

## CYP Select Committee - Summary of Evidence – Scrutiny Review of Stockton Local Safeguarding Children Board

Theme	Evidence
<b>Scope and KLOE</b>	<p><b>Scope of Review</b></p> <p>Stockton-on-Tees Local Safeguarding Children Board (SLSCB) is the key statutory body responsible for overseeing and monitoring the effectiveness of multi-agency arrangements for safeguarding children in the borough.</p> <p>It is important that Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council, as the lead agency, takes steps to evaluate the effectiveness of SLSCB against the Ofsted inspection criteria.</p> <p>A rigorous and independent review by CYP Select Committee would enable us to assess the progress made by SLSCB to date and determine whether any additional actions are necessary in order to meet these criteria.</p> <p>SLSCB has not been subject to a specific Ofsted inspection to date, but the Council’s self-assessment would indicate that whilst there are a number of strengths, there are still some areas we need to further improve.</p> <p>Key Lines of Enquiry were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the outgoing Chair’s view about the effectiveness of the Board?</li> <li>• What do Peer Reviews tell us about the effectiveness of the Board?</li> <li>• How is the LSCB held to account?</li> <li>• How effective has the LSCB been in monitoring and challenging the effectiveness of local safeguarding arrangements? What evidence is there that this challenge has led to changes in these arrangements and local working practices and relationships?</li> <li>• How effective is the LSCB Local Learning and Improvement Framework in sharing lessons from experience and driving service quality and development?</li> <li>• How does the LSCB systematically ensure that the voice and feedback of children is embedded in local safeguarding arrangements at the individual and strategic levels? Does the approach enable children from diverse backgrounds and with different needs to share their voice?</li> <li>• What information does the Board received in order to meet its statutory duties?</li> <li>• How is disagreement/ professional challenge resolved?</li> <li>• How do we ensure that all partners procedures are in place?</li> <li>• Are Governance structures fit for purpose?</li> <li>• How does the Board deal with serious case reviews?</li> <li>• How does the Board oversee early help services?</li> <li>• What difference has the Board made?</li> <li>• Why have we got four LSCBs across Tees?</li> <li>• How is the Board financed?</li> <li>• What interface does the Board have with other Boards?</li> <li>• What do Ofsted judgements tell us about best practice?</li> <li>• What does success look like?</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
<b>Statutory Framework</b>	<p>The LSCB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that agencies work together effectively to protect children at risk of significant harm.</li> <li>• Produces policies and procedures</li> <li>• Communicates and raises awareness of safeguarding</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluating – holding agencies to account</li> <li>• Training</li> <li>• Functions relating to child deaths and serious case reviews</li> </ul> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><b>Section 13 of the Children Act 2004</b> requires each local authority to establish a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) for their area and specifies the organisations and individuals (other than the local authority) that should be represented on LSCBs.</p> </div> <p><b>Statutory objectives and functions of LSCBs</b></p> <p>1. An LSCB must be established for every local authority area. The LSCB has a range of roles and statutory functions including developing local safeguarding policy and procedures and scrutinising local arrangements. The statutory objectives and functions of the LSCB are described in the two boxes below.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><b>Statutory objectives and functions of LSCBs</b></p> <p><b>Section 14 of the Children Act 2004</b> sets out the objectives of LSCBs, which are:</p> <p>(a) to coordinate what is done by each person or body represented on the Board for the purposes of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the area; and</p> <p>(b) to ensure the effectiveness of what is done by each such person or body for those purposes.</p> </div>

Theme	Evidence
	<p><b>Regulation 5 of the Local Safeguarding Children Boards Regulations 2006</b> sets out that the functions of the LSCB, in relation to the above objectives under section 14 of the Children Act 2004, are as follows:</p> <p>1(a) developing policies and procedures for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the area of the authority, including policies and procedures in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the action to be taken where there are concerns about a child's safety or welfare, including thresholds for intervention;</li> <li>(ii) training of persons who work with children or in services affecting the safety and welfare of children;</li> <li>(iii) recruitment and supervision of persons who work with children;</li> <li>(iv) investigation of allegations concerning persons who work with children;</li> <li>(v) safety and welfare of children who are privately fostered;</li> <li>(vi) cooperation with neighbouring children's services authorities and their Board partners;</li> </ul> <p>(b) communicating to persons and bodies in the area of the authority the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children, raising their awareness of how this can best be done and encouraging them to do so;</p> <p>(c) monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of what is done by the authority and their Board partners individually and collectively to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and advising them on ways to improve;</p> <p>(d) participating in the planning of services for children in the area of the authority; and</p> <p>(e) undertaking reviews of serious cases and advising the authority and their Board partners on lessons to be learned.</p> <p>Regulation 5(2) which relates to the LSCB Serious Case Reviews function and regulation 6 which relates to the LSCB Child Death functions are covered in chapter 4 of this guidance.</p> <p>Regulation 5(3) provides that an LSCB may also engage in any other activity that facilitates, or is conducive to, the achievement of its objectives.</p> <p>In order to fulfil its statutory functions under regulation an LSCB should use data and, as a minimum, should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the effectiveness of the help being provided to children and families, including early help;</li> <li>• Assess whether LSCB partners are fulfilling their statutory obligations set out in chapter 2 of this guidance</li> <li>• Quality assure practice, including through joint audits of case files involving practitioners and identifying lessons to be learned</li> <li>• Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of training, including multi-agency training, to safeguard and promote the welfare of children</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
	<p>LSCBs do not commission or deliver direct frontline services though they may provide training. While LSCBs do not have the power to direct other organisations they do have a role in making clear where improvements are needed. Each Board partner retains their own existing line of accountability for safeguarding.</p>

**Stockton Board**

SLSCB Core Budget

<b>INCOME</b>	2015 / 2016	
CAFCASS		550
Catalyst		1,500
Local Authority		61,257
National Probation Service		744
Police		16,683
SBC Schools		25,000
Stockton & Hartlepool CCG		53,055
	Sub Total	<b>158,789</b>
Brought Forward from 2014 / 2015		39,712
	<b>Total Receipts</b>	<b>198,501</b>

- Small coordination role, hosted by the Council
- Partners contribute funding
- Monthly meetings of the Board
- Regular meetings with Chief Executive of SBC, DCS and other Senior Officers
- Lead Member of Children's Services is participating observer at Board meetings.
- Annual report circulated as per Statutory Requirements and is available on SLSCB website: <http://www.stockton.gov.uk/slscb>
- Sample actions and priorities:
  - Voice of the child / consultation with child
  - Professional challenge
  - Managing parents / carers challenging behaviours / culture of optimism
  - Did Not Attend / Missed appointments
  - Neglect: awareness, identification & response
  - Conference decision making, quality of plans and involvement of all adults living in the household
  - Information Sharing

**Challenges and Issues:**

- Impact and outcomes
- Learning from Serious Case reviews: a national issue
- Leadership across agencies
- Multi agency working and added value or another layer?

Theme	Evidence															
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability of partners to service multiple LSCBs</li> <li>• Scale of operation</li> </ul>															
<b>Wood Review</b>	<p><b>Government Response to the Wood Review</b></p> <p>“The Wood Review argues that strong, effective multi-agency arrangements are ones that are responsive to local circumstances and fully engage the right people.</p> <p>The review found widespread agreement that the current system needs to change in favour of a new model that will ensure collective accountability across the system. This is the view that has emerged from extensive consultation with a wide range of individuals and organisations and with independent experts such as Lord Laming and Baroness Jay.</p> <p>We agree with that. Current arrangements are inflexible and too often ineffective. Meetings take place involving large numbers of people, but decision-making leading to effective action on the ground can be all too often lacking.</p> <p>We will introduce a stronger but more flexible statutory framework that will support local partners to work together more effectively to protect and safeguard children and young people, embedding improved multi-agency behaviours and practices. This framework will set out clear requirements for the key local partners, while allowing them freedom to determine how they organise themselves to meet those requirements and improve outcomes for children locally. “</p>															
<b>Ofsted Framework and Stockton Inspection Report</b>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>The Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) complies with its statutory responsibilities in accordance with the Children Act 2004<sup>36</sup> and the Local Safeguarding Children Board Regulations 2006.<sup>37</sup> The LSCB is able to provide evidence that it coordinates the work of statutory partners in helping, protecting and caring for children in its local area and there are mechanisms in place to monitor the effectiveness of those local arrangements. Multi-agency training in the protection and care of children is effective and evaluated regularly for impact on management and practice. The LSCB checks that policies and procedures in respect of thresholds for intervention are understood and operate effectively and identifies where there are areas for improvement. Challenge of practice between partners and casework auditing are rigorous and used to identify where improvements can be made in front-line performance and management oversight. Serious case reviews, management reviews and reviews of child deaths are used by the local authority and partners as opportunities for learning and feedback that drive improvement. The LSCB provides robust and rigorous evaluation and analysis of local performance that influence and inform the planning and delivery of high-quality services.</p> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> <p><b>LSCB effectiveness</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Judgement</th> <th>Count</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outstanding</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good</td> <td>22</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RI</td> <td>41</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inadequate</td> <td>15</td> <td>19%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> </div>	Judgement	Count	%	Outstanding	0	0%	Good	22	28%	RI	41	53%	Inadequate	15	19%
Judgement	Count	%														
Outstanding	0	0%														
Good	22	28%														
RI	41	53%														
Inadequate	15	19%														

Theme	Evidence
	<p>The recent Ofsted Inspection report judged the Stockton Local Safeguarding Report as requiring improvement. The Executive Summary states:</p> <p>“The board has very good understanding of its strengths and weaknesses. SLSCB meets its statutory functions. It benefits from appropriate multi-agency membership, very good attendance and strong commitment, including from three lay members who bring independent challenge to the board’s work. However, the board has lacked thoroughness in aspects of challenge and analyses of some key areas of its purpose. It does not yet have clear mechanisms for analysing, evaluation and collating how partner agencies are ensuring the effectiveness of their practice in respect of some key safeguarding practice. Performance information has been too focused on data and not on the underlying explanations of why performance is good or poor</p> <p>Insufficient action has been taken to ensure that thresholds are understood across partner agencies. Furthermore, the 2016-17 joint Stockton-on-Tees and Hartlepool training programme has been introduced without a full needs analysis, despite under-participation on some courses in 2015-16.</p> <p>Although the board has commissioned work on the influence and “voice of the child” it has yet to ensure that this is embedded in the work of the board and across all partner agencies.</p> <p>A key strength of the SLSCB is the work of the sub groups, especially those working across other Teesside local safeguarding children boards, including the vulnerable, exploited, missing and trafficked group (VEMT), which adds strength and challenge to safeguard children, the shared procedures sub group and the child death overview panel (CDOP).</p> <p>The board has been instrumental in shaping services for children and young people in Stockton-on-Tees, including those for domestic abuse and promoting the safety of children in public settings, and has been influential in the introduction of the multi-agency children’s hub.</p> <p>The annual report 2014-15 lacks rigour. While it includes a great deal of information, it is too lengthy, and does not include sufficient assessment and analysis of performance and effectiveness.”</p> <p>The recommendations contained in the report are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ensure that quality assurance and performance management processes provide clear analyses, so that the SLSCB has a clear understanding of the effectiveness of partner agencies.</li> <li>2) Ensure that the joint Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees threshold document is effectively used and understood by partner agencies.</li> <li>3) Ensure that the views of children and young people help to influence the work of the board and the safeguarding practice of all partner agencies.</li> <li>4) Undertake an analysis and evaluation of need to inform the Stockton-on-Tees and Hartlepool 2017-18 joint training programme.</li> <li>5) Ensure that the annual report for 2015-16 is succinct, and includes a clear analysis of performance and the effectiveness of partner agencies in undertaking their safeguarding functions.</li> </ol>

Theme	Evidence
<p><b>Evidence from Outgoing and Incoming Independent Chairs of the Board</b></p>	<p><b>Feedback from Colin Morris – Outgoing Chair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was strong multi agency working and commitment to the Board</li> <li>- Agencies now sent more senior representation and this had led to Board being more challenging and influential</li> <li>- Attendance by Board Members was excellent</li> <li>- There had been concerns in the past about the commitment of some agencies, particularly where there was representation on more than one Board, however, steps had been taken to rationalise structures and working arrangements</li> <li>- The Local Authority remained the driving force behind the Board and efforts needed to maintained to secure the same level of interest and commitment from all of the other agencies represented</li> <li>- The Board benefited from strong and consistent lay membership</li> <li>- One challenge was follow through and delivery of agreed actions. Colin had for example written to agencies in relation to CAF, Early Help, Voice of the Child and Section 11 compliance</li> <li>- There has been significant improvement in the performance information presented to the Board</li> <li>- There was a need to maintain the momentum and commitment which had been achieved around the VEMT work</li> <li>- He commented that although a statutory board, the powers of the board were limited and this will be picked up in the National review.</li> <li>- Work on the Neglect Strategy and Voice of the Child needed to gather pace</li> <li>- All agencies needed to recognise the need for greater focus on early help</li> <li>- Overall, he felt that the Board was more effective than many others and commended Neil Schneider the Lead Agency Chief Executive and the Cabinet Member for their support and commitment and the service for their support and honesty</li> <li>- He was conducting a 360 degree feedback in respect of individuals/ agencies represented on the LSCB and this was to be presented to the Chief Executive.</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
	<p><b>Feedback from Dave Pickard – New Chair</b></p> <p>Feedback from 1:1 discussions with Board Members:</p> <p>Board members liked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good information</li> <li>• Interesting/stimulating</li> <li>• Broadens perspectives</li> <li>• Sincerity</li> <li>• Genuine desire to do better</li> <li>• Learning into practice</li> </ul> <p>Board members didn't like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To many papers and lengthy meetings</li> <li>• Imposing and LA dominated</li> <li>• Where are we going? Not a clear thread</li> <li>• Defensiveness</li> <li>• Focus on process not outcomes. What are we achieving for young people?</li> <li>• Want to be part of it but feel on the edge. Do I have an equal voice?</li> </ul> <p>Board members wanted to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More group work and a thematic approach</li> <li>• Evidence of outcomes and impact</li> <li>• Best practice</li> <li>• Mentoring</li> <li>• Discussion on implications of a report rather than verbal reproduction of the report</li> <li>• The Board being a team with a common aim</li> <li>• I would like to see from the chair:</li> <li>• Encouraging mutual responsibility from all</li> <li>• Help people understand each other's views/organisations</li> <li>• Focussed agendas/discussions</li> <li>• Ensuring an equal voice/contribution/valuing</li> <li>• Authority/challenge/accountability/leadership</li> </ul> <p>Positives from Ofsted Inspection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good understanding of strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Good membership, attendance and commitment</li> <li>• Work of sub-groups</li> </ul>



Theme	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instrumental in shaping services</li> <li>• Good governance across partnerships</li> <li>• Safer Place for Children in public settings</li> </ul> <p>He believed that everyone sat around the table was passionate about making a difference and did so within their own sphere of influence.</p> <p>He felt it was importance to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board members together were greater than the individual parts</li> <li>• the Board were clear what they are doing and why</li> <li>• the Board were clear about what they were achieving</li> <li>• Board priorities were driving the business</li> <li>• all members of the Board fully understood its role and remit.</li> <li>• Board priorities and ways of working placed children at the centre</li> <li>• The Board is integrated with other partnerships and structures</li> <li>• the Board has a clear role with regard to preventative activity</li> </ul> <p>That the Board should operate with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge with respect</li> <li>• Engagement</li> <li>• Trust</li> </ul> <p>And that the Board should focus on back to basics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring Co-ordination</li> <li>• Effective Challenge</li> <li>• Enabling change</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence from Board Members</b>	<p><b>Neil Schneider – Chief Executive – Stockton Borough Council</b></p> <p>The CEO believed that it was important for him to be involved in the work of the SLSCB and whilst it was not possible to attend every meeting, he attended on a regular basis in addition to attending regular meetings with the Independent Chair of the SLSCB and Director of Children's Services.</p> <p>He was responsible for overseeing the appointment of the Independent Chair and discussed the operation of the Board as part of appraisal of the Chair. One outcome of these was that work would take place on succession planning.</p> <p>The Chief Executive emphasised the importance of commitment from all Board members and that he had challenged individual board members on commitment in the past. He felt that it was important that other agencies took the lead as well as the Local</p>

Theme	Evidence
	<p>Authority and there had been more recent evidence of this from Board Members. He felt that there was now good attendance and contribution from key partners. He also highlighted that the independent chair carried out appraisals of other Board members and their input into the work of the SLSCB.</p> <p>He believed that the Board was well resourced and he was aware of positive feedback from Board Members serving on more than one Board. He was assured by the clear focus and visible commitment of the Board.</p> <p>Members asked the CEO to provide examples of innovative/good practice of the Board. The Chief Executive highlighted the more focused performance management framework, the voice of the child and also focusing on outcomes.</p> <p><b>Cllr Ann McCoy – Cabinet Member for Children and Young People – Stockton Borough Council</b></p> <p>The Cabinet Member felt that the Chair and members of the Board provided effective challenge in their roles as board members and that there had been significant improvements in the operation of the board over the last two years. She highlighted Section 11 work, the Neglect Strategy and the Voice of the Child as examples of valuable work. She felt that attendance at SLSCB meetings were a vital part of her role as lead Cabinet Member.</p> <p><b>Julie Allen - Probation</b></p> <p>Julie had been a member of the SLSCB since June 2014 and commented that it took time to fully understand the wide range of work carried out by the board. With regard to effectiveness, the Committee heard that regular reviews on performance took place and detailed performance reports were discussed at board meetings and challenged.</p> <p>Julie believed that scrutiny led to effectiveness. It was noted that SLSCB agendas were robust/full agendas and consistently well structured. The Committee heard that there were strict expectations that all board members had read and understood the papers prior to each meeting. Notwithstanding this, Julie commented that she would prefer to see more regular, shorter meetings.</p> <p>Clear priorities had been set in the Business Plan. Key agenda items included early help and voice of the child. She felt that work carried out on smaller specific issues was useful as were the regular bulletins and the work of the Tees Wide Procedures Group. She also highlighted the Section 11 Audit as being a particularly valuable.</p> <p>With regard to attendance she felt that the board was well attended by agencies. It was noted that any agencies with poor attendance would be contacted by the Chair.</p> <p>In relation to added value and outcomes of the Board, Julie felt that this was achieved through the breadth of work and the wide range of agencies represented; members of the board were able to take back what was learned into their own organizations. She felt that the work of the sub groups were particularly useful as well as work that had been carried out on the Joint Neglect Strategy and the development of a new performance framework.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the high level of joint working across the Tees, Members asked why there were currently four LSCBS</p>

Theme	Evidence
	<p>as opposed to one large board for all four areas. Julie commented that as an external member, providing four responses to four boards was not a good use of her time but she acknowledged that if there was one board, there would need to be a new structure to ensure local focus was maintained. She commented that she would, however, welcome greater consistency across the four LSCBs.</p> <p><b>Lyndsey Robertson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deputy Director of Nursing, Patient Safety and Quality at North Tees and Hartlepool Foundation Trust</li> <li>- Board Member of the SLSCB</li> <li>- Chair of the Joint Training Group between Hartlepool and Stockton</li> </ul> <p><b>Jean Golightly</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Director of Nursing and Quality for Hartlepool and Stockton Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)</li> <li>- Executive Lead for Safeguarding across Children and Adults</li> <li>- Member of SLSCB</li> <li>- Member of Hartlepool LSCB</li> <li>- Member of Middlesbrough LSCB</li> <li>- Member of Redcar &amp; Cleveland LSCB</li> <li>- Chair of Performance Management Framework for the four Tees LSCBs</li> </ul> <p><b>Alastair Simpson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Head of Vulnerability for Cleveland Police</li> <li>- Member of SLSCB</li> <li>- Member of Hartlepool LSCB</li> <li>- Member of Middlesbrough LSCB</li> <li>- Member of Redcar &amp; Cleveland LSCB</li> <li>- Member of the Tees Safeguarding Adults Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>How effective are we? Are we doing what we should be?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board was now developing a greater understanding of the context of the data provided including a greater understanding around the support and services involved in early help and assessment</li> <li>• A task and finish group had met to review training needs analysis which was an issue raised by Ofsted</li> <li>• The Boards benchmarked regionally and nationally in order to ensure that it performed effectively</li> <li>• The Board was increasingly more effective in the way it managed relationships in and outside of Board meetings</li> <li>• There was a strong emphasis on continuous performance and quality improvement</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board had completed audit work which focused on the 'Working Together' safeguarding guidance and all Board members were asked to peer review each other's assessment</li> <li>• The Board identified important themes such as ensuring that practitioners heard the voice of the child and did not become distracted by the voice of the adult</li> <li>• Another area which the board focussed on was professional challenge which included ensuring that staff and practitioners had the confidence and sense of responsibility to speak up when they did not agree with a decision or had concerns and this continued to be an area for development</li> <li>• Members were informed that disguised compliance was often discussed among the Board so as to ensure that all practitioners were actually participating to the level that was perceived</li> <li>• It was noted that it was each professional's responsibility to ensure that issues and actions were put in place in their own organisations</li> <li>• In relation to the voice of the child, reports were received on the survey results from LAC and children on child protection plans. In future, reports submitted to the board were required to have a voice of the child section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Do we work efficiently?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that often, the same conversations were repeated across boards and groups, for example, The Health and Wellbeing Board, the SLSCB and Community Safety Partnership. There were also some members of the board who were members of all four tees LSCBs and therefore it was important to ensure that time was spent efficiently keeping repetition of information to a minimum. The Tees Procedures Group, North Tees Training Group, Tees Wide VEMT structure was effective in allowing appropriate work to be carried out across Tees and securing more consistent approached</li> <li>• Reports to Board meetings were often lengthy and there was often a need for further discussions to ensure the most positive outcomes</li> <li>• The performance management framework allowed the board to compare performance across Tees</li> <li>• attendance was monitored and reported back to agencies on a six monthly basis</li> </ul> <p><b>What is the added value and what are the outcomes?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of outcomes were arising from the strategic VEMT were identified including the Chelsea's choice presentations, a survey of year 8 and year 10 children, training of 423 professionals across tees in awareness around human trafficking</li> <li>• The SLSCB fostered joint working and impetus for change</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
	<p><b>Survey of all Board Members</b></p> <p>12 Board members responded to an online survey – see full report attached</p> <p>Overall feedback was positive the almost all respondents of the view that the SLSCB holds members to account, that local safeguarding arrangements are effective and that lessons are learned to improve. One respondent did not feel that agencies and organisations were working together effectively and there was less clarity about the LSCB Strategy being clear and communicated, listening to the voice of the child, added value and specific outcomes and impacts.</p> <p>The comments reveal that Board members feel that there are good relationships, most agencies are held to account and the Board is well organised and supported.</p> <p>Improvements identified included the LA taking less of a lead, better involvement of all members, improved quality assurance, lessons learned, reducing lengthy reporting, disseminating clearer information to front line practitioners and listening better to the voice of the child.</p> <p>Barriers to improvement included time and resource, lack of consistency, lack of focus on key priorities, lack of understanding about the remit of the LSCB in all agencies and lack of involvement of front line staff.</p>
<p><b>Feedback from Schools on Safeguarding Forum</b></p>	<p><b>How effective do you think the Stockton Local Safeguarding Children Board is in working with schools? On a scale of 1 - 5</b></p> <p><i>Least effective</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No responses</li> <li>2. No responses</li> <li>3. 4 responses</li> <li>4. 11 responses</li> <li>5. 5 responses</li> </ol> <p><i>Most effective</i></p> <p><b>What do we do well?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing of information and highlighting national safeguarding requirements</li> <li>• Plenty of training opportunities</li> <li>• Regular Updates</li> <li>• Information sharing</li> <li>• Organise information sharing</li> <li>• Review cases</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide challenge</li> <li>• Emails circulated via Education Improvement Service</li> <li>• Information raised by Kerry Coe</li> <li>• The Forum is helpful</li> <li>• Care workers/ Social workers are generally excellent</li> <li>• Condensed, concise information</li> <li>• Highlighting online support and information</li> <li>• Training</li> <li>• Regular Updates</li> <li>• Safeguarding Briefings</li> <li>• Fast response from DO</li> <li>• Efficient and well run ICPC and RCPC</li> <li>• Clear information on website for training</li> <li>• Up to date briefings</li> <li>• Be available at the end of a phone for adviser to receive/ advise on referrals</li> <li>• Provide support/procedures etc. via website</li> <li>• Great training provided</li> <li>• Email updates, information sharing</li> <li>• Everything when we get the information</li> <li>• Jane Groom's role is a huge support for us/ improvement</li> </ul> <p><b>How can we improve?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have to read a lot of information electronically which changes on a regular basis – is there too much reliance on electronic? More face to face at Safeguarding Forum?</li> <li>• Regular feedback at Safeguarding Forum</li> <li>• Communication – always difficult to find status of any cases, as well as getting final paperwork through</li> <li>• The VEMT process is unclear</li> <li>• Feedback about referrals and who they have been allocated to</li> <li>• Contact details to schools</li> <li>• Make accessing E learning a faster and more efficient process</li> <li>• Face to face communication feedback</li> <li>• Communicating (email) with individual schools</li> <li>• The Safer Referral Form could be adapted for schools – currently lengthy when needing referrals to be much more timely</li> </ul> <p><b>Any other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What actually happens at the Board? Who is a regular attender? What is achieved? How does this relate to national expectations of the SLSCB – I'm not sure I know this</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When VEMT referral is put on, often do not hear back if the child is on VEMT and what this means for the child and the family</li> <li>• Also not sure how up to date the VEMT list is</li> <li>• It is really hard to keep up with the changes, to know where referrals have been sent to – spend too much time chasing these up</li> </ul> <p><b>Do you have any further suggestions about how partnership working around safeguarding could support schools?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuation of Forum for designated leads to meet so an overview of how Early Help/CIN/CP is being managed in school effectively, any good practice can be shared, any areas for development can be highlighted</li> <li>• Testaments from CYP on what worked well for them and what could be done differently under subject matters i.e. bullying CSE, LA</li> <li>• More written support/ advice to give to parents</li> <li>• Regular visits from SLSCB</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evidence from Durham</b></p>	<p><b>Teleconference with Margaret Whellans, Assistant Director (Durham) 26 September 2016</b></p> <p>Councillor Carol Clark and Tracey Stott, Martin Gray, Martin Gray, Judy Trainer</p> <p><b><i>Q Durham’s Local Safeguarding Children’s Board receive a judgement of “good” from Ofsted. Why did they think they achieved this?</i></b></p> <p>A Margaret felt that there were three key things that the Board had done:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Durham LSCB had been the subject of a Peer Review which had concluded that the Board was under-performing and had identified areas for improvement. Based on the Peer Review findings, the Board had reviewed their arrangements. All Board members could map this developmental journey and were able to comment to Ofsted on the improvements that were being implemented.</li> <li>2) There was a strong performance and reporting culture resulting in a lot of detailed information and a strong evidence base. Performance of all partners was tracked and there was a lot of partnership reporting. There were strong Section 11 audit arrangements underpinning the work of the Board and strong accountability of senior leadership across all partners.</li> <li>3) In respect of staffing, the Board were well resourced from a business unit who chased progress and performance management information.</li> </ol> <p><b><i>Q How do you encourage agencies to engage and work together?</i></b></p> <p>A All Board members are at least at second tier level and are good attenders. Partners take on the lead for difference aspects of work and there is a high standard of reporting and consequently decision making.</p>

Theme	Evidence
	<p><b>Visit to Durham LSCB – 22 September 2016</b></p> <p>Councillors Carol Clark and Tracey Stott, Judy Trainer</p> <p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was an expectation that all attendees had read the papers</li> <li>• The majority of Board members contributed to the meetings</li> <li>• The Action Log helped to hold partners to account</li> <li>• A reasonable level of challenge was observed</li> <li>• Good chairing</li> <li>• The Board was debating similar issues to Stockton about structure/ duplication and what should be carried out locally/ sub regionally</li> <li>• Non Council Board members chaired the sub groups and reported back to the main Board. This increased ownership and multi-agency engagement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Observations at SLSCB meetings</b></p>	<p><b>Visit to Stockton LSCB – 13 October 2016</b></p> <p>Councillors Carol Clark and Tracey Stott, Judy Trainer</p> <p>Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again there was an expectation that papers had been read</li> <li>• Each report author/presenter was asked to do no more than a five minute introduction</li> <li>• Use of Action Log and standing item on organisation/ partnership safeguarding issues was effective in engaging with all partners and allowed the opportunity to reflect on any current issues/ concerns</li> <li>• There was good contribution from all Board members attending and a high level of challenge</li> <li>• Following the recent development day, the meeting was experimenting with a cabaret style layout and group discussion of reports on the agenda which worked well in stimulating discussion. The format would be kept under review</li> <li>• At the end of the meeting, all Board members were asked to identify what the added value has been in attending the meeting. The following were volunteered by Board members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of further work in relation out-of-borough placement panels</li> <li>• Information regarding Private Fostering to be taken back to Probation Service to ensure involvement is reported back into the Board</li> <li>• Scrutiny/ challenge around Children Missing Education</li> <li>• Questions around the quality of home education/educators/ reviewing home education outcomes</li> <li>• Missing-from-home issues significant - will be taking back specific challenges relating to Stockton</li> <li>• Profile-raising of Operation Shield intelligence forms</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Theme	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streamlining out-of-borough placement panels</li> <li>• Reassurance around the forthcoming SEND inspection</li> <li>• Running/missing from home/care - clarification of VEMT processes and scrutiny</li> </ul>
<b>Key Findings and possible Areas for Recommendations</b>	<p><b>Structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sub groups working across Tees were highlighted in the Ofsted report and by Board Members during the review as a key strength</li> <li>• Duplication was an issue identified by Board Members with the same conversations taking place at each of the Tees Boards and at other meetings such as Health and Wellbeing Boards etc.</li> <li>• There is a strong case for streamlining what is undertaken across Tees, by individual Boards and by sub groups to make better use of Board Member and agency time and resource</li> <li>• Stockton Initiate discussion with other Tees Boards about the balance of work undertaken across Tees and locally and the interface between boards</li> <li>• In response to the Wood Review the Government have indicated that they will introduce a stronger but more flexible statutory framework. This will give Boards the freedom to review structures and membership according to local circumstances</li> </ul> <p><b>Role and Remit of Board Members</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to clarify the role and remit of the Board (as being predominantly one of assurance and oversight, not usually, doing) amongst some agencies and a need to considering how the Board communicates their work and extends their sphere of influence outside of Board meetings</li> <li>• Board members feel that agencies are held to account but that there is still a need to develop the necessary skills and confidence to challenge. Thoroughness in aspects of challenge was highlighted by Ofsted</li> </ul> <p><b>Style and Ethos</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strong commitment from Board members was clearly demonstrated during the review and attendance was monitored and was excellent across all agencies</li> <li>• Board members commented on strong relationships but also on the need for agencies other than the Council to take a stronger lead</li> </ul>

Theme	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board Members commented on the heavy workload and lengthy reports and the need to prioritise more on key issues</li> <li>• Following the Ofsted inspection and the recent development day a number of improvements to Board meetings have been introduced to make them more productive and stimulate discussion</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcomes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a wealth of performance information and data submitted to the Board but Ofsted commented that there is a lack of underlying explanations of why performance is good or poor and actions underway to address issues</li> <li>• There is a need to consider how the Board consistently applies learning from the information they have and ensure that Board Members and Sub Groups have the skills to carry out this analytical role</li> </ul> <p><b>Ofsted</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board need to assure itself that it has responded to the Ofsted recommendations</li> </ul> <p><b>EMERGING AREAS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stockton to participate and initiate discussion where necessary with other Tees Boards about the response to the Wood review and the opportunities to collaborate further and ensure a streamlined and efficient approach with partners</li> <li>- Continue to develop a self-assessment and review format of Board and sub group meetings to focus discussion on key issues and strengthen the co-ordination, challenge and change functions including the potential role of an Executive</li> <li>- Identify ways to encourage all partner agencies to play a more active role in discussions, including varying the format of meetings</li> <li>- Provide training for SLSCB members to ensure that they have the skills to fulfil their roles, especially around assurance roles</li> <li>- The Board to assure itself that it has responded to the Ofsted recommendations</li> </ul>