
























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 	
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 	
Ann Workman (AW)	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 	
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	

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
Gill Booth (GB)	Executive Headteacher Secondary Schools			
Kerry Coe (KC)	Head Teacher Primary Schools		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Needs Panel Primary Heads Group ARP Cluster 	Apols
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 	
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) 	

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

Guests:		
Paul Diggins (PD)	SBC - Information Manager, Business Support & Info	For item 5b

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
Discussion	<p>GB was welcomed to her first Board meeting since becoming a SLSCB member.</p> <p>BG arrived at the meeting at 9.20am, and JH at 9.45am, due to prior work commitments. JE left the meeting at 11.20am for similar reasons.</p> <p>DP thanked SR for providing mince pies/cupcakes from 'Little Sprouts' - SR gave a brief description of this health enterprise, which was delighted to support partner agencies.</p>

Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.
Ref No. 2	Board Minutes for Accuracy – 17.11.16
Discussion	Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 17 th November 2016 were agreed as a true record.
Agreement/ Outcome	The minutes of the Board meeting held on the 17 th November 2016 be recorded as ratified.

Ref No. 3	Action Log
Discussion	<p>The circulated <i>SLSCB Meetings Action Log 2016 / 2017 (To do)</i> was provided for information - PB advised that all actions remain on track, and any required updates will be chased-up in the New Year.</p> <p><u>a) Revised Constitution</u> PB referred to the circulated <i>SLSCB Constitution</i>, which had been revised following discussions and agreement at the last Board meeting in November 2016. Included was an amended vision statement that acknowledged Stockton-on-Tees children placed out-of-area:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>'The Board will do all it can to ensure that children and young people in Stockton-on-Tees and those we are responsible for elsewhere are kept safe from harm.'</i></p> <p>Board members endorsed the revised SLSCB Constitution.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Action Log update noted, and revised SLSCB Constitution endorsed by Board members.

Partnership Information

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
Discussion	<p><u>Probation (NPS)</u> JA reported that the E3 project (re-design of the NPS structure) was still progressing, and that further Probation Services Officers had been recruited. A decision was made to close the Hartlepool office, with staff being re-located to Stockton - this may impact on services in the Stockton area.</p> <p><u>HAST CCG</u> JG advised that recruitment opportunities are being pursued, particularly in relation to the Designated Doctor for Safeguarding and Looked After Children, with the Designated Medical Officer (DMO) role expected to be resolved in January 2017. It has been proposed to split the vacant Safeguarding Children Officer post, with two half-time equivalents across the two CCGs (HAST and South Tees). DP questioned if this arrangement would adequately fulfil the necessary requirements of the role - JG felt confident that these proposals would deliver.</p> <p>Other ongoing work includes a review of the Clinical Quality Team, a mapping exercise around the current Health offering for domestic abuse (each Local Authority are approaching this issue differently) which will be shared with partners, and a significant SCR/Safeguarding Adults Review/Domestic Homicide investigation which is having an impact on resources. In addition, Hartlepool have had their SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) inspection, and the ongoing post-inspection stage will be used to inform the anticipated Stockton SEND inspection.</p>

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
	<p><u>Local Authority</u> AM reminded Board members that this was the last SLSCB meeting for JH and SM, who will be succeeded by MG and Rhona Bollands (SBC Service Manager, Assessment and Fieldwork) respectively. From an Elected Member perspective, the contribution and commitment of JH and SM to safeguard children has been much appreciated, and both were commended for their significant efforts.</p> <p>MG drew attention to the DfEs safeguarding campaign that the Local Authority took part in, and which is being rolled out nationally. Regarding domestic abuse, some recent visits to other Local Authorities have been undertaken to raise awareness of the differing approaches to this issue, and findings will be presented to the Domestic Abuse Steering Group. In terms of recruitment, a DVD will be shown later in the meeting which has been produced to raise awareness of the benefits of working at SBC (see agenda item 9), and Melanie Douglas (SBC Team Manager, Permanence Team 1) will be taking over from Rhona Bollands (SBC Service Manager, Assessment & Fieldwork) when Rhona replaces SM from the 1st January 2017. The MOMO (Mind Of My Own) app (capturing the voice of the child) is going well, and a lot of young people are using it - there are plans to roll out a similar product to the SEND cohort.</p> <p><u>Voluntary Sector</u> SR offered apologies to the three SLSCB Lay Members, as their intended visit to the Barnardo's CSE Team (to be organised between Barnardo's and Catalyst) had not yet been arranged. If any other Board members are interested in visiting this team, they should let SR know as soon as possible.</p> <p>SRCGA (Stockton Residents & Community Groups Association) will no longer be supporting smaller organisations - Catalyst will now take on this responsibility, though it will entail a change to the training information circulated across agencies. If partners hear of anything contradictory, they should refer this to SR.</p> <p><u>Police</u> AS referred to the recent child abuse allegations that have emerged around football, and noted that some enquiries have been received by Cleveland Police which could grow in significance (none relate to recent conduct). Engagement with Safeguarding Officers of local clubs and the Football Association (FA) is ongoing. PB attended a recent meeting with Judge Sunita Mason in relation the 'Truth Project' (allowing victims and survivors of child sexual abuse to share their experiences with the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse) - cases will be investigated, and leaflets are available for dissemination (these were circulated in the last SLSCB email bulletin).</p> <p>A multi-agency meeting is taking place tomorrow to discuss domestic abuse processes - this forum has the scope to streamline and improve current practice.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates noted.

Minutes / Updates / Outcomes from Meetings

Ref No. 5	SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group & Tees LSCBs Performance Group
Discussion	<p><u>a) SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group</u> SM provided an overview of his circulated <i>VEMT Sub-Group Chairs Update Report for SLSCB</i> (up to 31st October 2016), which highlighted the following:</p> <p><i>Attendance/Contribution of Members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There continues to be good attendance and positive contributions from all agencies

Ref No. 5	<p>SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group & Tees LSCBs Performance Group</p> <p>involved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been no health representation to date, but reps from NTHFT and TEWV have now been put forward and will be invited to future meetings. <p><i>Ongoing Work</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work Completed: Photographs of VEMT children; Task and Finish Review of CSE Progress Update. Work Currently Underway: Promotion of use of Police Intelligence Form by all agencies; Benchmarking exercise against Ofsted 'Deep Dive' CSE criteria; Analysis of missing data across Tees; Multi-agency case file audits. <p><i>Issues for Decision or Resolution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further to previous discussions in relation to health representation, named representatives were identified from HAST CCG, NTHFT and TEWV. HAST CCG and NTHFT representatives have attended regularly, but the TEWV representative has only been able to attend one meeting to date, and there has been no attendance from TEWV during 2016/17. <p>With reference to the issue of TEWV attendance, EM commented that this had been raised at a Board meeting last year in order to highlight the problems TEWV have in ensuring representation at all safeguarding-related groups. Current attendance is being reviewed as the Trust works across seven Local Authorities. AM added that, as a TEWV Governor, she will be raising this further.</p> <p>SM drew particular attention to the missing data which had been circulated by the Police a couple of Board meetings ago - this showed Stockton as an outlier across Tees, and led to an initial discussion at the VEMT Sub-Group. Work has now begun following these discussions, and a further update will be given to the Board in February 2017. SM urged caution around the robustness of the data originally circulated, as not all of the Tees Local Authorities appear to be measuring the same - in addition, it is known that the Stockton figures are skewed by a small number of young people (two of which were subsequently placed in secure accommodation), and that young people placed in Stockton from other areas can have an impact on the data.</p> <p>The benchmarking exercise that has been completed against the Ofsted 'Deep Dive' CSE criteria (assessing the adequacy of Stockton's CSE arrangements) may be of particular interest to the Board - it was suggested that this should be presented at a future meeting.</p> <p>DP thanked SM for his report.</p>
	<p><u>b) Tees LSCBs Performance Group</u></p> <p>JG and PD presented the circulated draft Tees-wide LSCBs Performance Management Framework (PMF) Quarter 2 2016-2017 data. Board members were informed that the information provided was subject to further validation (to ensure all four Tees areas are measuring the data items in the same way), and that these draft documents are not for use outside of Tees-wide LSCB meetings.</p> <p><i>Dataset Summary</i></p> <p>JG gave an overview of this headline sheet (summarising 53 of the 457 data items within the Tees PMF - those that are comparable (e.g. per 1,000)), noting the inclusion of Tees-wide (the average of the four Tees authorities), North East (giving a context of where Tees performance sits) and England (included where possible) averages. Board members were advised of a subtle update to the RAG-rated categories since the data was originally circulated (in response to last week's Hartlepool LSCB meeting) - green showed those Tees areas that had performed better than all averages, amber indicated those who were better than some but not all averages, and red meant that performance was worse than all averages. Some gaps in the data were noted - these were live, contemporaneous documents,</p>

Ref No. 5	SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group & Tees LSCBs Performance Group
	<p>and Hartlepool and Middlesbrough are in the process of updating their information systems.</p> <p>Attention was drawn to the Q2 statistics relating to the following data items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>8. LSCB04(d) (The percentage of 16-18 year olds whose status is not known - Q1 2016-17)</u>: Stockton's figure of 0.4% (green) is impressive - shows that young people are being tracked. • <u>14. LSCB04(d) (The percentage of 16-17 year olds whose status is not known - October 2016)</u>: The national definition for this measure has been changed to 16-17 year-olds (was 16-18 year-olds) - Stockton's performance was 0.4% (green). • <u>18. LSCB08(d) (The percentage of children becoming defined as a child in need during the year-to-date WITHOUT a history of assessment under Early Help Assessment (including CP and LAC))</u>: Stockton's 70.6% (amber) shows that a large proportion of children becoming CiN have circumvented the early help assessment process. • <u>25. LSCB10(b) (The rate of children becoming looked-after children during the year-to-date)</u>: The 6.1% (amber) figure for Stockton was significantly lower than other Tees areas (Tees-wide average was 23%), and needs checking to ensure accuracy. JH was not confident that this statistic reflected the true rate, and felt that some form of narrative would help inform how this, and other items, were being measured. JG stated that if Board members feel any of the information provided is inaccurate, they need to take this back to their own staff - agencies are responsible for what they submit. • <u>26. LSCB10(d) (The percentage of children becoming looked-after children during the year-to-date WITHOUT a history of assessment under Early Help Assessment)</u>: Again, Stockton's performance of 50% (amber) was significantly different to that of both Middlesbrough (99.1%) and Redcar (95.2%) - are there practice issues here, and what are the differences between localities? Hartlepool's data has been collated, but was not provided in time for this meeting. • <u>31. LSCB14(b) (Rate of Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP) or Statements of Special Educational Needs due to Social, Emotional or Mental Health issues (SEMH) or Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD))</u>: There is no good or bad statistic for this measure, therefore the RAG-rating was removed. • <u>36. LSCB12(b) (The rate of children referred to the Channel Programme) and 37. LSCB12(d) (The rate of children living in a household with an adult referred to the Channel Programme)</u>: These items are difficult to analyse - higher numbers may suggest an issue, but it is a good that an authority has identified these children. As with the previous measure, it would be better not to RAG-rate these. <p>PD advised that no statistic was RAG-rated green unless it was known that this performance was better than Tees-wide, North East and England (hence the large swathes of amber and red ratings) - where North East or England data was not available, amber ratings were given. Encouragingly, Stockton was able to provide responses for each item. JG added that partners will be accountable for what these numbers say, and that the Tees LSCBs will receive this summary sheet, and the full dataset document, on a quarterly basis for consideration (the next update (Q3) will be given in March 2017).</p> <p><i>Dataset</i></p> <p>PD led Board members through analysis of the full dataset, which listed all 457 of the individual data items that made up each of the 23 agreed Tees PMF measures. The scale of this framework was highlighted - with each of the four Local Authorities having to respond to these 457 data items, and with performance on a number of other measures also required, the total number of data lines produced comes to 1,905 (to be collated on a quarterly basis). Comments on selected data items were recorded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>LSCB02(a) (The number of conceptions to female children)</u>: Stockton's number (115) was higher than all other Tees areas (Tees-wide average was 82).

Ref No. 5	<p>SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group & Tees LSCBs Performance Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>LSCB02(c) (The rate of conceptions to female children per 1,000 aged 13-15 years old)</u>: The Tees-wide average of 7.5% was approaching nearly double the England average (4.4%). • <u>LSCB02(d) (The number of conceptions to looked-after female children)</u>: PD felt it was startling that this information is not currently available - systems cannot give this data. JG commented that local teams have given assurance that each authority is aware of those LAC who are pregnant, but stated that agencies need to ensure this is captured - such information will help regarding commissioning arrangements too. No national data is known to be available in relation to this item. • <u>LSCB06(a) (The number of children in families placed by local authorities in bed and breakfast accommodation or hostels (other than domestic refuge hostels) in the year-to-date)</u>: Stockton's number (50) was vastly higher than the other Tees areas (Hartlepool 1, Middlesbrough 1, Redcar 3), though the majority of these placements were in hostel accommodation (commissioned by the Local Authority). JE felt it would be useful to split this item into those placed in hostels, and those in bed and breakfasts (the Board would be more concerned regarding the use of B&Bs, which in the case of Q2 was one child placed for two nights), and offered to provide further information around such arrangements if required. AM queried why the other Tees areas numbers were so low - what do they do/not do? • <u>LSCB07 (The number of child asylum seekers and child refugees that have arrived in the last quarter (a) and the last twelve months (b), broken down into (i) children in families and (ii) lone children)</u>: The North East Migration Service have agreed to provide this information as part of the LSCB PMF, but do not want it published at this stage. PD verbally advised of the numbers involved, which showed that the Middlesbrough and Stockton areas are accommodating similar numbers of child asylum seekers and refugees - the great majority of these children are part of family groups, with only a very small number of unaccompanied children. There are much smaller numbers of child asylum seekers and refugees being accommodated in the Hartlepool and Redcar areas. • <u>LSCB23 (Attendance at Initial Child Protection Conferences (ICPC) and Review Child Protection Conferences (RCPC) in the year-to-date, showing in each case the number and percentage of conferences attended by each agency or staff group, as a percentage of the number of conferences to which that agency or staff group was invited (and also showing where written reports were submitted, if applicable))</u>: Regarding this item, MG highlighted the need to also collect data around Police attendance at Strategy's, an issue that was raised by Ofsted during the Stockton inspection in May/June 2016. <p>Supplementing the Tees PMF headline summary and full dataset documents was an additional <i>Proportion of factors by number of completed assessments with factor information at Quarter 2 2016/17</i> graphic. JH explained that, at the end of the single assessment, staff identify what the factors within a case are, and tick the appropriate boxes - however, there is unlikely to be consistency within Social Care teams, let alone across Tees, and some may select the predominant factor, whilst others identify more than just one. Comments in relation to the data within this graphic were noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Stockton, the overriding presenting issue/theme is domestic abuse (36.9%), although the figure here for England is 49.6%. Due to concerns around the Tees statistics, Dr John Bye (HAST CCG Named GP for Safeguarding Children) will be looking at the ONS data - this will be circulated to Tees LSCB Chairs. • The disparity between Redcar (73.4%) and Stockton (19.1%) for mental health being a factor signifies clear practice issues, as the cohort is unlikely to be that different. • AM felt that a future project could explore the link between domestic abuse and children's mental health. • PB highlighted the Stockton data for CSE (1.5%) and missing (1.5%) being a factor – these are very low considering the amount of time the Board spends on these areas. • EM noted the low rate of self-harm in Stockton (0.7%) compared to the other Tees lo-
-----------	---

Ref No. 5	SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group & Tees LSCBs Performance Group			
	<p>calities - this conflicts with item 44. LSCB18(bi-i) (<u>The rate of children presenting at hospital emergency departments for urgent and unscheduled treatment with a deliberate self-harm injury</u>) in the dataset summary, which shows Stockton (11.5 per 10,000) higher than the rest of Tees (Tees-wide average was 6.9 per 10,000). JG urged caution around all hospital data, as the information provided by NTHFT and South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust had inconsistencies (A&E data in particular should be ignored) - both Trusts have been asked to submit a composite picture, and this should be available for the Q3 update.</p> <p>JG reported that the 'quarterly' meetings of the Tees Performance Group are continuing on a monthly basis for now (a meeting is scheduled for this Friday, and will look at 'Deep Dive' information), and that the group are very receptive to ideas in order to take its work forward. The group also have a list of other data items the LSCBs may like to look at, but the current focus remains on ensuring the 23 agreed measures are captured in a rigorous and reliable manner. It was noted that just to get the PMF to its present state, there has been a lot of sharing of good practice between the Local Authorities, Health and Police.</p> <p>JG felt it was the Board's responsibility to look at and interpret the data presented, and that enhanced familiarity of the Tees PMF will inform and strengthen discussion/focus. PD advised that a 'data dictionary' is being produced, detailing where information comes from and how it is collected - this will increasingly standardise what the data items relate to. JG added that the Tees Performance Group will be 'trending' specific issues to ascertain the direction of travel (to inform how agencies allocate resources) - this data is a point in time, or the end of a point in time.</p> <p>Thanking all those involved in pulling together this piece of work, SR commented that, in terms of analysis, the Board should not be examining each measure line-by-line. Also, how do agencies know if averages are good or bad - would it be useful to have more absolute figures on the dataset summary (even though these are included within the full data sheets), as this is what Board members will look at first? The use of RAG-ratings may also provide a skewed picture, as well as encouraging focus on only the 'red' items. LC supported the latter observation - if agencies do not keep an eye on the 'green'-rated items too, they may turn 'red' (hence the 'trending' idea - other visuals will be developed to show trends/direction of travel).</p> <p>BG highlighted that the National Probation Service (NPS) and Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) had been recorded under one title ('Probation') - as such, if there are any issues with either of these strands, it could be difficult to identify where the problem lies. JG was happy to look at further refining the way the data is presented.</p> <p>DP thanked JG, PD and all those involved in the Tees Performance Group for their hard work and output. The next development around 'Deep Dives' will help inform thematic meetings, and it is expected that the narrative around the data will develop over time. As a Board, agencies need to take ownership of the Tees PMF in order to learn together and use the information provided in the most effective ways.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group report noted, with an issue around TEWV input outlined - work around missing data will be coming to the February 2017 Board meeting. Draft Tees-wide LSCBs Performance Management Framework Q2 2016-2017 data presented and discussed - Q3 data to be presented to the SLSCB in March 2017.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
51/12/1617	15.12.16	Address the issue of TEWV attendance at the SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group.	EM/AM	19.01.17

EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE

Ref No. 6	Multi-Agency Audits Reports – Domestic Abuse & Mental Health
Discussion	<p><u>Domestic Abuse</u></p> <p>MG gave an overview of the circulated <i>Multi-Agency Audits - issues, lessons and reflections from audit 1</i> report, which provided the SLSCB Learning and Improving Practice Sub-Group (LIPSG) with details on the first audit (focusing on domestic abuse) undertaken as part of the new Multi-Agency Audit process adopted by the SLSCB in 2016-2017.</p> <p>This was the first of three audits to be undertaken during 2016-2017, focusing on the ‘toxic trio’ (domestic abuse, mental health and alcohol/substance misuse) of issues which support the emerging priority of the Board to focus on the key drivers of neglect and abuse. The audit tool and process were included within the report for information.</p> <p>Outcomes and feedback on the audit were listed, both on the audit process itself, and the practice and learning issues identified (including general practice/quality, and specific issues for domestic abuse approaches).</p> <p><i>Process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall tool was effective and user-friendly, and it was clear what was expected. • The Audits Learning Event was felt to be worthwhile overall, and was helpful in identifying the key aspects of multi-agency practice. • The time taken to complete the audits was a potential barrier. • There was some confusion about the overall grading to cases, and whether this was recording each individual agency involvement or the work on the case overall. It was confirmed that this was about the latter, and some agencies felt they were not necessarily able to make this judgement. <p><i>Practice and Learning Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General practice/quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quality of plans - in some cases, it was not clear enough what was being expected, and the outcomes in others were not smart enough or specific enough to be able to measure progress. ○ In some cases, practice was not clear on the consequences of actions not being completed as part of plans (being addressed via Signs of Safety roll-out). ○ Examples of excellent assessment work being undertaken, very fast responses and appropriate acceleration of concerns. • Specific issues for domestic abuse approaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support programmes were not being effective or able to respond quickly enough to the issues (this was especially the case with perpetrators). ○ Not clear on the benefits of Harbour work with young people in particular as there was little evidence of successful outcomes. ○ In two of the five cases, Harbour would not work with perpetrators, which highlights some potential issues in our approach. ○ Timescales inappropriate - setting up to fail. ○ Some cases seemed to be focusing too much on the ability of the mother to protect from the implications of domestic abuse, when it was clear that they were struggling to protect themselves. <p>In terms of subsequent actions, wider practice issues will be taken forward as part of the Ofsted Action Plan, and domestic abuse outcomes will be fed into the wider work on the refresh of the strategy, and the work of the newly established Domestic Abuse Steering Group.</p> <p>At the subsequent Audits Learning Event held in August 2016, those present decided to repeat the process followed in the first audit, as this will then determine if any changes or</p>

Ref No. 6	Multi-Agency Audits Reports – Domestic Abuse & Mental Health
	<p>amendments would improve it. There was felt to be some value in enabling key workers to be present, to engage with families should they choose to do so, and to invite Board members to a future session, but it was agreed that a further round of audits would help to identify any process changes.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Mental Health</u> MG presented the circulated <i>Multi-Agency Audits - issues, lessons and reflections from audit 2</i> report, which provided the SLSCB Learning and Improving Practice Sub-Group (LIPSG) with details on the second audit (focusing on mental health) undertaken as part of the new Multi-Agency Audit process adopted by the SLSCB in 2016-2017. Once again, the audit tool and process were included within the report for information, and outcomes and feedback on the audit were listed as follows:</p> <p><i>Process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In using the tool for the second time, participants were more familiar with the purpose of the audit, with greater clarity around what was being asked for. • The Audits Learning Event was again felt to be worthwhile overall, and had enabled an open and honest discussion between partners on some of the issues. • The time taken to complete the audits was again identified as potential barrier by some agencies, though there had been different approaches taken in Audit 2, such as the involvement of those closer to cases in the audit process (four school nurses attended the Audits Learning Event). • There continues to be some confusion about the overall grading to cases. • Some agencies felt unable to provide detailed information on some of the cases chosen, as they had limited involvement in these specific cases (this is unavoidable). <p><i>Practice and Learning Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General practice/quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quality of plans continues to be a challenge. ○ In some cases, practice was not clear on the consequences of actions not being completed as part of plans (as in audit 1). ○ Examples where it appeared that there had been longstanding involvement in cases, with no real significant or sustained progress. ○ Examples where GPs were not informed of the status of children, or views sought. ○ One example where a child was used as an interpreter for a parent (not good practice). ○ A possible learning area was highlighted around working with particularly difficult to engage young people who refuse to engage with services, and if professionals have enough expertise in this area, or are aware of alternatives. • Specific issues for mental health concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In some cases, it was not possible to set out what work had been done with young people or parents by mental health services. ○ In some cases, only the GP was aware of the fact that mental health services were working with both the young person and parents, and this information was not shared with other practitioners. ○ In one case, there was no link between TEWV working with a parent and Alliance working with a young person through the TAMHS framework. ○ At least one example where there are concerns that there was too much emphasis/focus on the needs of mother - child's needs/issues became secondary. <p>Proposed actions were put forward following this audit, including for general practice and quality issues to be discussed at LIPSG, and from there, be taken back by agencies into their own quality assurance and performance discussions - the key learning points (information-sharing issues where mental health services are working with family members, and</p>

Ref No. 6	Multi-Agency Audits Reports – Domestic Abuse & Mental Health
	<p>the role of GPs, who in some cases are the only professional with information on multiple involvement of mental health agencies) will then be disseminated across LSCB partners.</p> <p>In terms of next steps, a further thematic audit will be undertaken (focusing on alcohol/substance misuse), and will be reported to LIPSG and the Board in due course - this will complete this first cycle. An annual compilation report will then be produced to feed into the Board's planning cycle - this will include outcomes and learning points, as well as recommendations about the future of the programme, including the link with single-agency audits.</p> <p>Reflecting on the contents of this report, JH noted the absence of comments around whether agencies were satisfied with the work undertaken with the child, and that their needs were met - this could be included as part of an overarching summary, as assurance is required. MG will ensure this is included for the next audit.</p> <p>In light of the findings from these audits, DP posed the question, 'so what?' MG highlighted specific learning/actions for individual services, and the reinforcement of the general point around the quality of plans (picked up through Ofsted). In addition, the next audit may begin to demonstrate the impact of Signs of Safety, and whether this tool makes plans more specific. BG, who found the audit process very useful in that it confirmed the learning points that arose from internal auditing, noted current Probation (CRC) attempts at improving the standards of planning.</p> <p>AM expressed concern over the communication issues identified - the Board needs assurance that this can be dealt with immediately as information-sharing is key. MG felt there was nothing of extreme concern here (practical examples were requested, but not many were provided), and that work regarding barriers to information-sharing (practice issues - what can be shared/what not) was ongoing - MG was confident that the issue is being addressed, and the LIPSG are best-placed to oversee developments, which will be brought back to the SLSCB at a future meeting.</p> <p>JH highlighted the impact of the Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Children's Hub, and the good quality of information being communicated by co-located staff - professionals should be sharing if it is in the interests of the child, and although Local Authority and Police staff have confidence in doing this, the same cannot be said of Health staff. JG reported that GPs are anxious about information-sharing, and although they want to share, they need a better understanding of what can/cannot be communicated - Dr John Bye (HAST CCG Named GP for Safeguarding Children) has compiled an easy-read guide to address this, and evidence from reviews shows that GPs can sometimes have the least information, therefore a collective partnership approach is required around this issue. EM noted her attendance (along with LR) at a recent 'Caldicott' event (the rules around the sharing of sensitive/personal information), and voiced concern in relation to the mixed comments on what should/should not be shared - this is clearly a national issue.</p> <p>TH sought clarity around how the audit information is disseminated to frontline practitioners. MG stated it was the responsibility of those involved in the audit process to ensure learning/actions were cascaded to relevant staff, with AS adding that some of this responsibility also fell on LIPSG.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Multi-Agency Audits Reports (Domestic Abuse and Mental Health) noted and discussed, specifically the audit process and practice and learning issues that arose. Concerns identified around information-sharing, with work being undertaken to address this outlined.

Ref No. 7	H&S LSCBs Training Update and Proposal for 2017 / 2018
Discussion	<p>With reference to the circulated <i>Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees LSCBs Joint Training Update</i> report, LR reminded Board members of the recommendation from the Ofsted inspection in Stockton during May/June 2016 relating to multi-agency training:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>‘Undertake an analysis and evaluation of need to inform the Stockton-on-Tees and Hartlepool 2017–18 joint training programme.’</i></p> <p>As such, this report, accompanied by a presentation at this meeting, provided an overview of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ April - September 2016 Course Attendance & Evaluations (Delivered & E-Learning) ➤ Current Training Programmes (Delivered and E-Learning) ➤ Training Needs Analysis ➤ 2017/18 Training Programme ➤ Charging Policy 2016/19 (attached to the report as Appendix 1) <p>LR proceeded to lead Board members through a <i>Hartlepool & Stockton-on-Tees LSCBs Joint Training Group (HSJTG) - Update and Training Proposal 2017/18</i> presentation - comments in relation to this were recorded as follows:</p> <p><u>2016/17 Training Programme</u> <i>Attendance: April - June 2016</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 courses delivered, with an 80% fill-rate average. • 64% fill-rate for Substance Misuse course - need work on this, as it is a Board priority. • 95% fill-rate for Domestic Abuse course - positive, but yet to see the impact of this. • 52% fill-rate for Designated Officers Training - LC felt that those not accessing this course should be identifiable as they are named people. <p><i>Attendance: July - September 2016</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 courses delivered, with a 92% fill-rate average. • Two drop-in sessions - Public Law Outline (64% fill-rate) and Providing Right Support to Meet Needs (22% fill-rate). The latter is delivered by Penny Thompson (Children's Hub Manager), and it is evident that professionals are still not using the threshold document before referring cases to the Hub. <p><u>April - September 2016 Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The original standard evaluation questions (which produced very positive scores) were recently revised in order to seek answers to more pertinent training issues (e.g. perceived knowledge of subject pre-course; knowledge post-attendance; frequency of application of training post-course; change to practice post-course). • It was proposed and agreed to conduct telephone calls with a selection of attendees from each course three months after the training to further ascertain impact - this has not been achieved thus far, but will be the focus for the next quarter's courses. <p><u>Proposed 2017/18 Training Programme</u> <i>Training Needs Analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate questionnaires were sent out to managers and practitioners in order to seek comments on the current training programme, and suggestions for future content in light of staff priorities/need. Although there was a low questionnaire return-rate, those that were submitted gave a reasonable level of information. • A large disconnect between what managers think their staff need, and what their staff think they need/want was evident - work is clearly required here. DWr queried why professionals at all levels are not working to the same priorities rather than cherry-picking courses that they would prefer to attend. Management overview of their staff and/or knowledge of the training programme itself could be an issue, but this is difficult to check - it is up to each agency to ensure such a disconnect is avoided, and the sub-

Ref No. 7	H&S LSCBs Training Update and Proposal for 2017 / 2018
	<p>sequent proposal for a condensed training offer may aid in these efforts.</p> <p><i>Principles</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linked to Board priorities - continued learning from sub-groups (this may be identified initially, but it is not done on a fluid basis). • Enhanced offer e-learning (in negotiations with Virtual College (e-learning provider) to offer a larger variety of courses on a Tees basis (with a self-registration option) via a joint Adults and Children's Board arrangement). • Reduction in core programme - streamlined to 14 'themed' courses. • Increased commissioning - key events (held on a multi-agency basis, and in relation to themes coming out of LIPSG and any Learning Reviews). <p>A number of opportunities and risks were also identified, in particular around training resources. MG highlighted the current trainer issue, with the respective Stockton employee having recently left his post - there is a need for a different and more sustainable model to cover this vacancy, with increases in e-learning options and practitioner-led training potential solutions (it was noted that Hartlepool are not as keen on e-learning, but it was felt that this should be part of the training offer). LR advised that if the core training post was not going to be replaced, this would change the current service level agreement (SLA) regarding training provision between Hartlepool and Stockton.</p> <p>In terms of the programme for 2017-2018, LR referred to the <i>Planning for Joint HSCB & SLSCB Safeguarding Children Training 2017-2018 Proposal</i> paper (circulated at this meeting), noting that this was a first draft and needed more work. These proposals stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programme should have awareness and also specialist level courses with commissioned services/specialists jointly delivering sessions. • Current courses to be grouped together and seen as a blended-learning approach. • The programme is to meet Board priorities and learning from SCRs/LRs/MRs as a minimum. Drop-ins should continue, with e-learning supplementing the main programme. • A full re-launch event of the training programme is needed to ensure managers are involved in deciding individuals' CPD, and that all staff know where/how to access safeguarding children training. Managers briefings, plus staff events/posters/flyers and promotion of programme required. <p>Reflecting on her own training background, LC highlighted the use of QR codes, and the difference these can make to the amount of evaluation evidence that can be collated. 'Train-the-trainer' courses were also advocated, as these give staff the skills to deliver future training, which becomes part of their own personal development. LR acknowledged the benefits of such courses, but cautioned that some people like to train, and some do not - can a training programme be delivered based on this being a key element?</p> <p>From a volunteer perspective, SR urged the retention of e-learning courses - this was a vital source for basic training, and feedback on the current provision has been very positive (BG added that e-learning had been well received within Probation). In relation to 'train-the-trainer' courses, this was not just about staff going on to stand up in front of others - it is also about sharing this knowledge with others. SR also proposed the removal of the reference to membership of SRCGA (2.2 of the proposed Charging Policy), and instead refer to 'small agencies not contracted by the Local Authority to deliver children's services'.</p> <p>JG highlighted the organisational pressures that can affect the availability of practitioners to carry out a trainer role. In Health, traditional winter activity is currently being seen in A&Es and acute services, and this can lead to community staff being brought in to backfill under-pressure areas - this is a challenge for the training group. JH noted the significant investment made in Signs of Safety, and queried where training on this sits within the proposals - assurance was given that this is in the suggested programme. JH also asked if</p>

Ref No. 7	H&S LSCBs Training Update and Proposal for 2017 / 2018
	<p>there was still a commitment to a North of Tees training group - this was affirmed.</p> <p>The proposed training programme for 2017-2018 was subsequently endorsed by the SLSCB. Regarding the Charging Policy 2016-2019 that accompanied the report, there were no significant changes outlined. As such, this was also approved by Board members, subject to the removal of the reference to SRCGA.</p> <p>DP thanked LR for her report and presentation.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees LSCBs training update and proposals for 2017-2018 noted and discussed - proposals were endorsed by the Board (including the updated Charging Policy 2016-2019 (subject to the identified amendment)).

Ref No. 8	CQC Not Seen Not Heard			
Discussion	<p><u>Response from NTHFT</u></p> <p>Reference was made to the circulated <i>CQC Not Seen Not Heard - North Tees and Hartlepool Foundation Trust</i> report, which gave the SLSCB an update on the work undertaken by NTHFT in relation to the CQC report, 'Not Seen Not Heard'. Key points of note included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CQC report was presented at NTHFT Safeguarding Children's Steering Group on 14/09/16 to share findings and recommendations - it was agreed that a Task and Finish Group be established to complete a gap analysis of the recommendations within the report against current practice. Of the 38 recommendations reviewed, 22 were identified as either being met, or were considered to be outside the domain of the Trust's responsibilities. A meeting has been arranged for 20/12/16 to formulate and agree the final work plan that addresses the 16 identified recommendations that the Trust is currently not achieving. The work plan will include agreed leads and timescales. <p>LR advised that the final NTHFT work plan will be brought to the next SLSCB meeting in January 2017 for comment.</p>			
	<p><u>Response from TEWV</u></p> <p>EM provided an overview of the circulated <i>Not Seen Not Heard - Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys Response</i> report, which gave the SLSCB an update on the work undertaken by TEWV in relation to the CQC report, 'Not Seen Not Heard'. Key points of note included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the publication of the CQC report, 'Not Seen Not Heard', a focus group was held with TEWV CAMHS teams to review the report, and map across what is currently done, and what can be done better. A work plan was subsequently developed (attached to the report as 'Appendix 1') which identified what is currently done within each of the areas, and what needs to develop to address each recommendation (this clearly shows how CAMHS can hear the child's voice in the work they complete). A focus group has been arranged with Adult Mental Health to review how the recommendations within this report can be addressed (this will be added to the work plan). 'Did Not Attend' policy is mentioned - work is planned to review in relation to children and young people around not being brought to appointments. The work plan is being shared across all CAMHS teams, and there will be a follow-up meeting in six months to review progress. 			
Agreement/ Outcome	Responses from NTHFT and TEWV to the CQC 'Not Seen Not Heard' report noted – NTHFT to provide final work plan at the SLSCB meeting in January 2017 for comment.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
52/12/1617	15.12.16	Submit final NTHFT Work Plan in relation to the	LR	10.01.17

Ref No. 8	CQC Not Seen Not Heard		
		CQC 'Not Seen Not Heard' report for consideration at the next Board meeting in January 2017.	

ENABLING CHANGE

Ref No. 9	SBC CSC Social Work Recruitment DVD		
Discussion	<p>As referenced at the last Board meeting in November 2016, and further to the ongoing challenges around the recruitment of experienced Social Workers, JH introduced a video that the Local Authority had produced using a number of SBC staff and Elected Members, outlining the benefits of working in Stockton. The video is now available on the SBC web-site (see link below).</p> <p>https://www.stockton.gov.uk/stockton-council/working-for-the-council-including-stockton-council-jobs/childrens-social-work-vacancies/</p> <p>Board members agreed that this was a very impressive production, and DP commended all those involved in its creation.</p>		
Agreement/ Outcome	SBC Children's Social Care recruitment video noted.		

Ref No. 10	SBC CSC Ofsted Action Plan		
Discussion	<p>JH presented the circulated <i>SBC Inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers - Improvement and Development Action Plan 2016</i>, which gave a summary of the actions resulting from the Ofsted inspection held in May/June 2016. This document was submitted to Ofsted on the 14th November 2016, and will be updated at SBC Cabinet - some actions can now be RAG-rated 'green', and there are no actions that are behind schedule.</p> <p>Regarding recent developments, it was noted that SM had undertaken work with managers around these actions, Signs of Safety was being further embedded, and thematic audits in relation to supervision were scheduled. Other areas of note included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Ensure that return home interviews are offered to all children who go missing from home or care, and that each episode is analysed to inform the child's safety plan and wider strategic planning in relation to prevention and risk reduction:</u> The intelligence and analysis role to support trends, patterns and interventions has now been recruited to. JH will also be doing work in the New Year around 'missing's', and will liaise with the Police - this can be brought back to the Board at a future meeting. • <u>Improve the quality and consistency of all children's and young people's plans, ensuring that the overall aim is clear, detailing the services or support that will be offered, and that reasonable timescales are set which reflect the child's needs and development:</u> Work on CP plans more robust than other plans, hence future actions identified around CiN and LAC from April 2017. • <u>The local authority should satisfy itself that all placements where children and young people are placed with connected persons and private fostering are appropriate, and that all carers are assessed under the relevant regulation:</u> Current arrangements were reviewed promptly, and via an external agency. • <u>Develop 'edge of care' services to respond in a flexible, family-friendly way to offer realistic alternatives to full-time residential or foster care:</u> MG is leading on a piece of work in relation to 'edge of care' services - this will come to the Board in the New Year. • <u>Ensure that the best quality legal advice is available to social workers and their managers to support effective and timely planning for children and young people:</u> MH to forward JH information around Court process expectations. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Ensure that there are sufficient foster carers, residential placements and potential adopters to meet the needs of the children:</u> Recognise the need for more Local Authority Foster Carers, but not so sure about the need for more adopters as some are currently without children. • <u>Ensure that when children are separated from their birth families, they have the opportunity to understand their past and move positively into the future through the provision of sensitive and timely life-story work:</u> TH queried if any contributions from LAC Nurses would be appropriate regarding life-story work - JH agreed this would be helpful, and would take this back for co-ordination. <p>JH advised that this Action Plan will be reviewed regularly within both the SBC Children's Management Team and SBC Cabinet.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	SBC Children's Social Care Ofsted Action Plan 2016 noted, with key improvement and development points outlined.
Log Ref	<i>Mtg Date</i> <i>Action Required</i> <i>Person Responsible</i> <i>Due Date</i>
53/12/1617	15.12.16 Forward JH information around Court process expectations (linked to SBC CSC Ofsted Action Plan). MH 19.01.17

Ref No. 11	Actions, Impact, Evidence & Difference
Discussion	<p>DP challenged Board members to identify the impact this meeting had made in terms of safeguarding children - the following views were expressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB: Tees PMF - this can have a positive impact in the future. • MG: Tees PMF - should not underestimate the work done in relation to this, and it will act as a real enabler for the Board (will see this throughout next year). • JB: Multi-Agency Audits - helping partners move forward (evidence of triangulation). • AM: Recognition of the importance of strong communications and information-sharing.
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.

OTHER

Ref No. 12	Any Other Business
Discussion	<p><u>SLSCB Annual Report 2015-2016</u> PB advised that the final SLSCB Annual Report for 2015-2016 will be circulated to Board members very shortly, and will also be sent to the statutory partners of the SLSCB.</p> <p><u>Future in Mind Project</u> DM reported that the uptake from secondary schools in relation to the Future in Mind Project (and further to the recent schools survey) has been positive - schools are submitting their Action Plans, so there should be a healthy number involved in the intended pilot.</p> <p><u>Children's Services – Caseload and Staffing</u> JH gave an update around the current caseload and staffing status within SBC Children's Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work continues to increase, and there are now 435 active referrals in the SBC Assessment Team. A significant number of nasty domestic abuse (alcohol-related) cases are coming into the system, as well as some serious sexual/physical abuse incidents - this will impact upon partners too. There were 13 Strategy meetings held in the Children's Hub in one-and-a-half days recently. • Further to the Children Missing Education (CME) assurance report discussed at the

	<p>Board meeting in October 2016, the Local Authority were satisfied that they had done everything they could in relation to the young people identified. There is one case of a child not being in education this school year - work is being undertaken by JH and DM around this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the high number of cases that have gone to ICPC but have not then proceeded to a plan (as noted at the Board meeting in November 2016), two pieces of work have been completed looking into this issue. Of 55 cases, 20% should not have gone to ICPC (learning to take back regarding management challenge), and there were four cases where there was a split decision (the Chair had the casting vote in deciding not to put the child on a CP plan). • Joint Targeted Area Inspections (JTAs) regarding domestic abuse - Lincolnshire's inspection was published last week, and this identified that Health were not receiving information around domestic abuse. The SLSCB need to consider this. MG stated that this had not yet been addressed by the Domestic Abuse Steering Group, but that Operation Encompass data is reported into the Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Children's Hub, where both NTHFT and TEWV are represented (JG reminded all present to remember that Health was not one organisation) - AS added that this issue may be the subject of discussions at the domestic abuse process mapping meeting tomorrow. 			
	<p><u>Daisy Chain</u> SR stated that the autism charity, Daisy Chain, are in the process of recruiting a Chief Officer using an external recruitment agency in London (SR is acting as the local link). If Board members know of anyone who may be suitable, can they please contact SR.</p>			
	<p><u>Secondary Schools</u> GB thanked Board members for making her feel welcome, and noted a presentation at the last secondary school Headteachers meeting regarding exclusions - there had been a sharp rise between September and December 2016, and reasons for this will be examined (it did not necessarily involve those on Pupil Premiums). In terms of Children Missing Education (CME), attendance issues at Key Stage 4 (mostly girls on Pupil Premium) had been identified - it was agreed that the Board would be interested in looking at this (GB can liaise with DM).</p>			
	<p><u>SLSCB Membership</u> DP formally thanked Clare Mason (former Secondary School representative) for her contribution to the SLSCB, and will write and send a letter of thanks to Clare shortly.</p> <p>As this was the last Board meeting for JH, SM and AS, gifts of thanks were presented. Regarding JH and SM, DP paid tribute to their wealth of knowledge and outstanding commitment to safeguarding children, which had involved years of service and a willingness to make a difference. The 'good' Ofsted rating received by the Local Authority was a pertinent legacy, and both were thanked for the invaluable contributions they had made. DP thanked AS for his immense contribution to the SLSCB, and the value he had added to the Board's cause - AS will be a huge miss, and he was congratulated on his promotion.</p> <p>DP wished all Board members a wonderful Christmas, and a happy New Year.</p>			
<p>Agreement/ Outcome</p>	<p>Noted.</p>			
<p>Log Ref</p>	<p>Mtg Date</p>	<p>Action Required</p>	<p>Person Responsible</p>	<p>Due Date</p>
<p>54/12/1617</p>	<p>15.12.16</p>	<p>Compose and send letter of thanks to Clare Mason (former Secondary Schools representative) for her contribution to the SLSCB.</p>	<p>DP</p>	<p>19.01.17</p>