

Salford Safeguarding Children Partnership

Salford
Safeguarding
Children Partnership

Date: 30th September 2019

Time: 13:00 until 16:30

Chair: Charlotte Ramsden, Strategic Director People, Salford City Council

Venue: Committee Room 4, Civic Centre, Chorley Road, M27 5AW

Minutes

1. Welcome & Apologies

1.1. Attended by:

Charlotte Ramsden (Chair)	Strategic Director, Salford City Council: People,
Vivienne Bentley (Minutes)	Senior Business Support Officer, Salford Safeguarding Children Partnership,
Karen Armfield	Head Teacher, Boothstown Methodist Primary,
Claire Baddley	Domestic Abuse Lead, Salford City Council: People,
Sharn Begum	Training Coordinator, Salford Safeguarding Children Partnership,
Deborah Blackburn	Assistant Director: Public Health Nursing & Wellbeing, Public Health,
Claire Davies	Lead Manager: Safeguarding Children, (representing Manjit Byrne), National Probation Service,
Kalpesh Dixit	Designated Doctor (Safeguarding) , NHS Salford Clinical Commissioning Group,
Dr Sharmishtha Ghangrekar	Named GP for Safeguarding Children, NHS Salford Clinical Commissioning Group
Rachael Harrison	District Superintendent, GMP,
Vickie Hollingworth	Service Manager (representing Emma Ford), Salford City Council: People,
Chris Packer	Detective Chief Inspector, GMP,
Andrea Patel	Designated Nurse, NHS Salford Clinical Commissioning Group,
Rachel Prest	Project Lead, Making a Difference in Salford,
Tim Rumley	Children's Services Senior Manager, Salford City Council: People,
Simon Westwood	Independent Adviser, Independent,

In attendance for Item 2:

Heather Clarkson	Coordinator, Manchester Safeguarding Partnership
Melanie Hartley	Lead Reviewer, Independent,
Megan Kelsey	Development Officer, Rochdale Safeguarding Partnership,

1.2. Apologies received from:

Manjit Byrne	Assistant Chief Executive, National Probation Service
Emma Ford	Head of Safeguarding, Salford City Council: People
Rabbi Grant	Lay Member, Community
Sharon Hubber	Assistant Director: Specialist Services, Salford City Council: People
Vicky Pemberton	Senior Communications Officer, Salford City Council,

Tiffany Slack	Business Manager, Salford Safeguarding Children Partnership
Francine Thorpe	Director of Quality & Innovation, NHS Salford Clinical Commissioning Group
Michelle Warburton	Voice and Influence Manager, Salford Community & Voluntary Services,

1.3. Not expected to attend:

Lorraine Ashton Solicitor, Salford & Manchester Legal Service,

1.4. Did not attend

Danielle Buckley Community Director for Salford and Trafford, Cheshire and Greater Manchester Community Rehabilitation Company,

2. Child MD (Case 2018-05) SCR Presentation, Melanie Hartley (Lead Reviewer),

- 2.1. Ms Ramsden noted that the intent of using written agreements is to empower women to keep their children safe, however JTAI findings indicated that they do not empower and she is not assured that we have fully reconciled written agreements and asked Manchester and Salford for their perspectives on written agreements. Ms Kelsey informed that Rochdale are also reviewing their use of written agreements. Salford have noted that written agreements are often isolated agreements between children's services and the family and not always visible as part of the child protection and child in need plans. Salford now include them in the child protection and child in need plans to ensure they are visible to other agencies. It is also important to identify what circumstances are appropriate to use written agreements with, for example they are not appropriate to be used in domestic violence circumstances.
- 2.2. Ms Clarkson informed that Manchester have not specifically worked on reviewing working agreements, however they are working on safe in together which looks at the language used, and uses less victim blaming tools. This means that questions are asked in a more positive way, such as, we understand this relationship will continue however this is how your children feel about the relationship. This method was rolled out two years ago in children's services and recently it has been rolled out to partners
- 2.3. Mr Westwood commented that it is important to question the purpose of the written agreement, if it is to set actions which have consequences if not followed then they are good, however if there are no consequences the written agreement has no effect. In addition we need to look at what agreement is in place with the perpetrator, if another agency is working with the perpetrator there may be two written agreements in place that do not fully align, multi-agency challenge will give written agreements more robustness.
- 2.4. Ms Harrison informed that DVPO and DVPNs place the onus on the perpetrator to have no contact, this is empowering to the victim as they are in place even if the victim does not agree to the terms.
- 2.5. Ms Davis informed that they have signed agreements shared with probation however they are not comfortable using these where the onus is on the victim. Ms Davies asked if there is a way that neighbourhood policing could be contacted to inform of any suspicion that perpetrators are at the property. It was accepted that this is reliant on services being aware that the perpetrator is an issue for the family.
- 2.6. Ms Ramsden commented that another issue is the transfer between authorities, for this family as they moved professional curiosity and awareness was not present as

- they moved. Professionals did not realise that dad picking up the children from school was a cause for concern.
- 2.7. Ms Patel informed that the sharing of midwifery special circumstances forms is an issue, there are also broader complexities of midwifery provision in Salford. The change of provision and altering of providers and how this looks like from a Greater Manchester perspective is being reviewed currently. Manchester have managed things differently than other areas. It was noted that babies are not born in Salford unless they are born in the midwifery unit, which is only available if there are no known or expected complications. The request is for there to be one agreed process across Greater Manchester.
- 2.8. Ms Blackburn noted that capacity and written agreements feature throughout the review and asked, is there a link back to audit services to professionally interrogate other services further, to make it clear that professionals should do more of a deep dive. Ms Hartley informed this is not included as a formal recommendation, however it is highlighted in the learning points. Ms Blackburn asked whether this should be included as a formal recommendation. Ms Hartley was conscious that there were three local authorities involved in this review and they also need to accept the learning, the recommendations from this review were contained to the key issues with the recommendation that the learning points have also been embedded. Ms Ramsden informed that there is a discussion about having a GM collation of learning points from serious case reviews and would not advocate additional recommendations.
- 2.9. Dr Ghangrekar informed that patients referred to IRIS often say they are no longer with the partner, however it is known that often these patients will end up in another relationship with similar domestic abuse issues, and asked if there is any work being done after a relationship has ended to empower them to come back and move away from the domestic violence. Ms Ramsden said the answer is currently no we do not have any intensive work in place however this is very valid and noted that recently Research In Practice (RIP) reviewed the practice in Salford, we know we have less capacity than we want to have in this area.
- 2.10. Miss Kelsey informed that this report will be taken to the practice review subgroup to look at any Rochdale specific learning it will also go to the Rochdale Safeguarding Children Partnership. Ms Clarkson informed that this will be the same for Manchester Safeguarding Children Partnership.
- 2.11. Mr Westwood asked how we would be able to access papers from private law to share CAFCASS information when private law proceedings have been in place. Ms Hartley noted that within this review it was noted that if children's services become aware of concerns moving back to family care, they should seek access to that information. Ms Ramsden informed there are regular meetings with the Family Justice Court and it can be discussed there to see if, in these circumstances, we will be able to access these papers. It was agreed this would be an action for Zoe Fearon to progress.
- 2.12. Ms Ramsden asked if things have changed in Probation since the JTAI. Ms Davies felt changed had been made and informed that she has just completed an audit on transfers within clusters. Transfers within areas are difficult and we are aware of coercive control which will always be a challenge. A lot is dependent on the confidence of the practitioner. NPS work with perpetrators and victims and noted that the controls in place are only as good as the people doing the work. Ms Davis stressed that home visits are important.

- 2.13. Ms Ramsden thanked Ms Hartley for attending today and noted that SSCP will disseminate the learning and the recommendations and learning points will be included in an action plan. Miss Hartley informed that a practitioner event was part of the review process, she will also prepare a 7-minute briefing for publication.
- 2.14. Ms Ramsden thanked Ms Hartley, Ms Kelsey – Rochdale Safeguarding Children Partnership and Ms Clarkson - Manchester Safeguarding Children Partnership for attending today

Actions and next steps:

- It was agreed to include the full details of the family feedback in the report.
 - It was noted that this is an SCR and will be published on the SSCP website and NSPCC repository.
 - Ms Hartley will further anonymise the report prior to publication.
 - Mr Westwood will write to the National panel when he sends the final version of the report to them.
 - The SSCP will disseminate the learning from this review and produce an action plan.
 - Ms Fearon will be asked to ask the Family Justice Court to consider sharing CAFCASS information from Private Law cases when children's services have concerns about the children.
3. **SSCP Minutes**
- 3.1. The minutes of the meeting held on 17th June 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.
4. **SSCP Action Log**
- 4.1. The action log was updated at the meeting.
5. **Feedback from:**
- a. **Safeguarding Exec 11/7/19**
- 5.1. There was a strong political view that the inter-board protocol should include all integrated commissioning and joint arrangements, however it was understood that this protocol is about statutory boards and their arrangements. The Safeguarding Executive has endorsed the inter-board protocol now.
- 5.2. The Safeguarding Executive looked at the role of independent scrutiny, where Mr Westwood's role as Independent Adviser fits into the partnership and also independent scrutiny at a Greater Manchester level.
- 5.3. Ms Ramsden informed that she received a letter to inform that the DFE are looking at what has changed since the implementation of the new safeguarding arrangements. It was thought that some areas have not implemented many changes, Salford have implemented change so it is important to ensure the role of independent scrutiny is right. Mr Westwood informed that Ofsted are looking at the scrutiny role, another Local Authority he works with has had an Ofsted inspection recently and the inspectors wanted to speak to Mr Westwood as the partnership advisor.
- 5.4. The Safeguarding Executive also had discussions regarding Greater Manchester and funding.

b. Salford Integrated Board Chairs (6/8/19)

- 5.5. Mr Westwood informed that there has been a lot of work undertaken by the business managers to produce a forward plan of work.
- 5.6. The value of the workshop held prior to this meeting and the outcome of that was noted.
- 5.7. There are other areas we could streamline and work together with.

c. GM Standards Board 3/9/19

- 5.8. Ms Ramsden informed that the minutes were not available yet.
- 5.9. Jane Shuffleworth has been working for Greater Manchester for two days per week and has taken on the role of interim chair of this partnership whilst they work out the next steps and recruit a new chair.
- 5.10. The meeting included discussion around independent scrutiny and the role of the GM standards board.
- 5.11. The GM Standards Board have children's services data and some GMP data, they are also working on collecting health data regarding conferencing and medicals. **Ms Ramsden agreed to** share the link with partners.
- 5.12. They intend to use the learning from the peer review on complex safeguarding, this learning will be collated along with some independent scrutiny of the process from RIP who observed the last two peer review sessions to see if they were used effectively. This will become part of the toolkit.
- 5.13. The meeting also discussed other areas of shared learning including learning from SCRs.
 - GM Policies update
- 5.14. Ms Ramsden informed that Ms Shuffleworth will coordinate this to ensure there local ownership when procedures are updated. We currently pay TriX to do the updates and have used some money available to support the process if required.

d. Safeguarding Operational Group (12/09/19)

- 5.15. Ms Patel informed that the meeting on 12th September was the second meeting of this group, they are still in the process of understanding what information should come into the group and where it should go.
- 5.16. The minutes were not yet available to be shared.
- 5.17. The last meeting included discussions regarding:
 - The funding to support business managers with the GM policies, more information was requested before a commitment was made.
 - Sub-group work plans, it was acknowledged that more work was required. The Safeguarding Operational Group will review all sub-group work plans biannually.
 - Forward plans.
 - Workforce and communication were discussed and a plan agreed.
 - The risk register and escalation, and agreed work regarding this as some of the work identified are worries and not risks. Ms Slack will work on this outside the meeting.
 - Reviewed the budget, and forecast, this included discussion regarding the Early Adopter and CDOP funding. It was agreed to pay the fee for ICO data protection.
 - The job descriptions and review of SSCP business unit.

e. Partnership Business Manager's 26/9/19

- 5.18. Ms Baker informed that the network group of business managers have undertaken a lot of work to develop the forward plan to help to drive the partnerships' business streams more effectively.
- 5.19. The group intends to look at sub-group arrangements and identify where they can merge.
- 5.20. The group is planning a work programme to reflect safeguarding and community safety plans.

- Salford Inter-board Protocol

- 5.21. Ms Baker informed that this has been refreshed and is here for ratification.
- 5.22. Ms Ramsden informed that the appendix showing where priorities were being led generated most discussion, this chart has been changed and does clarify who is leading on what.
- 5.23. It was agreed to endorse this Inter-board Protocol.**

6. SSCP Spotlight

a. Priority 2: Complex Safeguarding

- 6.1. Ms Harrison informed that this is a new group; the purpose of the spotlight report is to assure the partnership that the group is doing what we wanted it to do. Ms Harrison noted that the complex safeguarding hub has also highlighted the need to address adult complex safeguarding and noted that when pathways are agreed, it is expected there will be a greater demand on the service from vulnerable adults at risk of criminal exploitation.
- 6.2. There are a number of vulnerable adults, who do not necessarily meet thresholds to be eligible for adult social care support. It is important to help them understand that they are victims.
- 6.3. Ms Harrison informed that she started to work on the terms of reference (TOR) with Ms Hubber; initially they looked at the TOR of the previous three groups, however services have developed which was aided by the peer review, in addition there is caution regarding over selling their selves and their capacity. For example, the complex safeguarding hub does not have adult social workers in place to help at the moment.
- 6.4. Ms Harrison informed that they will have ToR which identify the current provision and articulating what they aim to provide in the future.
- 6.5. Gareth Jenkins produced a comprehensive delivery plan, however clarity around pathways is required. Ideally there would be an equivalent of The Bridge, but resources are not currently available to develop this. A set of recommendations will be made via the complex safeguarding group and brought to this meeting.
- 6.6. Police operations have focussed on organised crime, working as a multi-agency team to steer young people away from this lifestyle. The Safeguarding Team focussed on threats to life, all interested in protecting families at risk.
- 6.7. The new development; no wrong door, will be named Route 29 this will help as it is known that services overlap, children and families may fit in different areas.
- 6.8. The governance was established using the gold, silver bronze model and utilises the GM complex safeguarding board as well as neighbourhood meetings. It was noted that care needs to be taken with the use of community meetings, as there is limited capacity. GMP does receive a lot of demand at the front door and will need to take away from problem solving to deal with demand on occasion.

- 6.9. Perf measures have been drawn up; however detailed data is not available yet. There is GM wide data available on complex safeguarding and they want to be outcomes focussed. It was noted that we may not see the outcomes for several years.
- 6.10. One challenge is the cultural shift; children are being forced into crime from older children. National guidelines are not very clear and GMP have requested clarity in this area. They are trying to do the right thing for the Salford young people.
- 6.11. Mr Packer explained that a significant part of the work is looking at diversions, to show different ways to support young people and take them out of the environment. The positive outcome of colocation for the complex safeguarding hub has been a changed culture, there is a difference in the terminology used and a recognition that they are victims.
- 6.12. Mr Westwood noted that there was reference made to improvements required to address intelligence gaps and asked if there was any specific area identified as a key priority. Mr Packer informed that there was a CPD event held at the end of last year, they found that most of the CSE intelligence was submitted from the complex team. Mr Packer explained the difference between information and intelligence and noted that GMP want to widen the intelligence pool and open it to partners. Any information coming in will be assessed by the team and turned into intelligence.
- 6.13. Mr Westwood informed that North Yorkshire police produced a structured Safeguarding Board intelligence sharing form. Initially there were a lot of concerns regarding potentially submitting useless information and also the confidentiality. There is an ongoing piece of work regarding deciding what useful information is and to stress confidentiality of information providers. They also changed the title from police to partnership information sharing form, which increased the number of form submissions containing information. Mr Packer noted that this does feature in the delivery plan and Mr Jenkins is working on a form to encourage intelligence sharing.

b. Assurance Area 2: Domestic Abuse,

- 6.14. Ms Harrison informed that this report focus is on children affected by domestic abuse and includes findings from the domestic abuse needs analysis and recent MARAC review.
- 6.15. MARAC identified that there is a high volume of repeats; some of these are anti-social behaviour, which still have risks. The challenge from MARAC is that they have heard the case and set a plan, continually bringing back to MARAC does not help to resolve the situation. They will make recommendations on how to deal with these cases, which will probably utilise neighbourhood problem management.
- 6.16. IOPS presents a challenge, for instance information for case reviews is challenging to obtain. ISR has also increased the challenge for partners to contact the DC dealing with the case. This issue has been escalated and GMP are looking to find interim solutions to prevent the need to use 101 to contact DCs.
- 6.17. Ms Ramsden highlighted that the implementation of IOPS is causing a safeguarding risk as police information is not being received in a timely fashion and it is leading to significant delays in decision making. Ms Harrison assured that GMP are aware and are working to get interim measures in place to rectify this.
- 6.18. Mr Packer informed that at the last vulnerability meeting, this issue was raised to discuss views on ISR regarding what is working well and what needs to improve with a view to fix issues. This is being looked at by Joanne Rawlinson.
- 6.19. Ms Harrison informed that they are seeing a growing number of perpetrators being under 18 and being violent to their care givers. The YPDAM has ceased now.

- 6.20. Ms Harrison informed that there is more of an educational requirement, and explained that if it is determined to be NFA, this decision is authorised at inspector level, and is only in relation to criminal action, GMP will link with children's social care regarding the child being a perpetrator and potential victim of crime. It was noted that there is more work to do in this area.
- 6.21. Ms Harrison concluded that overall there is some really good, innovative work taking place in this area to support children.
- 6.22. Ms Baker informed that there is a squad in place to take forward the actions identified by the needs analysis. They also took a challenge paper to the CSP Board, they recognised the recommendations in the needs analysis and asked the squad to take this work forward.
- 6.23. Ms Blackburn queried whether the families who are repeatedly taken to MARAC and asked if there is any risk stratification for these people which include other areas of concern such as mental health, capacity of the victims and links to service. Ms Harrison acknowledged that this is not in place at the moment but would welcome further discussions with Ms Blackburn.
- 6.24. Mr Westwood noted that Operation Encompass is relatively new in Salford and asked if there had been any discussions to extend this to primary care. Ms Harrison was not aware of any discussions, it was acknowledged that it could be important to share this information with GPs. Ms Patel informed that health do receive notification of domestic violence incidents and the safeguarding lead does scan through the notifications. Ms Patel will look at the system in place to assure that the CCG are aware of domestic abuse incidents as soon as possible.
- 6.25. Ms Harrison informed that organised crime group (OCG) tensions can impact on children, and suggested implementing a similar process to the operation encompass model for OCG tensions.
- 6.26. Ms Baker informed that there have been discussions to extend operation encompass to include nurseries and noted that Jane Case would be able to update further on this.
- 6.27. Ms Ramsden informed that Rochdale have completed some work on tensions within families and have set up a workshop. Becky Bibby will attend this workshop which will also address violence towards carers.
- 6.28. Ms Armfield informed that the teaching of healthy relationships is compulsory in school curriculums now and this will hopefully change outcomes for children.
- 6.29. Mr Westwood noted that the needs assessment included in the papers is a good example of how it works.

Actions and next steps:

- Look at the Operation Encompass model to identify if it can be extended out to include GPs.
- Consider implementing a similar model or using Operation Encompass to include OCG tensions.

7. How are we doing Q1 2019/20 summary report

- 7.1.** Ms Patel apologised for the late submission of this report. The Safeguarding Effectiveness report was written to accompany the high level data.
- 7.2.** The report is working in line with the forward plan, next time it is expected to have more range of evidence.
- 7.3.** Ms Patel noted highlights from the scorecard:

- The number of child protection plans continued to increase although there was a decrease in the number of S47s.
 - Timeliness of child protection was conference reduced in this quarter, this was discussed and the sub-group are aware that reasons for lateness of conferences are agreed by the head of service.
 - Further exploration areas identified: Q1 had the highest number on CP plans for neglect since 2015/16. There was discussion at the last meeting regarding children referred for abuse/neglect. It was identified under broader discussions that external referrals are recorded as family dysfunction. This will be discussed further with Mr Littlemore and will also be looked at by Carole Brooks with her work on neglect.
 - CSE data noted a significant decrease in the number of crimes, but little change to the number of Bridge referrals. Ms Harrison informed that she discussed this with Gareth Jenkins, and would welcome further information regarding the data source. They did note there was a lull in February and then numbers went back up. Ms Patel agreed to ask Mr Harding for the contact details of the GMP data lead.
 - Domestic abuse – this was discussed in the spotlight report; it was noted that incidents reported into The Bridge had increased.
 - Early Help have continued to increase the number of assessments, this was noted as positive. .
 - There was no data available on complex safeguarding, the group identified that numbers of referrals in would be good as a basic start point.
- 7.4. Ms Patel informed that reduced membership at Safeguarding Effectiveness Group meetings is adversely affecting the group's ability to be effective.
- 7.5. Mr Westwood noted that we need to understand the relationships between the data, for example Early Help assessments and Team Around the Child (TAC) is positive and would hope that we would see a reduction somewhere as a result, unfortunately that has not been seen. Dr Dixit commented that it will take time for the outcome to be in place. Mr Westwood suggested also looking at plans starting within the year, we currently do not know if the increase is due to a build-up of plans, and if we need to look at discharge of CP plans. Ms Hollingworth informed that there are a number of children on CP plans for a significant length of time, this is to reduce the number of children representing on CP Plans. The CP coordinator will not remove a child without assurance and evidence of the journey of the child and will not remove a child from a CP plan without evidence, as a result there is an increase in numbers on plans but there is a decrease in re-plans and it is hoped these figures will further reduce.
- 7.6. Dr Dixit commented that it is positive that there is better agency processes in place to identify risks and an increase in neglect referrals. It was noted that it is a long process to identify neglect.
- 7.7. Ms Patel asked of SSCP want the focus report to look only at Q4. Ms Ramsden asked that the report continues with the purpose set for the group as there is a wider focus.
- 7.8. Ms Ramsden noted that we need partners to attend the sub-group. The SSCP Business unit will email where representatives have not attended and request attendance, and escalate to query why they have not attended.
- 7.9. Ms Patel informed that representatives at the group need to have sufficient oversight.

Actions and next steps:

- Ms Patel agreed to ask Mr Harding for the contact details of the GMP data lead.
- The SSCP Business unit will email representatives who have not attended Safeguarding Effectiveness meetings and request attendance, and escalate to query why they have not attended.

8. Partnership Subgroup Updates

a. Practice Review

8.1. Ms Hollingworth updated:

- There is good attendance at meetings.
- New case review guidance with a toolkit has been shared
- The purpose of the practice review sub-group is more focused.
- Rapid and case reviews are all progressing within timescales.
- Case review training has been organised for November and December.
- The group will develop a parental advisory board; Ms Ford is liaising with Bexley around this.
- We need Case review facilitators; they should also access the training. Email to follow up?
- Ms Ramsden acknowledged there is pressure to complete rapid reviews within a short timescale and noted that Ms Slack will monitor. Mr Westwood informed that the time given to read the rapid review report and submit his comments is very tight. It was agreed to develop a contingency plan in case Mr Westwood is not available to endorse the recommendations of the rapid review panel.

Actions/next steps

- **SSCP Business Unit will send an email to request case review facilitators are identified to access training.**
- **Ms Slack will monitor rapid review timescales.**
- **Develop a contingency plan in case Mr Westwood is not available to endorse the recommendations of the rapid review panel within timescale.**

b. Strategic Workforce Development

8.2. Ms Begum updated:

- The sub-group meetings are well attended by representatives from both children's and adults' services.
- In the process of revising the strategy, TOR and work plan.
- The group remains driven by the SSCP and their needs to be increased contribution from SSAB including merged priorities such as organised crime groups, this is in place for children's services but we need to cover both.
- SSAB training is not as established as the SSCP training and the governance for workforce needs and requirements is unclear.
- Recently held a Training Pool Development day; a lot of partners support the delivery of the training programme and it was requested that more partners come on board to facilitate training courses and support the training programme. There are an increasing number of conferences and spotlight briefings, as well as train the trainer sessions held as part of the training programme.
- It was noted that members of the training pool deliver courses and seminars because they want to and they have asked for continued support from strategic leads as they do not always feel supported by their managers. A letter has been

drafted which will be signed by statutory partners and disseminated to strategic leads.

- 8.3. Ms Ramsden asked that the Workforce Development Group feed into the SSCP if they become aware of issues that would be beneficial to be shared or requested at a GM level.

Actions/next steps

- Partners were asked to support the training programme
- Statutory partners will sign the letter to request strategic leads support staff to contribute to the training pool.
- Feedback to the SSCP on issues that would be beneficial to be shared or requested at a GM level.

c. Neglect

8.4. Ms Blackburn tabled the neglect sub-group update report and highlighted:

- Engagement events have been planned; details included in the update report.
- The neglect summit will take place on 29th October 2019.
- The needs assessment is in progress.

8.5. Ms Ramsden informed that a social work report on neglect has also been completed.

8.6. Ms Harrison informed that she co-chairs the drug and alcohol group and asked if there is anything they can do to support.

8.7. Dr Dixit noted that obesity is also a symptom of neglect and informed that a paper was written for the pathway and designed for Salford use. The paper is currently with health partners for feedback before it is shared with SSCP.

8.8. Mr Westwood noted that Manchester have recently published an SCR that features obesity and neglect.

Actions/next steps

- Ms Blackburn and Ms Harrison to liaise regarding the drug and alcohol group supporting the work of the neglect group.

d. Education

8.9. Ms Armfield updated:

- There is good representation at the group; they have identified a gap regarding SEND representation and discussed this with Ms Starbuck.
- The last meeting looked at making best use of Early Help Coordinators; the group is involved in QA of these roles.
- Keep schools updated on items discussed.
- The group has asked schools to identify immediately if the wrong school has been notified of a domestic violence incident through Operation Encompass.
- The group is working with Carole Brooks on the neglect strategy.
- Work with E-Safe is ongoing to develop a contextualised understanding of what children are accessing online.

8.10. Mr Westwood asked at what point the schools audit will be used. Ms Armfield informed that the audit should have been included in today's briefing, however there was an issue, it will be out later today. Schools are advised to complete the audit and to use this as their submission for audit requests such as Section 11.

e. Communication and Engagement

8.11. Report submitted with the papers, no further update shared at the meeting.

f. Voice of the Child

8.12. Mr Rumley updated:

- Last meeting looked at setting up aims of the group and ensuring the young people understand the agendas of the SSCP and 0-25 Advisory Board.
 - Looked at what is positive care.
 - The group is trying to bring youth groups together, going to the groups and asking how it would be best for them to be involved in the VOC group.
 - Completed the ToR with young people and looking at creating a young person friendly version.
 - Working to identify how to present SSCP items creatively to young people in order to encourage and facilitate their feedback and input.
- 0-25 Advisory Board - Engagement with Young People and Families
 - Making a Difference Project Highlight Report

8.13. Ms Prest presented the highlight report which was included in the papers for this meeting:

- The project aims to increase and make evident and visible the work undertaken to engage with young people.
- The project is looking at identifying methods already used within services and helping them to develop their own engagement methods and reduce the number of items brought through the VOC agenda.
- The model embedded in the report is from NCB and promotes a shared language to demonstrate change, how young people have been listened to etc.
- Feedback from young people is valuable and this is an opportunity to discuss how to get a feedback hub. Looking at how we centralise the feedback asking questions such as; what helps you be well in Salford. A lot of comments received currently relate to CAMHS.
- The project outcomes fit into five separate 5 work areas.
- Talking to young people about who has made a difference to their lives has given a description of the sort of person they respond well to. Ms Prest would like to introduce an award for any worker from any agency that meets the young people's criteria.

8.14. Ms Ramsden recognised that the governance for the project work streams are complicated. Ms Westwood noted that the ambition would be that the Health and Wellbeing Board had the governance for this work as it relates to the health and wellbeing of all children in Salford; however it was recognised that in reality this was unlikely to be achieved quickly and probably needs to be driven through this partnership initially. Ms Harrison asked if the project should be discussed at SOG level before being brought to SSCP. Ms Patel noted that discussions with Ms Prest have acknowledged that clear governance is required for this project outside of the project group.

8.15. Ms Ramsden concluded that where the work is in relation to safeguarding updates should go via SOG to SSCP. For 0-25 elements they should go via the 0-25 Advisory Board and then to Children's Commissioning. If the work identifies areas for other boards to provide assurance, we can pass this on and indicate that we require a response.

Actions/next steps

- It was agreed to add the making a difference project to the agenda for inter-board chairs to agree the governance of the five work streams.
- SSCP will take the lead role in governance of this project; safeguarding elements will go to SSCP via SOG, 0-25 elements will go to Children's Commissioning via the 0-25 Advisory Board.

g. CDOP

8.16. Ms Patel informed that a task group has been set up to look at CDOP work; there is an action plan and meetings in place.

8.17. Ms Blackburn has agreed to Chair CDOP on an interim basis.

8.18. Discussions took place on Friday to look at the proposal to look at governance on a GM basis. This will be included in the commissioning standards.

Actions/next steps

- Ms Patel agreed to provide a written update on CDOP, including the proposals for the GM approach for the next SSCP meeting.

9. Pre Conference Reflective Session Pilot evaluation June19

9.1. Ms Hollingworth presented the evaluation report with was written by Chris Broadbent.

9.2. Purpose of introducing pre-conference reflective sessions was to reduce the number of children re-presented to child protection conferences as Salford has the highest rate in GM. A reflective session is held for all children re-presented within 12 months of a previous plan closing or for a third presentation regardless of the time since the last plan closed.

9.3. The reflective sessions commenced in Jan 2019 and provide a good example of agencies feeling informed. It was noted that 70% of people who attend the conference were not known to the family previously and therefore were not involved with the discharge of the previous plan. The Safeguarding Unit now completes an audit of the case and provides a written history of the case so all current professionals have an understanding of the family history.

9.4. It is proposed to consult with parents at the end of each CP plan so they inform us of their views on the plan.

9.5. Partnership support was requested to encourage past worker attendance at reflective sessions and also to identify facilitators to lead reflective sessions. At the moment all reflective sessions are led by Ms Hollingworth and this is not sustainable in the long term.

9.6. Mr Westwood commended this piece of work and noted that it is addressing the right questions. Ms Hollingworth informed that she has also started to work with the QA team to identify themes and triangulate themes across partners.

Actions/next steps

- The SSCP agreed to support the continuation of pre-conference reflective sessions for another 12 month period.
- SOG will be asked to support the identification of facilitators for reflective sessions; it was noted that facilitators from different agencies would be beneficial.

- Ms Hollingworth agreed to prepare a set of questions for past workers to complete to inform the reflective session as it was accepted that it was unlikely they would have the capacity to attend.

10. YPP Evaluation (Jan 2019)

- **YPP Assurance Report (May 2019)**
- **YPP Guidance (Aug 2019),**

10.1. Ms Hollingworth presented the YPP evaluation and highlighted:

- 64% felt the threshold for YPP was right.
- The recommendation to implement tighter timescales has been implemented.
- A separate letter will be sent to parents of young people with a YPP to inform them what support is required from them
- A pilot will start soon to ensure that the same coordinator chairs the YPP meetings and CP meetings for any siblings. Ms Hollingworth noted that this has been a challenge to coordinate but should start by the end of October 2019.

10.2. Ms Hollingworth informed that the IT department have worked with to include a risk and rationale box to be explicit about why the YPP was decided.

10.3. Most actions on the action plan are complete. GMP markers were outstanding, however now every young person on an YPP has a CP marker on their name as well as the address where they are living. This mirrors the CP process. Ms Harrison highlighted that this is a benefit of the new police IT system, the previous system would not allow a CP marker to be placed on an individual

10.4. There is a plan in place to receive police information for YPP meetings. YPPs are reviewed 6-weekly but GMP will be asked to submit information in line with CPP expectations (3-monthly).

10.5. Ms Ramsden commented that YPPs were recognised as good practice in the peer review and is assured that the plans are connected back to progress against risks and noted there is interest in the process from DfE.

10.6. It was noted that young people on YPPs are not currently included in CPP figures, work is in progress to address this; they are worked at the same level as CPP and are tracked in the same way.

10.7. Mr Westwood commented that previous reviews had indicated areas that needed to be addressed for YPPs and this evaluation and action plan provides assurance that these areas have been addressed. This is an excellent piece of work.

11. Family S SCR , Simon Westwood

11.1. Mr Westwood noted that the papers for this meeting included a copy of the action plan for this SCR.

11.2. This SCR has generated significant interaction with the national panel, who advocate that the report could be redacted and published. However redaction lost context and it has been agreed that the final report will not change and will not be published. This decision was endorsed by the SSCP Safeguarding Executive.

11.3. As the final report was agreed, learning needs to be disseminated.

11.4. Mr Westwood informed that he is meeting with the Coroner on Wednesday, 2nd October 2019, the Coroner has requested a copy of the SCR report and the IOPC report. The purpose of the meeting is to request that the report is not placed into the public domain.

11.5. The final SCR Report will be circulated to the wider partnership and an event will be arranged for the report author to present the report.

- 11.6. Ms Harrison informed that the IOPC have produced a report, however recommendations have not been agreed yet, that report cannot be shared until the recommendations are agreed.
- 11.7. Mr Westwood informed that it has been agreed that the mother's death will also be heard by the Salford Coroner and not Manchester.
- 11.8. It was noted that there may be further criminal investigations following the death of the mother.
- 11.9. A wider learning event needs to be arranged to share the learning from this SCR.

12. SSCB Annual Report 2018-19, Simon Westwood,

- 12.1. Mr Westwood informed that he has started work on this report and will pull together a draft using the same format as previous years. This annual report is the last one reporting on the previous arrangements.
- 12.2. The draft report will be circulated for comments, evidence and challenge.

13. Feedback to:

a. SSCP Subgroups

- Safeguarding effectiveness Group to remain focussed on original TOR
- Link with the children and young people to continue
- Safeguarding Operational Group will be asked to support the identification of facilitators for reflective sessions ahead of repeat CP conferences; it was noted that facilitators from different agencies would be beneficial.

b. SSCP Safeguarding Executive

- See the work ongoing regarding young people and understand the role of partnership and executive in overseeing that
- Share the SCR report and action plan from Case 2018-05 in confidence
- Update on the SCR Family S

c. Other Local Boards/Partnerships

- Several things agreed to be referred to the GM Standards Board in relation to SCRs and need to link up around CDOP

d. Regional Meetings

- Nothing discussed at this meeting to feedback regionally.

e. Children, Professionals & Communities

- Feedback to children and young people that the two reports were positively received.
- Mr Rumley will continue to engage with young people.

f. Items to evidence impact, challenge and good practice, Chair ,

- The YPP and the work undertaken to evaluate it.
- Complex Safeguarding developments

Key Information: Items Circulated for Information

14. Local Authority Modern Slavery Statement,

14.1. The modern slavery statement was available with the papers for this meeting, members of the partnership were advised to contact Jeanette Staley with any comments or queries. (jeanette.staley@salford.gov.uk)

15. Family S SCR

15.1. The following documents were included with the papers for this meeting for information, members of the partnership were advised to contact sscp@salford.gov.uk with any comments or queries:

- Action Plan
- Letter to C SPR 2019-08-19
- C SPR Response Letter

16. Dates and themes of future SSCP meetings

Date	Report Deadline	Theme	SSCP Lead
16/12/2019	6/12/2019	Neglect	Debbie Blackburn

Minutes approved by: Charlotte Ramsden, Strategic Director, People

Minutes approved on: 13th November 2019