

Date: 24th April 2017

Time: 13:00 until 16:00

Chair: Simon Westwood, Independent SSCB Chair

Venue: Community Rooms 1 and 2, Swinton Gateway,
Chorley Road, Swinton, Manchester, M27 5AW

Minutes

1. Welcome and Apologies

Chair N/A

Chair of meeting:

Westwood, Simon Independent SSCB Chair

Members in attendance:

Ms Armfield, Karen	Head Teacher, Boothstown Methodist Primary School
Ms Blackburn, Deborah	Assistant Director: Public Health Nursing
Ms Clancy, Karen	Deputy Director of Integrated Governance, Lead Named Nurse GMW Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Dr Dixit, Kalpesh	Designated Doctor, SRFT
Rabbi Grant, Simon	Lay Member
Ms Hubber, Sharon	Assistant Director Specialist Services, Salford City Council
Ms Murray, Louise	Deputy Chief Executive, CVS,
Ms Ramsden, Charlotte	Director of Adult and Children's Services, Salford City Council
Ms Seale, Manjit	Assistant Chief Executive, National Probation Service
Ms Thorpe, Francine	Director of Quality & Innovation, NHS Salford Clinical Commissioning Group

Officers in attendance to represent SSCB members:

Mr Dodd, Gwyn	DCI, Greater Manchester Police (Representing Mr C Allsop)
Mr Griffiths, Andrew	Interchange Manager, Cheshire & Greater Manchester CRC (Representing Ms N Pugh)
Ms McKenzie, Jane	SRFT (Representing Ms C Kelly)

Officers from the SSCB in attendance:

Ms Bentley, Vivienne (minutes)	Senior Business Support Officer, SSCB
Ms Slack, Tiffany	Interim Business Manger, SSCB

Other agencies or groups invited onto the Board as co-opted members and advisors

Mr Barnes, David	Child in Need and Quality Assurance Service Manager, Salford City Council
------------------	--

The Lead Member for Children's Services (participating observer)

Cllr Walsh, John	Elected Member
------------------	----------------

Apologies received from:

SSCB Members:

Mr Allsop, Chris	Superintendent, Greater Manchester Police (Representative attended)
Ms Browse, Laura	Head of Primary Care, NHS England
Ms Kelly, Clare	Assistant Director of Nursing, SRFT (Representative attended)
Ms Patel, Andrea	Designated Nurse, NHS Salford CCG

Ms Pugh, Nicola Community Director (Manchester, Salford and Trafford) Cheshire & Greater Manchester CRC (Representative attended)
Ms Shannon, Lana Head of Safeguarding, Salford City Council

The Lead Member for Children's Services (participating observer)

Cllr Stone, Lisa Assistant Mayor: Services for Children & Young People

Other agencies or groups invited onto the Board as co-opted members and advisors

Ms Burfitt, Elaine Named Doctor: Community Child Protection, SRFT

Not expected to attend

SSCB Members:

Mr Hassall, Anthony Chief Accountable Officer, Salford CCG
Mr Herne, David Director of Public Health
Ms Nathan-Lingard, Sarah Service Manager, CAF/CASS

Sub Group Chairs (attend when required):

Mr Rumley, Tim Senior Youth Service Manager, Salford City Council
Ms Metcalfe, Madeline Learning Support Service Manager, Salford City Council

Other agencies or groups invited onto the Board as co-opted members and advisors

Ms Armitage, Emma Learning Support and Safeguarding Manager, Salford City College
Ms Ashton, Lorraine Solicitor, Manchester & Salford Legal Section
Dr Burfitt, Elaine

Did not attend

Ms McGovern, Jennifer Assistant Director Joint Commissioning
Cllr Walsh, Executive Support for Education and Learning (representing Cllr Lisa Stone)

Presentation of Reports –

2. Vulnerable Young Person's Plans (VYPP) David Barnes (Paper)

Mr Barnes attended the meeting to present this report.

- Child Protection Plans set out what is expected of parents, it is recognised that plans for some teenagers need a different approach which involves direct engagement with the young person and gives them some responsibility about how the meeting is managed. During the pilot, VYPP meetings were held more frequently than child protection plan review meetings.
- Risk management of cases is a priority and the aim is to provide a framework to work safely with young people who are undertaking risky behaviour and identify what can and cannot be done.
- The pilot took place from April to December 2016, 26 cases were managed on VYPPs, and they were all coordinated by Child in Need Coordinators.
- Processes did emerge and develop as the pilot went on, the initiative is quite dynamic and established that best way for VYPPs to begin was from the child protection strategy meeting, it was helpful to set in place the consultation following a CAFAS, consultation with CP Coordinator to determine if they met the child protection threshold. VYPPs appear to have worked well.
- It was positive that from an early stage the police agreed to place a marker on the young person, not their home address.
- Received good feedback from young people who have been placed on a VYPP

Mr Barnes informed that the proposal is that SSCB takes over governance and oversight of VYPPs. This does not include the operational oversight of VYPPs.

The Chair noted that this system allows a named professional, who is not necessarily a social worker to take the lead with the child. This has the potential to free up capacity for child protection social workers. The Chair asked what it means to be responsible for the governance of this system and what are we expected to do. These are some of most vulnerable children who are undertaking risky behaviours. Child Protection Plans do not help this group however, if we take on governance, we also take on the risk.

Ms Thorpe asked whether reducing demand on social workers will result in the risk that this demand is transferred to other agencies. Mr Barnes informed that professionals from youth services, schools and colleges are most likely to be the key professionals. During the pilot, all of the young people also had an allocated social worker, however, to fully implement this model there would be cases without an allocated social worker. It was noted that all of the Child in Need Coordinators are social work trained, therefore there would continue to be social work oversight of the cases.

Ms Armfield asked if there is any back-up if the young person chooses a key worker from a different organisation. Ms Hubber noted that the lead professional would always be a professional with an established relationship with the young person and also assured that training will be available.

Ms Murray feels positive about this initiative and suggested that it may be more of a risk to continue with child protection plans for this age group as it has already been established that this system is not working. Some clarity is required regarding the training and expectations of the key worker. Mr Barnes assured that if there is not an allocated social worker; the case engagement by the key worker and their manager would be shared with the coordinator. Training does need to be delivered to a range of professionals to give them the confidence to undertake the role.

The Chair informed that he attended a briefing session when the pilot was being developed and found it to be a positive session.

Cllr Walsh informed that he is in agreement with Ms Murray, there are examples from the pilot to indicate that this process is working, therefore we should support it.

Mr Barnes highlighted that one of the risks is when cases transfer in or out of neighbouring authorities. We need to ensure cases are transferred with the correct status. **The Chair suggested** sending a summary report to the Greater Manchester Partnership to inform them of the system and noted that we will need a written agreement with them at the point of transfer.

Ms Slack noted that this links to threshold of need **and she will need** to work with Mr Barnes to include this process in the threshold of need documentation. **Ms Hubber will** inform Chris Williams, Ofsted Quality Assurance Officer and DfE to let them know how we are planning to work with this cohort of young people. It was noted that this system will support the DfE strategy to reduce the number of children placed on child protection plans.

Rabbi Grant expressed concern that too much emphasis will be placed on the youth service supporting this group of young people, especially as this service is vulnerable to further budget cuts as more Local Authority budget cuts are made.

Dr Clancy commented that this initiative demonstrates how we work with other young people and partner agencies; this work embraces the voice of the child and teaches children to take responsibility for their actions.

Mr Barnes informed that the proposal is for this process to be used for young people 15 years and older.

The SSCB understand that supporting this means we are taking a managed risk, however the same safeguards are in place as with a child protection plan. The process also gives strength to the voice of the child and looks for the person with the best relationship to take on the lead professional role. **It was agreed to** support this initiative and accept governance of the VYPPs in Salford.

Ms Ramsden noted that in some cases the person on a VYPP may have younger siblings placed on a child protection plan, and therefore the family will have an allocated social worker.

Dr Dixit suggested including these young people in some research to identify the outcomes of this intervention. Current research looks at the effect of the current child protection system on children as they move into adulthood and become parents. If we are going to make a difference it would be interesting to follow up with these young people. **It was agreed to** discuss this with the university as a potential research project.

Actions	Lead
2.1 work with Mr Barnes to include the VYPP process in the threshold of need documentation.	Tiffany Slack
2.2 inform Chris Williams, Ofsted Quality Assurance Officer and DfE to let them know how we are planning to work with this cohort of young people	Sharon Hubber
2.3 Report to Greater Manchester to highlight work and inform that child protection discussions will be different at transfer in/out for children aged 15 and over.	Sharon Hubber
2.4 Contact the university to inform of the research opportunity to follow the progress of young people who have been the subject of a VYPP as they move into adulthood	David Barnes

3. Future Safeguarding Arrangements

Chair (Paper)

The Chair presented his report, included with the papers for this meeting and informed that the Children and Social Work Bill is complete and awaiting royal assent, which is expected before the general election. Draft guidance should be available in summer 2017 for consultation to be finalised in autumn 2017.

The Chair has met with SSCB members individually, an overview of these discussions and SSCB members views are included in the report. It is expected that the DfE will approve the plans to abolish LSCBs in their current form. The Chair is keen for the SSCB to get to point where we have a clear idea of the position in April 2018. The implementation timetable is uncertain; some authorities are not in a position to implement changes but it is understood that if local authorities are in position to move earlier, they can do this anytime from April 2018-April 2019.

The report recommendations were discussed:

- i) To retain the current structure until 31st March 2018

The current structure needs to be continued at least until this date.

- ii) Based on discussions and views shared at the Board the Independent Chair and Board Manager, with support from board members as required, prepare a draft plan for 2018/19 arrangements for final approval of the Board on 20th November 2017.

Need to identify what the new model may look like, and what the detail will be. If a meeting is required, look at identifying if it can be merged with other meetings. **The Chair agreed** to work on identifying models and how they will work.

- iii) The Chair to begin discussions to explore the proposal that the strategic planning and oversight of early help and prevention be transferred to the 0-25 Strategy Board as soon as regulations allow

The Safeguarding Board's remit is becoming unpredictable, we need to identify the safeguarding needs analysis and show its effectiveness and do what needs doing.

- iv) To recommend the establishment of a transitional Salford Safeguarding Children Partnership executive decision making body comprised of the local authority Chief Executive, Chief of Police

and Chief Operating Officer of Salford CCG or their nominees.

As current legislation is shared, the statutory guidance is likely to name posts that should be a part of the Boards.

If there is going to be an executive, the accountable person will probably delegate to the safeguarding leads.

- v) To re-brand the SSCB as the Salford Safeguarding Children Partnership from April 2018 and review the constitution, membership, guidance and policy changes required to transform the current SSCB to that.

Re-branding will need to be undertaken ASAP. Ms Seale suggested using a development day, to give SSCB time to spend looking at the changes and taking into account government developments, budget restrictions, and look at what we want to do to transform ourselves. Need to look at the approach the SSCB will take to implement these changes. A development session has been arranged for 16th October 2017, 10am- 1pm. There was some discussion about whether there would be sufficient time to agree a re-brand of the SSCB.

Mr Dodd said we should be asking whether certain meetings and procedures should continue. Meetings and Boards should be set up because there is something that needs to be done and suggested we have more than one development session. Ms Seale felt we should be more transformational and consider outside the Board and agree to the steps to have a facilitated discussion about how transformational the Board can be. **It was agreed** to continue with the booked development session booked and look at whether it is a culture change and identify what we need to do. We will then arrange another development session for January 2018, when the guidance should be published with a timetable in place.

The Chair noted that the expectation is that statutory partners will have to sign off the arrangements and they will have to be in force from April 2019. The changes could be made earlier than March 2019 and SSCB is in a position to make the changes earlier. **It was agreed** that a decision on the timeline can be made in January 2018.

- vi) From April 2018 to stop using the term lay member but to ensure that there is community representation on the partnership with a revised role to provide additional independent scrutiny.

Local scrutiny has not been defined and the history of lay members has put some constraints on how we get input from the community. It is proposed to move away from the term "lay member" and use a different approach. Ms Murray would like to discuss this further outside of this meeting.

- vii) To retain an independent chair for the partnership on a one year rolling contract to allow for continuing independent scrutiny and a smooth transition, but allowing for further change as the GM wide standards board develops.

The Chair informed that he will be stepping down as Chair of SSCB next year. The legislation does not stipulate an independent chair; however it was thought to be wise to keep one, with a one year rolling contract. If this is agreed, the SSCB will need to recruit to this role in December, in time for March 18.

- viii) Agree to delegate to the case review sub-group in conjunction with the Chair of the Board, consideration and any response to Government consultation and guidance on case review and make recommendations to the Board, as part of the plans to be agreed in November 2017, on the process for changes, if any, to local practice case reviews.

There are a number of changes around serious case reviews, the terminology will change to national reviews and local practice reviews. Detailed guidance is not yet available. The national reviews will be thematic, unclear how they are triggered. The new national panel will be a ministerial appointment, the current panel is advisory. When the guidance arrives it is suggested

that the case review and audit sub group should be tasked with clarifying the expectations when referring cases to the national panel. If the term “serious case review” is not being used they will need to rewrite the definition.

- ix) To retain the current tripartite CDOP arrangements until any proposed changes emerge from GM wide discussions. From April 2018 recommend that these will not be a sub-group of or funded through the revised partnership but will directly report to any executive decision making body identified by the statutory partners.

Oversight of CDOP transferring from DFE to DoH needs to be maintained, currently unsure about how this will be done. Funding CDOP is a significant budget pressure for the SSCB, it was also noted that most child deaths are health related and result in public health campaigns. It was suggested that CDOP would be better placed with Health and Wellbeing Boards, however until regulations change; we need to continue with the current model.

Ms Seale expressed concern with the proposal that no one sits on more than one group and asked if this will mean more meetings. The Chair assured that this will not happen as long as statutory partners are clear where the priorities sit; currently we do not have any prescription of priorities for example most LSCBs have a CSE sub group. We will need to see the legislation and look at the sub groups, asking the group to challenge their selves and look at the purpose of the group, asking if they are making a difference and if the time invested is proportionate to what is taken from it.

Ms Seale noted that the Coordination and Delivery group is already a meeting that other LSCBs do not have. Perhaps this group could have a different status; originally it was set up as a meeting of sub group chairs. The Chair will take this work forward but it needs to be mandated by the SSCB.

Ms Ramsden commented on how this fits with the Greater Manchester picture, and noted that Greater Manchester Safeguarding Standards Boards is something the DfE want to fund, however due to the upcoming general election we are unlikely to receive a response soon. Greater Manchester Safeguarding Standards Boards principle is to identify what can be looked at once as a combined authority and then feedback to local areas. Comparative safeguarding data so can challenge areas and ask for the story to explain the data. We would also be able to share learning from initiatives that work well such as the VYPP. There are Greater Manchester themes, complex safeguarding, organised crime etc. The Board work well as a partnership and has a collective responsibility and this should be able to continue. CDOP is likely to become a Greater Manchester group; there is scope for Salford to simplify the sub groups, a lot of work can be undertaken and shared with other Boards.

Ms Thorpe noted that there is still a need to have an overview, and provide scrutiny and challenge. Strategic partners with statutory responsibilities still welcome the challenge that partners put into the work they do.

The chair summarised that in general the view of SSCB members is that:

- The Chair will undertake more work ahead of the development session in October,
- The importance of maintaining current arrangements is recognised and it was agreed not to change for the sake of it.
- Identify if the processes can be streamlined, and if all of the sub groups are required.
- Start dialogue for work to be done elsewhere.
- Look at how we strengthen the wider partnership, and identify the function of the executive decision making body.
- Detailed discussions are needed on community engagement on a wider basis, taking the role of the lay member, elected members and community and voluntary engagement.
- Whilst looking at the groups, identify if there can be one meeting rather than separate Board and Executive meetings.

Actions	Lead
3.1 work on identifying models and how they will work for the SSCB	Simon Westwood

3.2 arrange another development session in January 2018 at which point the legislation will be published.	Simon Westwood
3.3 discuss outside of this meeting how we get input from the community. It is proposed to move away from the term “lay member” and use a different approach.	Louise Murray

4. Theme: Early Help/ Emotional Health and Wellbeing Deborah Blackburn (Paper)

- **Early Help Report**

Ms Blackburn presented the Early Help report included with the papers and highlighted:

- Looking at refining the performance measures used and reporting by exception only.
- The Family Assessment process is changing, therefore CAF data is not available to be reported on, however information from the team suggests that family assessments are being completed and indicate the threshold of need in the city.
- Injuries for children above 5 years of age tend to be sports related; under 5's tend to sustain injuries from falls from beds.
- There has been an increase in breastfeeding, which is thought to be as a result of health visitors undertaking ante-natal visits.

Questions/comments:

Ms Armfield informed that completing the family assessment is much more beneficial than the CAF.

The Chair noted that with regards to data, it may be worth checking if there are any particular things the board wants to see as assurance. The accountability on early help sits with the SSCB but the detail of the work sits with the CYPTB. Need to identify if there are particular things that the SSCB would like to see in the assurance report.

Ms Seale commented that in the long term would hope the outcome is a reduction in children on child protection plans; however this is a long term outcome. Ms Blackburn said the aim of the early help indicators was to hold the system to account.

It was agreed to receive the Early Help report on exceptions.

The Chair requested a report on the progress made with family assessments as this is a very new process.

With regard to under 4s, it would be beneficial to understand any action which has been undertaken to tackle this.

- **Emotional Health and Wellbeing Report**

Ms Blackburn presented the Emotional Health and Wellbeing report included with the papers and highlighted:

- This is part of the 0-25 programme and the test case has received significant investment from NHS Salford CCG to transform the system.
- There is a huge amount of work happening at the moment, the expert reference group reports to 0-25 Board and also to CYPTB.
- There are a number of indicators used to benchmark emotional health, trying to identify how to measure how happy young people are. Data for some of these measures is difficult to obtain; a number of services are level 3 tiered for CAMHS who receive referrals. There are also level 2 providers but currently we can only receive information from NHS services despite services being provided from other sectors.
- A lot of work with children and young people's health watch took place last year, to look at issues regarding early years and building resilience.
- Transitions from primary to secondary schools, and also children's to adults' services are significant points in children's lives.
- Working with LGBT

- There is an action plan being developed which will include a rolling program of work being undertaken.
- Perinatal mental health and parental mental health are also issues.
- Looking at parent and infant attachment and issues and improving the integration and delivery of provisions.

Questions/comments:

The Chair noted that there is a lot of detail in the report, helpful if there are particular things SSCB want more information, concerns or challenges they are highlighted now:

Cllr Walsh commented that the capacity of the current system is not meeting the needs of children and young people. Ms Blackburn assured that the transformation money is being used to transform services. Cllr Walsh commented that we need to look at the “so what” and identify how we ensure the family is emotionally well enough and resilient enough to cope. Ms Blackburn informed that in areas where there was expected to be an increased no of referrals to CAMHS, there wasn’t. Ms Armfield noted that there is more that can be done regarding early help; in particular we need to be able to advise and support fragile children. These children can be identified, and schools need additional advice and support but do not necessarily need a referral to children’s services or CAMHS. The Chair asked what the impact of the schools pilot is, has it been accepted and fed into the investment strategy. Ms Blackburn informed that it has and there is a piece of work with The Bridge and West Locality to test the Emotional Health and Wellbeing work to look at contacts from schools being through The Bridge, there is also a piece of rapid response 24-7 work ongoing and some work at a Greater Manchester level to show what a whole Greater Manchester system could look like.

Ms Armfield informed that the pilot did go well, and felt this was largely due to having somewhere to contact before referring to The Bridge.

Ms Murray agreed that it is right to ask SSCB support, and that it is unhelpful to only measure CAMHS involvement. With regard to the voluntary and community sector, there were 2-3 models with links to schools, and it is fortunate that with help from NHS Salford CCG we are able to bring this out to schools to provide earlier help to families.

The Chair highlighted that this was top of the agenda for the youth council, members were able to give examples of instances where friends want and need support and the length of time they needed to wait before an assessment took place.

The Chair noted that it would be useful to know progress around the integrated commissioning and the SSCB can ask the 0-25 Board and the Executive to provide some assurances that there is some plan to tackle the issues identified. **It was agreed** to request an assurance report on exceptions and focussing on: support to schools, CAMHS waiting list, and the agreed transformation plan to deliver the CAMHS service locally and regionally.

Mr Dodd asked where the early intervention has been tested. Ms Blackburn informed that the website “Partners in Salford” that signposts young people to online support and also gives advice to professionals on where to seek additional support. With regard to early intervention, there has been some mapping of services in schools; there is also a counselling framework in schools. Mr Dodd noted that these are all tactics and asked how we know that any of these tactics are making a difference.

Dr Dixit informed that he has read a paper, available on the internet which looked at the effect of adverse childhood experiences, mapped out in the area the referral rate and experiences children facing. The papers noted that simple things like street lighting and close nurseries reduced the referral rate to child protection. Ms Blackburn informed that they are looking at whole life support.

Ms Seale asked whether when children are victim of abuse, they are referred to the CAMHS service for counselling or if counselling services are commissioned by bespoke services. Ms Hubber explained that this depends on the case and what services are available to the individual. The Fight for Change council have identified that if a child is removed from their family, they have suffered emotional harm, whilst this does not mean they should always be referred to CAMHS it does mean we need to look at what support is in place for their mental health at that time.

Rabbi Grant noted that there is mention of links to the internet to access information and support however in some ethnic minority communities young people do not have access to the internet. Ms Blackburn informed that there are two pieces of research ongoing in Jewish communities at the moment, one with young Jewish men to look at how they access mental health services. This is due to be complete in 4-5 months. There is also an issue with young women, 42nd Street are looking at introducing peer mentors, and trying to identify the needs within the community. We need to ensure we use the right resources, initial feedback indicates that boys do not want face to face contact, however girls do.

Ms Thorpe asked how we are publicising this work to young people so they can see that work is being done in areas they prioritise and they know that we are acting on the points they have raised. The Chair noted that one tangible way would be to feedback directly to the Youth Council.

Ms Blackburn informed that the outcomes are being refined.

Actions	Lead
4.1 feedback to the Youth Council on how their views have directly effected services	Simon Westwood

5. JTAI Action: Bridge Assurance Report

Sharon Hubber Paper expected

Ms Hubber apologised, a written report has not been prepared for this meeting. There are several pieces of work ongoing at The Bridge:

- A permanent full time manager has been appointed to oversee the clipboard for all contacts.
- The Bridge now has two very experienced social care managers.
- The Bridge has always quality assured their work, but previously there has not been a focussed look at front door.
- Contacts will be quality assured where labelled as green, with a view to identifying if it was right decision and if it was referred to the right place and if it is evidenced why that pathway was most appropriate.
- A social work improvement officer has been appointed; they are independent of any case work. The social work improvement officer will produce an analytical report by July.
- The audit team are also completing a thematic audit on the work coming into The Bridge; they are producing a joint report which will be presented in September.
- The Bridge Strategic group is a multi agency group who are being assured of ongoing work.
- Working hard to check on including other agencies at The Bridge at strategy discussions.
- There will be an assurance report and data available in September.

Business


6. Minutes of previous meeting, matters arising Chair Paper


The minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting held on 13th February 2017.

7. Outstanding actions

The action log was updated at the meeting and the following actions were agreed as complete:

Date	Actions	Lead	Progress
21/03/2016	Set up a small working group via the Neglect group for a Webinar on Neglect and circulate plan identifying the audience and key objectives and give SSCB members the opportunity to comment before it is finalised.	Simon Westwood	16/05/2016: Mr Westwood to follow up with Sean Atkinson 14/06/2016 Email sent to SA re aim of webinar and key objectives.

Date	Actions	Lead	Progress
			 RE Webinar.msg <hr/> <p><u>11/07/2016:</u> Work progressed with webinar; draft outline will come to SSCB for comments to Sean. Ms Slack will ask Sean Atkinson for this info.</p> <p>The webinar will take place in October 2016- and will include learning from Child S multi-agency concise review. It is hoped that Simon Westwood and Clare Hyde will be involved</p> <p><u>17/10/2016:</u> This has been deferred. The original plan was to hold a live webinar. Some key participants were unable to attend so a new date needs to be arranged.</p> <p><u>02/11/2016:</u> Ms Bentley has contacted Sean Atkinson to request a new date.</p> <p><u>30/01/17</u> Simon Westwood discussed at GM partnership and offered to extend the webinar to be a GM wide event. This is referred to at the GM neglect sub group and Sean Atkinson will continue to liaise with Salford Uni. This will still feature Salford case learning but will require GM planning so estimate this will be held June/July time</p>
19/12/2016	2.1 Child R- Recommendation 15: The Chair suggested rather than include this recommendation in the report he will write to GMP as it is a wider issue.	Simon Westwood	<p>Complete</p> <p>Child R's parents were arrested in the presence of their children. Mr Dodd, DCI GMP informed that this is not a desirable occurrence and wherever possible police try to plan arrests so that they do not take place in front of children.</p> <p>SW has received a written response from GMP and is satisfied with the response.</p>
19/12/2016	3.1 Raise the issue at the Greater Manchester LSCB Chairs that LSCBs are not routinely notified if a DHR is being commissioned which impacts on	Simon Westwood	Complete. This was raised at the meeting on 16 th Feb

Date	Actions	Lead	Progress
	children. The LSCB Chair should be notified to clarify engagement from the offset to avoid SCR's and DHR's running parallel		
19/12/2016	5.1 draft a note to the CYPTB asking for an update on early help	Simon Westwood	13/02/2017 Ms Slack updated: Debbie Fallon attended the last joint performance subgroup 2.2.2017 and has agreed to seek clarity from the CYPTB. She is aware the next SSCB theme is early help. Complete 24 th April board
19/12/2016	8.3 Consider sexting as a theme for the Coordination and Delivery Group.	Chris Allsop	Chris A agreed to do this at the ASM on 3 rd March.
19/12/2016	16.1 Take to the regional GM LSCB chairs meeting the challenge back to Bolton Be Safe Partnership regarding the DHR. The author focused on children's issues which wasn't core business of the DHR.	Simon Westwood	Complete discussed for 16 th Feb
19/12/2016	17.1 Respond on behalf of the Board re. the draft Anti-poverty Strategy 2016 and seek assurances from DWP/ Skills and Work Board locally about sanctions, universal credit and the impact on families and children.	Simon Westwood	<u>No longer needed. Deadline for response missed</u>
13/02/2017	2.1 Circulate the family assessment training dates	Natalie Lunn	Complete Dates circulated 16/02/2017  FW Family Assessment is replaci
13/02/2017	7a.1 request a copy of the redacted version of the domestic homicide review report for SSCB members to access before it is published.	Tiffany Slack	Complete A copy has been received; this has not been circulated as it is restricted.
13/02/2017	9.1 email The Chair on 24 th February 2017 to update on the situation regarding the lead professional for Child R.	Tiffany Slack	Complete
13/02/2017	18.1 Discuss verification of training courses and whether there should be a charge for this service at Coordination and Delivery.	Manjit Seale	Complete 24/04/2017: C&D discussed this and agreed there should be a charge

8. Coordination & Delivery Group Update **Chris Allsop** **Paper**

Mr Allsop has sent his apologies to this meeting, the vice chair, Ms Patel has also sent apologies. The update report from the last Coordination and Delivery Group meeting was included in the papers. Issues to raise with SSCB are:

- Verification of training courses: the Coordination and Delivery Group agreed to charge non statutory partners who charge for the delivery of training a fee for the verification of the course content. It is accepted that this may mean some organisations will not approach SSCB for verification. The Chair noted that the verification of courses does generate a cost therefore it is not unreasonable to charge for this work. Ms Hubber highlighted that we will need to retain a verified copy of the course and be clear that any further changes will need to be checked again.
- Sexting: the Coordination and Delivery Group agreed to sexting as a thematic discussion at a future meeting.
- Performance Officer: the Coordination and Delivery Group requested an update on the progress of advertising this position. Ms Slack informed that the Job Evaluation banding recommendation from HR is two grades lower than Grade 4a; Ms Slack and Ms Brooking have a meeting arranged with HR to discuss the grading of the post. Ms Hubber suggested advertising the post at this grade, if there is no interest then we can look at reviewing the grading. Ms Slack will look at the grading breakdown form with HR.
- Admin support: Ms Blackburn has requested support for the Complex Safeguarding Sub Group. **It was agreed to** include admin support when looking at the new LSCB arrangements.

9. SCR – verbal update

Sharon Hubber Verbal update

Ms Hubber informed that this group last met on Friday and updated:

- SCR Child R: Ms Hubber informed that the report and action plan are in place, this case was included at the learning event on 31st March 2017. The learning event was well attended and included a lot of interaction. Ms Hubber took the opportunity to formally thank all of the case review and audit sub group members who supported the tables and facilitated conversations and helped to make it a successful day.

The case review and audit sub group will monitor the completion of Child R action plans.

- Case 2017-01 SF: The National Panel have agreed with the decision not to commission a SCR. We are in the process of identifying a lead reviewer for the Multi Agency Concise Review (MACR). At the last case review and audit sub group meeting it was agreed to contact Melanie Hartley to review the case.
- Case 2017-02: New referral received, the family were housed in a garage. Initial information suggests that this case does not meet the criteria for a SCR but there is a lot of learning. At the last case review and audit sub group meeting it was agreed to have a MACR, with a practitioner learning event.
- Case 2017-03: This is a young person who is thought to have taken hi own life. He lived with his mum in Eccles and died in Cambridge after walking in front of a train. At the last case review and audit sub group meeting it was agreed to request further information and ensure that the CDOP notification has been received.

Ms Hubber noted that there has not been any quality assurance of this referral, there needs to be an oversight and clear reasoning for the referral. It was explained that the referral was made by GMP as the young person was reported missing at the time he took his own life and a SCR should be considered if a child commits suicide whilst missing from home. Ms Hubber commented that it has not yet been established if it was suicide or if he was missing from home.

Key Local and National Issues

10. Feedback from:

a. GMSP

Deborah Blackburn

Verbal update

The last GMSP meeting was cancelled

b. Children & Young People's Trust Board

Info Only

Paper

c. Health & Wellbeing Board

Info Only

Paper

