

SLOUGH LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD - Meeting held on Tuesday, 24th November, 2009 at Connexions, High Street, Slough.



Present:-

| Name | Representing |
|----------------------------|---|
| Elaine Coleridge-Smith | Slough LSCB Independent Chair |
| Mahen Beehook | CAMHS Manager |
| Valerie Bressington | CAFCASS |
| Robin Crofts | Assistant Director, Inclusion, SBC |
| Cilla Dorman | Heatherwood and Wexham Park Hospitals Trust |
| Debbie Daly | Berkshire East PCT |
| Jesal Dhokia | Slough Council for Voluntary Service |
| Sally Grimstone | Head of Psychology and Inclusion, SBC |
| Pat LeRoy | Reviewing Service Manager, SBC |
| Jatinder Matharu | Training Officer, SBC |
| Jo Matthews | Slough Primary Heads |
| Janine Edwards | Homestart Slough/SCVS |
| Shelley LaRose | Head of Service - Youth Offending Team |
| Jessi Loftus | Connexions Berkshire |
| Rebecca Lacey | Berkshire East PCT Community Health Service |
| Councillor Natasa Pantelic | Commissioner for Education and Children's Services, SBC |
| James Priestman | Head of Drugs and Community Safety, SBC |
| Jeff Richardson | Slough Secondary Heads |
| Ian Sandbrook | SBC Interim Director |
| Flick Schofield | Interim Assistant Director, Children's Social Care, SBC |
| Mary Shannon | LSCB/CT Business Manager |
| Liz Smith | Education and Children Services, SBC |
| Karen Stoneham | SBC – HR Business Partner |
| Elaine Welch | Named Nurse for CP for Slough |
| Sophie Wing-King | Domestic Abuse Co-ordinator TVP/SBC |
| John Worgan | ICT Manager, Schools, SBC |
| Susanne Yeoman | Locality Manager, Mental Health, BFT |

Apologies for Absence:- Neil Aves, Assistant Director of Housing
 Rekha Brigue-Parker, Senior Probation Officer
 Chris Etheridge, Children Young People and Maternity Lead
 Kate Ford, Thames Valley Police
 Bob Garnett, Assistant Director Raising Achievement
 Juliet Holloway, East Berkshire College
 Theresa Jordaan Berkshire East PCT Named GP
 Chris Shead, Thames Valley Police
 Louise Watson Berkshire East Community Health Service

| Item | Main Points/Action Arising | Action By |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|

17. Welcome

It was noted that Elaine Coleridge-Smith (ECS), who had been

Local Safeguarding Children Board – 22.09.09

| Item | Main Points/Action Arising | Action By |
|------|--|-------------------------|
| | appointed as Independent Chair of the LSCB, would be chairing the meeting. | |
| 18. | <u>Feedback from LSCB Executive Board – 5th November, 2009</u> The Minutes of the Executive held on 5 th November were noted. ECS informed the meeting that the responsibilities of the Local Safeguarding Children's Board and Terms of Reference had been discussed at this meeting. | |
| 19. | <u>LSCB Key Issues</u> <u>Review of LSCB Business Plan and agreed actions that had been allocated to LSCB Sub-Groups</u> ECS stated that the Business Plan had been discussed and the Terms of Reference and the Agreed Actions that had been allocated to LSCB Sub-Group needed to be examined and agreed by Members. (a) Policy and Procedure Group The Terms of Reference and Actions Allocated for the Sub-Group were agreed. (b) Safer Staffing Sub-Group Karen Stoneham stated that whilst the Terms of Reference for the Sub-Group were acceptable, Sub-Group members were unclear about the remit of the sub-group and the scope of the Business Plan. ECS stated that the purpose of the meeting was to agree the terms of reference for the Sub-Group and that the first meeting of the Sub-Group would examine the detail of the Business Plan, following which the appropriate amendments could be made. It was reported that the meeting of the Sub-Group was scheduled for 15 th December and that a verbal report would be reported back to the January meeting of the LSCB. It was queried as to whether it would be beneficial to have a representative from the voluntary sector and an adult representative on the sub-group. Mary Shannon stated that she would investigate this further. (c) Quality and Performance Sub-Group Pat LeRoy stated that the remit for this sub-group was too broad and therefore had difficulty in prioritising the objectives. ECS stated that the detail of the Business Plan should be discussed at the Away Day and reported back. | Mary Shannon to action. |

Local Safeguarding Children Board – 22.09.09

| Item | Main Points/Action Arising | Action By |
|------|----------------------------|-----------|
|------|----------------------------|-----------|

(d) **Child Death Overview Panel**

It was reported that the Child Death Overview Panel was aiming to improve understanding of how and why children in Berkshire die and use the findings to take action to prevent future child death for generally to improve the health and safety of the children. It was noted that this was a Berkshire-wide Panel.

Members were informed that two key areas that were being examined included whether the rapid response was working adequately within the area and whether the analytical information being provided was sufficient. The terms of reference were agreed and members were informed that the process of appointing a CDOP Manager who would attend future LSCB meetings was currently underway.

(e) **Training Sub-Group**

Debbie Daly agreed the terms of reference. Concern was expressed that whilst membership attendance was okay, there was rarely a representative from education or adult services at the meetings. Furthermore it was queried as to whether one education representative was sufficient for the whole of East Berkshire. It was also commented that whilst the objectives for the sub-group were acceptable the language used was too operational. It was noted that this would be discussed at the first meeting of the sub-group.

It was suggested that a list of representatives nominated to each of the sub-groups would be useful. It was agreed that Mary Shannon would provide this information.

Mary Shannon
to action.

Ian Sandbrook stated that although there was not a specific group set up to look at e-safety this was an important area. It was agreed that the possibility of establishing an e-safety sub-group, together with terms of reference, membership, responsibility and scope to be discussed at the next meeting of the LSCB.

Mary Shannon
to agenda
plan.

(f) **Stay Safe Sub-Group**

Flick Schofield stated that two away days had been held to discuss the aims of the Sub-Group and consider in detail who was responsible for delivery of these and who would be managing the performance of the Sub-Group. It was noted that the Children's Trust were responsible for the delivery of the aims and that the LSCB would be responsible for service management.

ECS stated that each of the service group had confirmed that the terms of reference and membership lists were ok. The next

Local Safeguarding Children Board – 22.09.09

| Item | Main Points/Action Arising | Action By |
|------|----------------------------|-----------|
|------|----------------------------|-----------|

stage was for Chairs of the Sub-Group to meet and discuss in detail the business plans assigned to each of the sub-groups.

Rise in Child Protection Numbers

Flick Schofield stated that over the last two years there had been an overall trend in an increase in activities in the number of referrals received to Social Services regarding child protection. It was highlighted that this increase was the second highest in the country. It was reported that during this period there was no corresponding increase in the numbers of social workers, with inevitable consequences that staff became more overstretched.

Members were informed that following an unannounced Ofsted inspection in August 2009, it was found that the service did not have the capacity to meet the increase in the workload that it was experiencing. The reasons for the increase and the number of referrals being made were outlined. It was stressed that an important message was conveyed to all agencies involved in the protection of children in that there was a real need to ensure that appropriate referrals were being made.

Two approaches were being proposed and included –

- (a) Agencies needed to give greater consideration to contacting social care services. Whilst awareness of safeguarding and particularly of child protection was vital across partner agencies, a more sophisticated approach was required. The data showed that only a very small proportion of the families who were referred to social care actually received a service. The scarce social work resources that were in place needed to be dedicated to working with those families in greatest need, rather than responding to contact that did not meet social care thresholds. The parents were advised that they should check with child protection specialist within their own agencies before contacting social care and that it should be carefully considered whether the concerns they have could be dealt with differently either in their own agency or via the common assessment framework.
- (b) Greater consideration needed to be given to the supporting families under Section 17 Family Support, rather than through a child protection plan. It was reported that the main reasons for children currently being subject to a Plan was due to neglect (68%) and agencies and particularly social workers needed to consider whether the same services and support could be delivered through a less intrusive means. It was

Local Safeguarding Children Board – 22.09.09

| Item | Main Points/Action Arising | Action By |
|------|----------------------------|-----------|
|------|----------------------------|-----------|

noted that a number of recommendations as outlined in the report had been agreed by the Children's Trust Board.

Debbie Daly stated that she was confident that the health professionals making referrals to social services were appropriate and was extremely concerned that a message was being conveyed not to refer children to social services. Furthermore it was important that the issue was looked at on an individual case by case basis and not purely through an increase in numbers. In addition it was stated that if there were incidents of inappropriate referrals being made this information needed to be relayed back to the relevant agency with a view for them to consider improving or amending their referral mechanisms.

FS stated that although the importance of partner agencies' integrated working was emphasised, it was still essential that where there were serious concerns relating to child protection that these were always referred to the appropriate service.

Accident Prevention

Jessi Loftus asked LSCB Members whether there was a need for an Accident Prevention Task Group. It was reported that previously it had been highlighted that NI 71 had been very poor and serious concerns had arisen from that. Following discussion, it was agreed that a memo would be sent to the Children's Trust Board stating that the LSCB were extremely concerned about NI 71 and what measures would be taken to address this.

ECS to send memo to Children's Trust Board.

CHILDREN'S TRUST

20. LSCB Annual Report to CT

ECS stated that the annual report had not yet been produced but it was envisaged that this would be finalised by the end of the financial year.

Mary Shannon to agenda plan.

21. Reports from other areas

Performance Report

Details reporting to the national indicators relating to the overall effectiveness of safeguarding in Slough were detailed. In particular reference was made to NI 68 – Referrals to Children's Social Care going on to Initial Assessment. In 12 months to September 2009 Slough had received 4200 referrals of which 51.4% progressed on to initial assessment. Slough's performance remained below both the statistical neighbour and

Local Safeguarding Children Board – 22.09.09

| Item | Main Points/Action Arising | Action By |
|------|--|---|
| | <p>England average figures. What this meant was that Slough Social Services continued to receive more referrals that were deemed as not requiring an assessment when compared to other local authorities.</p> | |
| | <p><u>E-CAF</u></p> | |
| | <p>Robin Crofts introduced the item and stated that the use of E-CAF was being looked at and how this linked in with the Common Assessment Form and the safeguarding process. It was noted that all the key agencies and individuals involved within the safeguarding process needed to promote this scheme. The decision to initiate a CAF would always be taken in consultation with parents/carers and other professionals.</p> | |
| | <p>It was stated that there needed to be an understanding that the Common Assessment Form was not an automatic referral to social services but rather it was an initial consultation which included information collated from multi-agencies and would be used as a source of reference when required. It was reported that the E-CAF process was about managed intervention and formalising the issue without having to repeatedly ask for and receive the same information from an individual. Details relating to the security of the E-CAF system were highlighted and included access only being provided to individuals who had had the designated training and an enhanced criminal record check.</p> | |
| | <p>Work relating to promoting the use of the E-CAF was outlined and included training professionals from schools and the health service.</p> | |
| | <p>ECS stated that the progress and impact of the scheme to be reported to a future meeting of the LSCB.</p> | <p>Mary Shannon to agenda plan.</p> |
| | <p><u>Serious Case Review</u></p> | |
| | <p>It was noted that Flick Schofield and Mary Shannon would investigate the possibility of establishing a Serious Case Review Panel.</p> | |
| | <p><u>Media Strategy</u></p> | |
| | <p>ECS reported that there currently was no strategy in terms of dealing with the media. Members were informed that some work was currently ongoing with the Communications Team with a view to implementing a Media Strategy and that the strategies developed by the neighbouring authorities would also be looked at.</p> | |

Local Safeguarding Children Board – 22.09.09

| Item | Main Points/Action Arising | Action By |
|------|----------------------------|-----------|
|------|----------------------------|-----------|

Ofsted School Inspections

An update with regard to Ofsted School Inspections was provided. Pat LeRoy stated that there was an extensive waiting list for training relating to CP1/CP2. It was reported that Primary Headteachers had brought in training externally. However, the LSCB needed to take responsibility that the local authority was currently overwhelmed by demand by schools for this training. It was suggested that the LSCB raise with the Children's Trust that this was an issue that needed to be highlighted to the relevant Director. It was agreed that this issue would be reported back to the next meeting.

Mary Shannon
to agenda
plan.

(The meeting opened at 2.00 p.m. closed at 4.15 p.m.)