



Leeds Safeguarding Children Board Monday 21 March 2011, Leeds Art Gallery

Present

Jane Held	Chair of LSCB
Philomena Corrigan	Director of Commissioning, NHS Leeds (Vice Chair)
Nigel Richardson	Director of Children's Services
Jackie Wilson	Chief Officer, Children and Young People's Social Care (Chair of Policy and Procedures Sub Group)
Chief Supt Richard Jackson	Divisional Commander, West Yorkshire Police
Maggie Smith	Deputy Head of Service, Leeds Youth Offending Service
Dennis Holmes	Adult Safeguarding Board, Adult Social Care
Dr Chris Buller	Named Psychiatrist, Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust
Sam Prince	Acting Managing Director, NHS Leeds Community Health Care (Chair of Performance Sub Group)
Christina Fairhead	NHS Leeds (representing Diane Hampshire)
Sally Threlfall	Chief Officer, Early Years and Integrated Youth Support
Jill Asbury	Divisional Nurse Manager, Leeds Teaching Hospitals
Sharon Yellin	NHS Leeds, (Chair of CDOP)
Stephanie Richardson	Wetherby Young Offenders Institute
Andy Carter	Head of Communications, LCC (Chair of Communications task and finish group)
Gillian Mayfield	Head of Business Development, Community Safety
Angela Maguire	Assistant Director, NSPCC
Barry Graham	Chief Executive, Browning House (Chair Third Section Reference Group)
Claire MacDonald	Leeds City College (co-opted member representing FE Sector)

In attendance

Bryan Gocke	LSCB manager
Sheila Hall	Assistant LSCB manager
Martyn Stenton	Governance and Partnerships Lead, Children's Services
David Ashcroft	Performance Management Consultant
Matthew Orton (item 9)	Safeguarding Standards Manager, Children's Services
Pat Toner	Director of Organisational Improvement, Education Leeds (representing David Dickenson)
Rebecca Suaznabar	Children's Services (minutes)

Apologies

Clr Judith Blake	Executive Lead Member for Children's Services
Martin Fleetwood	Chair of Headteacher Forum, Temple Moor High School
Sally Boulton	Chair of Primary Headteacher Forum, Haigh Road Infant
Mick Mills	Head of Residence, Wetherby Young Offenders Institute
Steve Boorman	Section Head Social Care, Legal Services (Professional Advisor)
Deborah Lightfoot	Interim head of Safeguarding and Review
Diane Hampshire	NHS Leeds, Designated Nurse, Safeguarding
Kevin Ball	Operations Manager (West Yorkshire Probation) (Chair of Learning and Development Sub Group)

Not present

Dr Chris Hobbs

Designated Doctor, Safeguarding

Item

1.0 Welcome and introductions

Jane Held welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Andy Carter as a new member of the Board. Andy Carter will be chairing the Communications task and finish group. Jane also welcomed Clare MacDonald from Leeds City College representing the F.E. sector. The Board agreed to formally co-opt Clare until her seat on the board is formalised when the governance arrangements are reviewed.

2.0 Minutes and Matters arising of the last meeting on 21.01.11

2.1 The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record with the following amendments.

2.2 David Ashcroft was present at the meeting and apologies were noted from Sharon Yellin and Diane Hampshire

2.3 Item 5.0 – Integrated Safeguarding Unit. As Deborah Lightfoot was unable to attend the meeting Jane Held updated the Board on progress to date. Deborah has managed to interview almost all members of the Board and has found the process very helpful in establishing a way forward. The support for using resources collectively has been overwhelming, but concerns are shared by many partners about the 'how'. A discussion took place about some of those concerns.

2.4 The Board noted that the recruitment for the 'head of safeguarding' post will commence shortly, and members of the LSCB executive group will be invited to sit on the interview panel. There will also be a children's panel as part of the process. Dates will be shared with the Board when confirmed.

2.5 It was agreed that the second phase of establishing the ISU would need to ensure it fully involved the Board, and allowed them to influence and contribute to the design and detail to ensure ownership, transparency and clarity about the multi-agency nature of the LSCB division of the integrated unit.

3.0 Key points from the Executive group

3.1 The Board noted the minutes and summary paper from the Executive group.

4.0 Action tracker

4.1 The Board discussed the action tracker. The action to delay the review of approaches to SCRs and LLRs until after the Munro Review was raised. Pat Toner suggests that work around methodology for LLRs could be done separately to SCRs and without delay as we should not be trying to replicate the SCR method. This was generally agreed.

4.2 Sheila Hall updated the Board that the LSCB Business Support Unit is proposing to look in detail at the methodology used by SCIE.

- 4.3 David Ashcroft indicated that he is currently working with other safeguarding boards which have undertaken reviews of their LLR methodology, ensuring learning is captured and there is rigor. He added that he is happy to make this learning available on a confidential basis.

Action

- 4.4 David Ashcroft to share learning with SCR Panel,
- 4.5 Learning from SCIE methodology to be shared by LSCB Business Support Unit.
- 4.6 Revised LLR procedures to go to Policy and Procedure subgroup when finalised.

5.0 Issues and decisions from subgroups

- 5.1 The paper was noted.
- 5.2 Sharon Yellin drew the Board's attention to paragraph 7.2 of the update from the policy and procedures subgroup. She clarified that the multi agency protocol being developed is specifically related to sexual abuse medicals.

6.0 LSCB Business support team structure and budget 2011/12

- 6.1 Bryan Gocke introduced this report which sets out the Executive group's recommendations about the new structure of the LSCB Business Support Unit, a draft budget and a funding formula. In addition there is also a report providing an overview of in-kind contributions from partners. The two reports together set the context for a discussion about the Boards' budget, and the infrastructure for the Business Unit.
- 6.2 The report sets out proposals for an enhanced business support structure with increased focus on the Board's key functions. It identifies a base budget that is based on the new structure, and proposes that a commissioning budget of £50k is also set up. In addition it proposes that additional audit capacity is provided by seconding a member of staff from one of the partners for a period of 6 months at a time.
- 6.3 The report proposes a formula for partner contributions of 60% local authority, 30% health and 10% other partners. This does not include any of the 'in kind contributions' in the additional report.
- 6.4 Jane thanked all partners for their contributions to this latter piece of work which has given real transparency for the total effort supporting the LSCB. She suggested that any partners wishing to do further work on their contributions finish this work. The latter is an incomplete piece of work and when all in-kind contributions are refined and submitted the Business Support Unit will compile a summary.
- 6.5 Jane also extended thanks to Richard Jackson for the very significant uplift in contributions from WY Police. Bryan informed the Board that Probation will be also be providing an uplift in contributions. There may still, however, be a shortfall in the 10% element of the formula which may need to come back to the Board mid-year for budget adjustments. Jane also noted that any use of the £50k commissioning budget will be subject to properly costed business proposals. If the commissioning budget is used up, any new proposals for commissioned work will need to come to

the board for approval and agreement on additional funding from partners on the formula basis.

- 6.6 Phil Corrigan suggested that when put together it is clear the amount of money being spent by the Board in cash or in kind is very significant. She reminded the Board that it should make efforts to challenge itself continually to be more effective and efficient in order to justify itself to the public.
- 6.7 Nigel Richardson highlighted that there is a difference between the Board itself and the broad spread of what it co-ordinates, commissions and does. Continuing to be transparent and focussed on better outcomes for parents and families will ensure that it uses investment wisely and generates confidence in its work. The test will come when the structure of the Business support Unit is in place and there is better capacity and evidence on which to base decisions about the Board's effectiveness.
- 6.8 Sharon Yellin raised concerns that there still appears to be a gap in the structure in terms of audit capacity. It is imperative we ensure agencies are prioritising multi agency audits as well as looking at their single agency activity. Jackie Wilson explained that this reflects the discussions at the Executive meeting. She said that the new structure allows for the LSCB to have flexibility of input from partners so they can tailor what the Board wants to examine, by seconding particular individuals. Nigel Richardson commented that a review process will be built into the structure to ensure it is working.
- 6.9 Dennis Holmes explained to the Board that this structure reads well across to the Adult Safeguarding Board, who have a similar contribution formula, and a commissioning budget.

Action

- 6.10 The Board agreed the base budget and requested that Jane Held writes to all partner agency chief officers notifying them of the agreement, the contribution from their agency and funding formula on which that contribution is based and invoices them accordingly.
- 6.11 The Board agreed the establishment of a £50,000 commissioning budget.
- 6.12 That all expenditure from the commissioning budget will be subject to proper business proposals
- 6.13 The Board agreed with the proposed restructure of the LSCB support team and for recruitment to begin ASAP.
- 6.14 The Board agreed in principal the secondment arrangements to increase audit capacity.
- 6.15 The Performance Management subgroup will develop a set of proposals regarding the annual audit plan as part of the Performance Management System for 2011/12.

7.0 Child Death Overview Panel report

- 7.1 Sharon Yellin introduced this report as Chair of CDOP. She gave the background to the CDOP in Leeds. There is a large backlog of cases for review from 2009/10 but the panel is working hard to overcome this.
- 7.2 Cases have been held up for a number of reasons. Issues within the BU administrative team have been largely overcome. The biggest barrier is the length of time it takes for agencies to return pro-formas. There are also cases that get held up by the coronial process.
- 7.3 Sharon clarified for the Board that this process is retrospective and is primarily a public health intervention. There are other systems in place to deal with the immediate circumstances of a child's death and to manage the sensitivities of unexpected bereavement for a family including the

Rapid Response Service. Sharon also explained to the Board that the process for completing the forms is not a SMART process, and although the forms are very similar to the SUDIC (Sudden Unexpected Death In Childhood) form they cannot be turned into one form.

7.4 A discussion took place about the whole CDOP process, its value in terms of informing the Board and Leeds about trends or areas for anxiety in terms of child deaths and its complex and rather bureaucratic centrally prescribed processes. These are currently statutory but it is possible it could be simplified. A debate about whether Leeds could argue for a pilot approach designed locally with DfE (given the current political approach to reducing burdens) took place.

7.5 Jane Held thanked Sharon Yellin and everyone who contributed to the report on behalf of the Board.

7.6 **Action**

7.7 The Board agreed to formally receive the report and noted and agreed the recommendations. Sharon Yellin was asked to prepare a version of the report without the recommendations for publication on the LSCB website.

7.8 Jane Held to monitor progress in reducing the backlog with Sharon Yellin on behalf of CDOP on a quarterly basis and report back to the Board.

7.9 Jane Held and Sharon Yellin to consider whether to argue for a review of the process and to take these conversations nationally.

7.10 The report to be presented to Children's Trust Board and Community Safety Board for information.

8.0 **Conclusion of current LSCB task groups**

8.1 Bryan Gocke explained that the report proposed the end of four task and finish groups. They have undertaken important work, and laid strong foundations but the majority of their ongoing responsibilities will be subsumed into the work of the ISU.

8.2 Jane Held noted that there is an ongoing issue for the Board in terms of its relationship with the criminal justice system, aside from relationships with members of the Board. Jackie Wilson explained that the Safer Leeds Board is currently having conversations around families heavily involved in crime and the impact on children. Jackie Wilson also noted that the trafficking of children is a gap and needs to be included in the recommendations. A joint discussion about the overlap between safeguarding children and children in the criminal justice system needs to continue between partners and options for improving co-ordination presented to the Board in July.

8.3 The Board raised some concerns about the rationale for ending the task groups. Jane Held stressed the importance of ensuring that task and finish groups do come to an end so that effort and focus can be re-channelled. Bryan Gocke also explained that only two of the groups were able to fulfil their aims, and the others did not have the appropriate level of support and so achieved far less.

8.4 Jane Held extended her thanks on behalf of the Board to the subgroups for their work to date.

Action

8.5 The Board agreed to end the four task groups.

- 8.6 The work of the task groups will be included in that of the sub groups as indicated in the paper.
- 8.7 An E-Safety Champion is to be sought from the Board when a person spec. is further developed by Bryan Gocke.
- 8.8 Richard Jackson will liaise with Safer Leeds about progressing safeguarding issues identified for children and young people within the Criminal Justice System
- 8.9 Consideration must still be given to child trafficking and the executive shall decide where this work should be located.
- 8.10 Options for improving co-ordination between the LSCB and the Safer Leeds partnership to be presented to the Board in July as part of the wider governance review process
- 9.0 Safeguarding responsibilities for commissioners**
- 9.1 Matthew Orton introduced on behalf of Sarah Sinclair a report setting out how the Local Authority are progressing their safeguarding requirements within their commissioning and contracting processes. This process includes requirements that contracted suppliers undertake a S11 Self Assessment annually.
- 9.2 As part of the new process a monitoring framework has been introduced. Contract officers carry out a monitoring visit annually.
- 9.3 Barry Graham raised a concern that whilst he agrees with the need to ensure commissioning and contracting includes a safeguarding requirement he has seen a similar but less complex approach recently which has been developed nationally through the Safe Network which offers support to services to improve. This other type of approach is really helpful for the voluntary sector particularly for small organisations.
- 9.4 Jane Held said that a strong protocol for commissioners to use in contracting with service providers including the third sector was very important. She recognised that the trend will increasingly be towards a commissioning and contracting approach to the provision of public services. She suggested that the S11 process could also contribute to a strong commissioning and contracting culture and inform commissioners about safeguarding practice in their contracts.
- 9.5 She felt that it was important that the LSCB satisfied itself that each partner agency was using S11 properly in its commissioning activity, and that each partner needed to be satisfied they had suitable commissioning and contracting protocols with clear LSCB sponsored standards for safeguarding practice by contractors. She suggested the LSCB needed to ensure it had developed clear standards for all to apply, particularly with regard to safe workforces.
- 9.6 Matthew Orton explained that the S11 arrangements are a statutory requirement as set out in Working Together to Safeguard Children. Over the past 3 years the LSCB has undertaken a self assessment audit programme which needs a monitoring element as part of contract compliance.
- 9.7 Jackie Wilson suggested that the next phase of work may be to look at child exploitation in the production of goods and ensure all LA contracts use non-exploitative products. Matthew Orton offered to talk to Ian Dunne with regards to this.
- 9.8 Pat Toner informed the Board of recent work done by Education Leeds with regards to statutory services to schools, and the significant learning they have acquired from reassessing the statutory duties of the of the local authority towards schools as independent contractors that may contribute

to this work.

- 9.9 Sharon Yellin said that she thought that the concept of visiting all providers was unachievable. In the NHS the degree of scrutiny and monitoring of contractors differs between big and small providers, targeting where there are issues of concern to be investigated. Pat Toner highlighted that we need to make sure that we are supporting the Voluntary Sector and if Adult Social Care and NHS Leeds have a way of making it easier for smaller agencies than we need to re-examine how we do this.

Action

- 9.10 The Third Sector Reference group to look at how a proportionate approach to establishing safeguarding standards for contractors, and safeguarding protocols for commissioners might be developed, with input from Matthew Orton, Pat Toner and Sarah Sinclair. This work needs to be done in liaison with and incorporated into the Children's Trust Board commissioning and finance subgroup.
- 9.11 Sharon Yellin to send to Matthew Orton an example of the NHS method.
- 10.0 Strategic Plan 2011-15**
- 10.1 Bryan Gocke and David Ashcroft introduced this report. Since the last development session priority areas have been identified and now work is being undertaken with partners to agree the key objectives for action. The next step will be for the agreed priorities to be put together and allocated to each sub group, which will act as the specific programme Board for the delivery of those priorities, The sub-group chairs will be asked to develop the action plans designed to deliver their identified objectives. The overall priorities and detailed programme board actions will then be considered at another short development session
- 10.2 Jackie Wilson asked that the Board try and quantify the work that will be coming through the subgroups as there is a danger that they will not get through all this work. She felt that some of this work should be undertaken by the new LSCB Business Support Unit when it is established.
- 10.3 Jane Held agreed that the new structure includes 'project officers' who will 'do' as well as support work. Jane suggested that the challenge for the subgroups is to establish what actions are going to drive the priorities which will put the detail into the plan. The sub groups will in fact be responsible for rationing the amount of action they agree they will undertake, and then the project officers will ensure it is done
- 10.4 Martyn Stenton reminded the Board that the draft strategic plan will then need to go to the CTB for consultation and comment.

Action

- 10.5 All Board Members agreed the process set out from this point and agreed that sub groups will act as programme boards, supported by the LSCB Business Support Unit Project Officers working to detailed project delivery action plans. .
- 10.6 All agreed that the current short term LSCB business plan continues to be used to monitor LSCB activity until the full new 2011-2015 strategic plan is in place.

11.0 Quarter three performance report

- 11.1 Sam Prince presented the report from the performance subgroup. She highlighted the increase in demand for child protection intervention and that the figures are approaching 1000 children with child protection plans. Performance is currently being maintained, however there are concerns over how sustainable this is given the continuing increase in child protection activity.
- 11.2 The timescales for initial child protection conferences (ICPC's) are still being flagged up as a significant poor performance issue. The sub group has identified that school holidays are a major barrier, with significant difficulties being experienced in obtaining staff attendance from all agencies during these periods. As a result a significant proportion of ICPC's are delayed and so is the agreement of multi agency child protection plans.
- 11.3 Jackie Wilson pointed out that holding an initial conference within 15 days is not optional, nor is the expectation that certain partners actually attend. The LSCB needs to make this clear to partners.
- 11.4 Nigel Richardson raised the point that now we have better performance information to hand the Board needs to start asking the question, 'what do we do with it?' Jackie Wilson added that there are currently 968 child protection plans in Leeds, 1431 Looked After Children and 2000 open children in need cases. These cases need to be looked at so that thresholds can be better understood and strong multi-agency early intervention plans implemented or they will turn into child protection plans. She stressed that it is a however a good thing that child protection plan numbers are up as Leeds was below average before. The issues now are have they gone up too far, and how effective the plans actually are. She suggested this could be an early audit piece of work for the new LSCB audit team.
- 11.5 Pat Toner told the Board that the feeling among Head Teachers is that fear is the driver around the rapidly increasing referrals and there is work to be done around restoring confidence in a multi-agency approach to shared risk and early intervention practice.
- 11.6 Jane Held noted that there is a lot of work being done on thresholds, models for locality based multi-agency teams and models of early intervention practice. Nigel Richardson has been asked to update the Board on this work.
- 11.7 Jane Held thanked Sam Prince and the group on behalf of the Board for all their work.

Action

- 11.8 The Board's position is clearly that it is a statutory requirement to attend child protection conferences and that all partners need to take action accordingly
- 11.9 Jane Held and Sam Prince to write jointly to all partners to set out their duty in law to provide staff to attend ICPC's all year round including school holidays and ask them to ensure they put arrangements in place to enable this to happen.
- 11.10 The Performance Management subgroup to monitor compliance with this requirement by partners and report to the LSCB
- 11.11 Pat Toner to continue work within Education on emphasising the clear expectations of the board.
- 11.12 Nigel Richardson to report to the next Board on the work underway on thresholds and early intervention and on proposals for an Outcomes Based Accountability approach to reducing the number of referrals
- 11.13 The Performance Management sub group to include consideration of the effectiveness of Child

Protection Plans in the annual audit programme 2011/12

- 11.14 The final proposals on the Performance Management system for 2011/12 will come to the Board from the Performance Management subgroup in May.

12.0 Business Plan

- 12.1 Bryan Gocke gave an overview of progress to date. The outstanding tasks at year end will be considered for inclusion in the Improvement Plan for 2011/12.

13.0 Serious Case Reviews

- 13.1 Updates on the progress of serious case reviews and local learning lessons reviews were received.

14.0 Date of next meeting, 23 May 2011, 2-5pm