













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 	
Martin Gray (MG)	Director of Children's Services	Local Authority (SBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MALAP (Multi-Agency Looked After Partnership) Tees Valley Education, Employment and Skills Board Transforming Tees Executive Group Health and Wellbeing Board YOT Management Board 	Apols
Ann Workman (AW)	Director of Adults and Health			Apols
Rhona Bolland (RB)	Assistant Director - Safeguarding and Looked After Children / Chair SLSCB VEMT Sub-Group			
Sarah Bowman-Abouna (SBA)	Assistant Director - Public Health			Apols
Diane McConnell (DM)	Assistant Director - Schools and SEN		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convener of the Safeguarding Forum for Education Settings Tees LSCBs Strategic VEMT Group 	
Jane Edmends (JE)	Housing Services Manager		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing, Neighbourhood and Affordable Warmth Partnership (Thematic Group) Stockton VEMT Sub-Group Stockton LIPSG Stockton MALAP (Multi-Agency Looked After Partnership) 	
Cllr Ann McCoy (AM)	Lead Cabinet Member - Children and Young People (Participating Observer)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Tees, Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust (TEWV) 	
Neil Schneider (NS)	Chief Executive (Participating Observer)			Apols
Margaret Harvey (MH)	Service Manager	CAFCASS		Apols
Anne-Marie Salwey (AMS)	Detective Superintendent / Chair SLSCB LIPSG	Cleveland Police		

David Woodward (DWO)	Independent Schools - Deputy Headmaster, Yarm School	Education Establishments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Schools Inspectorate (ISI) Compliance and EQ Inspector. HMC North East Pastoral Group. 	Apols
Gill Booth (GB)	Secondary Schools - Executive Headteacher, Ian Ramsey Academy (and Venerable Bede)			Apols
Kerry Coe (KC)	Primary Schools - Head Teacher, St John the Baptist CE VC Primary School		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Needs Panel Primary Heads Group ARP Cluster Joint Commissioning group (SEN and Health) School to School Support Group (Campus Stockton) Mentor for new HT 	Apols
Joanna Bailey (JB)	Post-16 Education - Principal, Prior Pursglove and Stockton Sixth Form College		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vice-Chair of NET Stockton Secondary Hub Governor at The Grangefield Academy Campus Stockton Teaching Alliance 14-19 Partnership, Secondary Heads Group SCITT Board Member Governor at Errington Primary, Marske SFC rep for Sutton Trust (social mobility) 	Apols
Jean Golightly (JG)	Director of Nursing & Quality	Hartlepool & Stockton-on-Tees Clinical Commissioning Group (HAST CCG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Tees CCG (Director of Nursing & Quality) Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board Member of NHSE Quality Surveillance Group meeting Chair of Tees LSCBs Performance Management Framework 	Apols
Trina Holcroft (TH)	Designated Nurse, Safeguarding Children & LAC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hartlepool SCB (full board, exec and LIPSG) CDOP Tees LSCBs Procedures Group Multi-Agency Looked After Partnership (MALAP Stockton) Stockton Performance Management Stockton LIPSG Hartlepool Performance and Quality Group Joint Training Group MACH SMB and Implementation Group Teeswide Designated Professionals Group NTHFT Steering Group 	✓
Vacancy	Designated Doctor <i>Advisor to the Board</i>			
David Charlesworth (DC)	Quality and Patient Safety Manager	NHS England (Cumbria & North East)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hartlepool LSCB Middlesbrough LSCB Darlington LSCB (Deputy) Durham LSCB (Deputy) 	✓
Lindsey Robertson (LR)	Deputy Director of Nursing	North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust (NTHFT)		Apols
Elizabeth Moody (EM)	Executive Director of Nursing and Governance	Tees, Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust (TEWV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teeswide Safeguarding Adults Board North Yorkshire Adult Safeguarding Board North Yorkshire Children's Safeguarding Board (Member of other Safeguarding Boards but send deputies on regular basis) 	Apols

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

Guests:

Cllr Carol Clark (CC)	SBC - Elected Member	For item 5
Julie Nixon (JN)	SBC - Transformation Team	Observer
Judy Trainer (JT)	SBC - Team Leader, Electoral and Scrutiny	For item 5
Claire Allen (CA)	TEWV - Named Nurse	Sub for Elizabeth Moody

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>CA was in attendance as the substitute for EM.</p> <p>JN was present in an observational capacity, and due to her involvement in the review of SLSCB effectiveness (see agenda item 9).</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.

Ref No. 2	Board Minutes for Accuracy – 19.01.17
<i>Discussion</i>	Minutes of the Board meeting held on the 19 th January 2017 were agreed as a true record.
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	The minutes of the Board meeting held on the 19 th January 2017 be recorded as ratified.

Ref No. 3	Action Log
<i>Discussion</i>	The circulated <i>SLSCB Meetings Action Log 2016 / 2017 (To Do / In Progress)</i> was provided for information - PB advised that there continued to be no immediate concerns, and all actions remained on track.
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Action Log update noted.

Partnership Information

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>Before any agency updates were provided, DP reminded Board members that this well-established agenda item gave an opportunity for anyone part of the SLSCB to voice safeguarding issues, not just those who are a member of an organisation.</p> <p><u>Voluntary Sector</u> SR highlighted the regular meetings of the Voluntary Sector via the VCSE (Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise) Safeguarding Forums, the last of which was attended by over 40 representatives. Exciting plans are in place for 2017-2018, and any Board members who would like some time on a future agenda should contact SR.</p> <p><u>Local Authority</u> RB provided an update in relation to Social Care:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a further increase in referrals into Social Care. • 321 young people are currently subject to child protection. • 430 young people currently have LAC status. • There are 10 unallocated cases at present, though assurance was given that these young people are being seen. • Regarding the Department for Education (DfE) campaign 'Together we can tackle child abuse', there would normally be an increase in referrals into Social Care off the back of such publicity. PB advised that Stockton had been chosen as one of the few Local Authorities that will receive free advertising - this reflected recognition of the good work going on locally, and an acknowledgement of the number of referrals coming into the system. This campaign will also have significant presence on the SLSCB website. <p>DP commented that Social Care demand had been a particular issue since he had become SLSCB Chair, and the concerns raised were clearly not dissipating. As such, was there a longer-term strategy around supply and demand? RB stated that although a lot of work is ongoing in relation to early help/early intervention, a number of referrals coming into Social Care were at the higher/more complex end of the safeguarding spectrum. In addition, Social Worker recruitment and retention issues, raised in previous Board meetings, continue to contribute to the overall challenges.</p> <p>Regarding the work around early help, AM noted that any positive effects of this endeavour may not be seen for some time - however, it should not stop the Local Authority from concentrating on this aspect. DP supported this view, with prevention being better than cure, and advised that the Tees Performance Management Framework (PMF) Quarter 3 data (October - December 2016) will soon be available for analysis - a significant amount of time will be allocated at a future Board meeting to go through this. It was also noted that</p>

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
	<p>in Middlesbrough, data has shown that most young people on a CP plan never touched early help.</p> <p>LB queried whether the recruitment video, demonstrated to Board members at the SLSCB meeting in December 2016, had made any impact in the efforts to recruit staff. RB felt it was difficult to verify the direct impact of the video, but reported that 12 applicants had been shortlisted for Social Worker posts recently, five of which were experienced professionals. AM added that the Local Authority uses the North East regional portal to advertise such vacancies, but that there is not a link to the recruitment video on this platform - this is being investigated with a view to getting it added. DP recognised that there was a lot of competition for Social Workers amongst all Local Authorities.</p> <p>TH questioned if the 10 unallocated cases were due to resource issues or caseload limitations. RB reported that this situation had occurred as a result of both, and that although a duty rota is in place, young people need consistency in their involvement with Social Workers. New Social Worker recruits will hopefully pick up CP cases, though there will be a delay in these staff coming into post - DP considered it a priority for these unallocated cases to be picked up as soon as the roles are filled.</p> <p>AM reflected on the 'A Fairer Start' presentation given at a recent Children and Young People's Partnership meeting, which raised concerns around communication. The SLSCB has previously discussed Operation Encompass information-sharing with Health, and as Chair of the 'A Fairer Start' Board, SR highlighted other basic concerns that had been identified, including the ability to access information across different agency systems. Partners need to be able to communicate in order to give the best possible service - having the appropriate software, and being able to access it, is crucial. AM added that some professionals can be risk-averse, which in turn can inhibit the sharing of important information. DP felt that the SLSCB need to be assured that information-sharing protocols are effective - SR noted that discussions going forward will look at how this issue is approached (e.g. parental consent - proactive consent, or via exclusion). SR to update the Board on the information-sharing protocols being developed within 'A Fairer Start'.</p> <p><u>Police</u></p> <p>AMS highlighted Operation Javelin (predominantly within Middlesbrough), looking at responses to historic CSE/child abuse, and noted the involvement of a number of victims and perpetrators. A recent trial in Middlesbrough saw guilty verdicts for all those put forward (sentencing will take place shortly), and this reflected the significant efforts of the Police team involved.</p> <p>The Police are currently struggling with demands on services, and resultant backlogs are impacting on the supply of information to partners. Domestic abuse referrals are reviewed every 24 hours, and AMS gave assurance that none of the high-risk cases will be missed - it was also noted that a Harbour worker is now situated in the office to provide specialist support. A long-term plan is being devised to address the current demands and the subsequent effect on resources.</p> <p>Police attendance at Strategy meetings has increased significantly, and is now consistently over 90% - live investigations into child abuse have risen as a knock-on effect. Work to review how this is managed is ongoing, and updates can be provided at the next Board meeting in March 2017.</p> <p>In terms of Operation Encompass, one staff member has been picking up all related work across both Stockton and Hartlepool (another worker has been off sick). Notifications are still being done on a daily basis, though the impact on the welfare of staff is an issue. The Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Children's Hub model is not yet right and will need to be reviewed - this will also look at the sharing of information with Health as well as with</p>

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues
	<p>schools. TH noted that a lengthy multi-disciplinary meeting took place recently which looked at system duplication and how information is shared with Health.</p> <p>Referring back to the challenges around demand, particularly in relation to domestic abuse, JN queried where the Board stood regarding the re-commissioning of services - do the current services work, or can/should partners be doing more around prevention. DP stated that the Board's remit here was to examine the respective strategy and its impact on young people, not do the work itself. MG, as the Chair of the Domestic Abuse Steering Group, gave a domestic abuse presentation at the last Board meeting in January 2017, and partners will need to challenge the effectiveness of the work being undertaken - this remains a huge issue which is difficult to address. AM added that the Children's Commissioning Board is reviewing the Harbour contract, and that concerns have been raised regarding the lack of success of the perpetrator programme. DP concluded that if agencies can positively address domestic abuse, mental health and substance misuse, this will help alleviate the pressures for all partners.</p> <p><u>Thirteen (Housing Provider)</u></p> <p>JM advised that external consultants were being brought in to look at Thirteen's safeguarding policies and procedures, and that recommendations should be available soon (these will be shared with the SLSCB).</p> <p>SR attended a Safer Stockton Partnership (SSP) meeting yesterday, and queried if communications took place outside Thirteen in relation to the sharing of good safeguarding practice. JM stated that a specific post in Thirteen's governance team had been proposed to pull such information together and disseminate accordingly.</p> <p>On a wider note, DP asked if SLSCB partners were confident that private sector landlords understood their safeguarding obligations. JE stated that it is difficult for the Local Authority to know who these people are, but that a system has been encouraged where private landlords notify SBC of their status. Safeguarding reports/assessments are automatically undertaken, and a landlord accreditation scheme is in place - landlord newsletters also go out, but the Local Authority only knows what it knows.</p> <p>DP questioned what the difference was between a private landlord and anyone else living in accommodation with children - are the usual safeguarding mechanisms to assess/identify issues relied upon, and is there a need to elevate private sector considerations at the SLSCB? Partners should be assured that universal/general services are able to identify problems, and any escalation of concerns needs to be evidence-led. JE commented that the private sector was the biggest growing sector nationally, and that the Government appeared to be moving away from home ownership, and was instead encouraging renting - however, LC noted the changes in regulations which may lead to a loss of private landlords, which in turn may increase housing problems. Regarding some landlords, AM queried how it is possible to get people who do not look after their property to care about those living inside the property - PB reflected on the importance of the DfE 'Together we can tackle child abuse' campaign, and the onus it puts on everybody to consider issues around safeguarding, including responsibilities to report and remove myths. The Board agreed that, at this time, there was no evidence requiring private landlords to be treated differently with regard to safeguarding messages that are focused to all.</p> <p><u>Lay Members</u></p> <p>LC notified the SLSCB that Stockton had been chosen as one of only four areas nationally to host a 'Hidden' exhibition (details of which were circulated to Board members yesterday) at the ARC. A permanent display will be on show, with some young people from Stockton included on the visuals. An opening presentation (by invitation only) is taking place on Thursday 2nd March 2017, and the subsequent display is open to everyone from Friday 3rd March 2017 to Saturday 11th March 2017 (10.00am – 5.00pm).</p>

Ref No. 4	Organisation / Partnership Safeguarding Issues			
	<p><u>NHS England</u> DC highlighted the role of NHS England in seeking assurances of Health commissioners and providers, and asked if the SLSCB would be interested in such assurance information on safeguarding (e.g. Pharmacists and Dentistry). Another key area of work involves making systems work across the Health spectrum - this used to be facilitated through the provision of finance, but now only occurs via the supply of resources (DC drew attention to an app which he would forward to PB for circulation to Board members). Also, a national safeguarding conference (Commissioning for a contemporary safeguarding system) is taking place in London on the 21st April 2017 - both DC and TH are scheduled to attend. A subsequent presentation to a future Board meeting around the role of NHS England and CCGs with regards safeguarding was suggested.</p> <p>Noting the ongoing winter pressures for Health, LC queried whether there was an issue regarding the cancellation of operations for children, as this could have a significant impact on their safeguarding (reference was made to the SCR Harry case in relation to missed appointments). TH advised that during a recent NTHFT meeting, such an issue was not brought up, though this could be checked out further if required. Should an operation be cancelled, risk assessments are carried out.</p> <p>Reflecting on the wider Health arena, SR felt that it was important for the likes of Pharmacists and Dentistry to fully understand that they are part of the safeguarding network in Stockton - DP considered whether this could be done in conjunction with the CCG to get the whole picture (providers and commissioners), with DC adding that such work would benefit from the Board understanding the Health landscape first. DWr expressed surprise that this was being raised, as surely any professional who comes into contact with children should have safeguarding at the forefront of their mind. DP understood this view, though noted the low number of referrals from GPs regarding domestic abuse in the past - it could be dangerous to assume that all professionals think in such a way.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	Updates noted.			
Log Ref	Mtg Date	Action Required	Person Responsible	Due Date
57/02/1617	16.02.17	Update the SLSCB on the information-sharing protocols being developed within 'A Fairer Start'.	SR	16.03.17
58/02/1617	16.02.17	Update the SLSCB with regards the status of live Police investigations into child abuse.	AMS	16.03.17
59/02/1617	16.02.17	Forward PB the link to the NHS England app for circulation to SLSCB members.	DC/PB	24.02.17
60/02/1617	16.02.17	Give a presentation to the SLSCB on the role of NHS England and CCGs regarding safeguarding.	TH/DC	11.05.17
61/02/1617	16.02.17	Check with NTHFT regarding any issues around the cancellation of operations for children.	TH	16.03.17

Minutes / Updates / Outcomes from Meetings

Ref No. 5	SBC CYP Select Committee Review of SLSCB			
Discussion	<p>CC and JT were in attendance to present the circulated <i>Children and Young People Select Committee: Scrutiny Review of Stockton Local Safeguarding Children's Board (January 2017)</i> report. The main aim was to provide a rigorous and independent review to enable an assessment of the progress made by SLSCB to date, and determine whether any additional actions are necessary in order to meet Ofsted criteria.</p> <p><i>Key Lines of Enquiry</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the outgoing Chair's view about the effectiveness of the Board? 			

Ref No. 5	SBC CYP Select Committee Review of SLSCB
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do Peer Reviews tell us about the effectiveness of the Board? • How is the LSCB held to account? • 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? • How effective is the LSCB Local Learning and Improvement Framework in sharing lessons from experience and driving service quality and development? • 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? • What information does the Board received in order to meet its statutory duties? • How is disagreement/ professional challenge resolved? • How do we ensure that all partners' procedures are in place? • Are Governance structures fit for purpose? • How does the Board deal with serious case reviews? • How does the Board oversee early help services? • What difference has the Board made? • Why have we got four LSCBs across Tees? • How is the Board financed? • What interface does the Board have with other Boards? • What do Ofsted judgements tell us about best practice? • What does success look like? <p><i>Recommendations</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 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. 2) 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. 3) Continue to identify ways to encourage all partner agencies to play a more active role in discussions, including varying the format of meetings. 4) Provide training for SLSCB members to ensure that they have the skills to fulfil their roles, especially around assurance roles. 5) Assure itself that it has responded to the Ofsted recommendations. <p>In light of the review's observation of Durham LSCB (graded 'good' by Ofsted), TH asked whether the SLSCB and Durham LSCB appeared to operate in a similar manner. JT stated that Durham's Board meetings had a lot of members present, who were expected to read all information prior to meetings. However, the SLSCB had a calmer environment, where more effort was made to engage everyone. Also, due to venue constraints, Durham's Board was not conducive to undertaking group work - it is much easier to employ this format in Stockton.</p> <p>SR referred to the first recommendation regarding the Wood review, noting that this is a contentious issue, and sought clarity around what was expected of the SLSCB here. JT felt this was about looking at different ways of working, and balancing between what is done locally, and what is carried out across Tees - it is more a principle of working than specifics.</p> <p>DP considered this review a timely publication in light of the later agenda item around SLSCB effectiveness (see agenda item 9), and expressed gratitude to all those involved in the review which will help inform the work of the Board. DP thanked CC and JT for their presentation and subsequent comments.</p>

Ref No. 5	SBC CYP Select Committee Review of SLSCB
Agreement/ Outcome	CYP Select Committee Scrutiny Review of SLSCB report noted, and recommendations for the Board acknowledged.

Ref No. 6	SLSCB LIPSG – Babies Summary
Discussion	<p>TH, as Vice-Chair of the SLSCB Learning and Improving Practice Sub-Group (LIPSG), gave an overview of the circulated <i>North East LSCBs Proforma for Review Feedback (Learning / SCR)</i> paper regarding Co-Sleeping and Alcohol Use (Learning Review).</p> <p><i>Case Summary</i></p> <p>In April, and then August 2016, LIPSG were asked to consider two cases for SCR following the deaths of two infants, where possible issues of co-sleeping and alcohol intoxication were a factor. Both cases involved lengthy discussions and the consideration of several learning points recommended by the SLSCB Chair.</p> <p>LIPSG panel members considered :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is co-sleeping (generally) sufficient to suspect neglect? 2) Is co-sleeping when drunk sufficient to suspect neglect? 3) When is the threshold met to suspect a parent of neglect? <p>Members felt that co-sleeping per se could not be considered neglectful. In this case, whilst co-sleeping when clearly intoxicated could be considered reckless enough to suspect neglect, there was insufficient evidence to suggest that mother was intoxicated on the night of the death. In both cases, evidence of co-sleeping was equivocal, and in neither case could the cause of death be definitively attributed to abuse or neglect. Neither case demonstrated that agencies had not worked together or that there had been any critical lack of information-sharing between professionals.</p> <p>In light of this, members felt that there was insufficient evidence to suspect that either death was as a result of neglect, and recommended that neither case met the criteria for SCR, although some lessons were identified. Key messages arising from these cases included that the vulnerability of babies needs to be considered at all times by agencies, and that the impact of substance misuse on children and families is a rising cause of concern, and needs to be taken into account during assessment and investigations.</p> <p><i>Key Points of Learning</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ante-natal Team Around Family (TAF) meetings can be useful, and therefore need to be considered at the earliest opportunity. 2) Assessments of wider family members involved in support of a mother/child should be carried out, including consideration on whether their involvement would be a positive/negative influence. 3) Police blood tests post-death need to be carried out as soon as possible. This should be a matter of routine for Police Officers, even if no-one says anything regarding alcohol. <p>Reflecting on the LIPSG findings, DWr queried how being in charge of a child when drunk could not be considered neglect - TH re-iterated that in these cases, the levels of intoxication were not proven, and AMS added that neither case appeared suspicious. In terms of procedures around taking blood tests, AMS stated that Police Officers feel uneasy requesting these when a parent is in the very early stages of grieving - however, it has been recognised as an issue, and training has been undertaken with those staff who are on-call and attend premises following a child death. It remains a complex situation that has been addressed and will be reviewed.</p> <p>Mindful that two similar cases had occurred, DP queried what universal services (Health Visitors, Midwives, etc.) were doing to address the issue of co-sleeping - is the Board assured that educative programmes are taking place? TH advised that both Midwives and</p>

Ref No. 6	SLSCB LIPSG – Babies Summary
	<p>Health Visitors discuss safe sleeping with parents, and give advice on the guidelines for babies sleeping in cots - however, some parents prefer to sometimes co-sleep, despite the advice being not to. PB noted the SLSCBs support of the Lullaby Trust (safe sleeping campaign), and emphasised that the message from LSCBs is that co-sleeping is not safe - DP felt these cases showed there was no such thing as safe co-sleeping.</p> <p>PB requested permission to share this paper with other LSCBs in the region for the purposes of wider learning - this was agreed. SR asked if this could also be shared outside of the usual safeguarding networks (e.g. Lifeline) - PB stated that Board members can share such information within their own networks as it is not person-identifiable.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB LIPSG - Babies Summary paper noted and discussed, including the key messages and key points of learning arising from the cases. Agreement that this summary can be shared with other regional LSCBs and within Board members' networks.

Ref No. 7	Health & Wellbeing Board
Discussion	<p>DP advised that the SLSCB Annual Report 2015-2016 was recently presented to the Health & Wellbeing Board (HWB) and was well received. The focus of the presentation was on the future rather than the past, with SLSCB priorities and addressing the elements of neglect highlighted.</p> <p>Subsequent discussions emphasised the need to ensure that functions are not duplicated - those professionals who are members of both the SLSCB and HWB have a key role in this. There was also a clear desire for the SLSCB and HWB to work together in achieving agreed outcomes.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	Update noted.

EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE

Ref No. 8	Business Plan and Future Arrangements
Discussion	<p>With reference to the circulated <i>SLSCB Business Plan 2016-2018</i>, DP drew attention to the three agreed Board priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>Preventing Harm</u>: The root causes of neglect (with a focus on domestic abuse, drugs and alcohol, and parental mental health) are tackled. 2) <u>Protecting Vulnerable Children</u>: The risks of children and young people who are VEMT, or are at risk of being VEMT, are reduced. CSE structures are in place and work well, but need to be continually reviewed. 3) <u>Business Improvement</u>: If the Board is not effective, the first two priorities (above) will not be sufficiently addressed. MG was commended for his work in composing the aide memoir (SLSCB assurance role) that Board members now have access to at each SLSCB meeting. Development of Board structures is moving forward - the Executive Group starts in April 2017, and this will aid the prioritisation of Board activity, pull together the Chair's of all the Board sub-groups, and provide a shadow function for the Wood Review. Aided by the Tees Performance Management Framework, it is the discussions between agencies which will add value to this data. <p>DP expressed gratitude to SR and the SLSCB Review Team for their work on the Business Improvement priority.</p>
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB Business Plan 2016-2018, including the three agreed Board priorities, noted.

Ref No. 9	Review of SLSCB Effectiveness														
Discussion	<p>In his capacity as SLSCB Vice-Chair, SR gave a presentation titled <i>Stockton Local Safeguarding Children Board: Effectiveness & Efficiency Review</i>. Commending the progress made since DP assumed the role of SLSCB Chair, including the change of culture that has strengthened Board members' ability and confidence in seeking assurances across all agencies, key elements of the presentation (along with associated comments) were recorded as follows:</p> <p><i>Scope & Purpose of Review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure Board members individually and collectively have a clear understanding of their role and the function of the Board. • To move the culture of the Board to an assurance role rather than a service reporting function. • To identify good practice in terms of Board behaviours and knowledge and to recommend training and development that may be need to further equip Board members. • To further explore how the voice of the child can be heard in Board discussions and priority setting (good practice is evident in reports/updates presented to the SLSCB, but do we hear the voice of the child as a Board?). • To review the function and practice of the Board sub-groups (including potential sharing with other LSCB sub-groups). <p><i>The Review Team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR (Chair), JB, TH, AMS, JN, DWr and PB. <p><i>Timetable</i></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>• December 2016</td> <td>Chair of review invites participants.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 31st January 2017</td> <td>First meeting to scope lines of enquiry and evidence sought/methodology.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 16 February</td> <td>SLSCB workshop/discussion.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• February-March</td> <td>Refining understanding/undertaking research/identifying actions to improve.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 1st week April</td> <td>Long session to agree recommendations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• 15th April</td> <td>SLSCB Chair receives draft report.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• End April</td> <td>Report completed.</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Key Lines of Enquiry (1-3)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a shared purpose and agreed priorities? What are they? What is the role of Board members in setting them? Is there a hierarchy? • Is the voice of the child being heard at the Board? • Does the Board take on the role of assuring that safeguarding practice is improving across all services? <i>"How do we know what we talk about ends up on the street?"</i> <p>SR spoke about Board members 'wearing' the SLSCB badge - may need to consider bringing an appropriate colleague from their own agency to SLSCB meetings, as Board members are in attendance as Board people.</p> <p><i>Key Lines of Enquiry (4-6)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effectively does the Board work together? Do all members have opportunity to contribute, challenge, be held accountable, reflect and be appraised? • Are the sub-groups effective in driving the practice and culture of the Board? Are they empowering the Board? Could they merge with Hartlepool (not to be discussed today, but needs consideration in the future)? • Is there clear evidence of a learning culture that is evidence-based and drives the formal training & development of Board members? Are we being proactive enough? 	• December 2016	Chair of review invites participants.	• 31 st January 2017	First meeting to scope lines of enquiry and evidence sought/methodology.	• 16 February	SLSCB workshop/discussion.	• February-March	Refining understanding/undertaking research/identifying actions to improve.	• 1 st week April	Long session to agree recommendations.	• 15 th April	SLSCB Chair receives draft report.	• End April	Report completed.
• December 2016	Chair of review invites participants.														
• 31 st January 2017	First meeting to scope lines of enquiry and evidence sought/methodology.														
• 16 February	SLSCB workshop/discussion.														
• February-March	Refining understanding/undertaking research/identifying actions to improve.														
• 1 st week April	Long session to agree recommendations.														
• 15 th April	SLSCB Chair receives draft report.														
• End April	Report completed.														

Ref No. 9	Review of SLSCB Effectiveness																											
	<p><i>Key Lines of Enquiry (7-8)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there strong leadership and co-ordination? • How effective is the Board in communicating and being accountable to external bodies and partners? Other LSCBs? (Should there be closer links across Hartlepool/Tees?) <p>AM questioned the level of public knowledge of the SLSCB, and it was agreed that the level of LSCB knowledge and understanding was an issue across many places. DP felt that a more pressing concern was ensuring that the Board works as effectively as possible before the focus moves externally - the Board only has so much capacity, and needs to address its identified priorities (e.g. capturing the voice of the child is more crucial than raising public awareness of the SLSCB).</p> <p>Working in the following groups, Board members were asked to consider the <i>Key Lines of Enquiry (1-3)</i> (note: before this group discussion proceeded, DP left the meeting room so that Board members could comment on the role of SLSCB Chair if desired):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="292 712 1484 824"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="292 712 890 745"><i>Group 1</i></th> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="898 712 1484 745"><i>Group 2</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 745 435 779">PB</td> <td data-bbox="443 745 587 779">DWr</td> <td data-bbox="595 745 738 779">AM</td> <td data-bbox="746 745 890 779">SR</td> <td data-bbox="898 745 1042 779">LC</td> <td data-bbox="1050 745 1193 779">AMS</td> <td data-bbox="1201 745 1345 779">DC</td> <td data-bbox="1353 745 1484 779">CA</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 779 435 813">LB</td> <td data-bbox="443 779 587 813">RB</td> <td data-bbox="595 779 738 813">JM</td> <td></td> <td data-bbox="898 779 1042 813">JE</td> <td data-bbox="1050 779 1193 813">TH</td> <td data-bbox="1201 779 1345 813">JN</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Following lengthy discussions, both groups provided feedback on the key lines of enquiry identified - SR will feed these comments into a set of questions which the Review Team members will use for the proposed 1:1 meetings with each Board member (which will form part of the review's refining understanding and undertaking research process). A formal report will ultimately be brought to a future SLSCB meeting for consideration.</p> <p>SR thanked all Board members for their contributions to the group discussions.</p>				<i>Group 1</i>				<i>Group 2</i>				PB	DWr	AM	SR	LC	AMS	DC	CA	LB	RB	JM		JE	TH	JN	
<i>Group 1</i>				<i>Group 2</i>																								
PB	DWr	AM	SR	LC	AMS	DC	CA																					
LB	RB	JM		JE	TH	JN																						
Agreement/ Outcome	SLSCB Effectiveness & Efficiency Review noted, with group discussions on the identified key lines of enquiry (1-3). Feedback to be used in the formulation of questions for subsequent Board member 1:1 meetings with a member of the SLSCB Review Team.																											
Log Ref	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>																								
62/02/1617	16.02.17	Group feedback following discussions on the SLSCB Effectiveness & Efficiency Review key lines of enquiry (1-3) to be fed into a set of questions to be used for the subsequent 1:1s with Board members.	SR	03.03.17																								

ENABLING CHANGE

Ref No. 10	Actions, Impact, Evidence & Difference			
Discussion	<p>Comments made in relation to this agenda item since the October 2016 Board meeting had been circulated for information. DP asked 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"> • LC: Organisation/Partnership updates - good degree of discussion, questioning and challenge. • TH: SLSCB effectiveness discussions provided good food for thought - similar themes cropping up. <p>DP acknowledged that this meeting had been somewhat of a pseudo-Development Day in light of the concentrated discussions around the review of SLSCB effectiveness.</p>			
Agreement/ Outcome	Noted.			

OTHER

Ref No. 11	Any Other Business			
<i>Discussion</i>	<p><u>Police Invitation</u> In order to increase knowledge and understanding across SLSCB partners, AMS invited Board members to come along to the PVP (Protecting Vulnerable People) Team within Cleveland Police and ask questions of the practitioners - small group (rather than individual) visits would be preferential. AMS to provide PB some potential dates for visits - PB to then email Board members regarding expressions of interest (responses to be co-ordinated with AMS).</p> <p>On a similar theme, SR noted the recent SLSCB Lay Member visit to Barnardo's which LB undertook. LB reported that it was very interesting to see the facilities, gain an understanding of the numbers involved with Barnardo's and the referral process, and hear views on funding issues/concerns - much of this feeds into the discussions within SLSCB meetings.</p> <p>AM added that a number of Board members had now visited the Hartlepool and Stockton-on-Tees Children's Hub, which had proved a good opportunity to increase knowledge of the Hub's structure and operation. A Hub report will need to be submitted to a future SLSCB meeting.</p> <p><u>Board Member ICPC/RCPC Attendance</u> DP reminded Board members of the requirement to attend at least one ICPC (Initial Child Protection Conference) or RCPC (Review Child Protection Conference) meeting per year. Arrangements for this should be made via PB - it was noted that ICPC meetings are usually held on Tuesday's and Thursday's, with RCPC meetings scheduled for the remaining weekdays.</p> <p><u>Child Protection Information Service</u> TH highlighted the Child Protection - Information Sharing (CP-IS) system, and those children who attend unscheduled care settings - dialogue will take place with CPIS, along with Local Authority representatives, regarding its implementation. DC commented that enablement funding may be available in relation to this.</p> <p><u>Disrespect Nobody Campaign</u> TH drew attention to the 'Disrespect NoBody' campaign which will soon be promoted on TV. Information on this campaign was included on the latest SLSCB email bulletin - specific links were provided for Board members to circulate within their own organisations.</p>			
<i>Agreement/ Outcome</i>	Noted.			
<i>Log Ref</i>	<i>Mtg Date</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
63/02/1617	16.02.17	Provide PB with some potential dates for Board members to visit the PVP Team within Cleveland Police.	AMS	02.03.16
64/02/1617	16.02.17	Email Board members regarding interest in visiting the PVP Team within Cleveland Police, and co-ordinate responses with AMS .	PB	16.03.16