of the SLSCB. The review had been undertaken to seek assurance that the safeguarding of children was being delivered effectively across the Borough.</p> <p>The review included an examination of the current sub-groups of the Board, as well as the working groups established to address identified priority areas of work. It also challenged the working practice and effectiveness of the Board and looked at how it gained assurance from the sub groups and individual agencies that safeguarding practices were having the positive impact intended.</p> <p>The recommendations identified from the review would be referred to LIPSG for further consideration.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
05/05/17/18	11.05.17	The Effectiveness of SLSCB Review recommendations be circulated to LIPSG for consideration.	PB	21.05.17

Ref No. 11	Actions, Impact, Evidence & Difference			
<i>Discussion</i>	Board members were asked to identify the impact this meeting had made in terms of safeguarding children – the following views were expressed:			

Ref No. 11	Actions, Impact, Evidence & Difference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DP: <u>Risk Assessments</u> – lack of resources available and the challenging environment currently operating in, was acknowledged by the Board. It was imperative however that processes were completed and followed correctly at the outset.
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.