

Minutes
Meeting Title: Leicester Safeguarding Children Board Meeting
Date: 6th December 2018
Venue: Town Hall, Room 1.12 (Tea Room), Bishop Street, Leicester

Name	Role	Agency	Present	Apologies	Absent
(The Chair)	Independent Chair of the LSCB	Independent	✓		
(AT)	Lay Member	LSCB		✓	
(ASp)	Consultant Nurse, Safeguarding Children and Adults	Leicester Clinical Commissioning Group		✓	
(AEJ)	Designated Doctor for Safeguarding Children	Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust	✓		
(AC)	Deputy Chief Nurse	Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust		✓	
(BB)	Head of Service (HoS)	DLNR Community Rehabilitation Company		✓	
(CT)	Director of Social Care and Early Help	Leicester City Council	✓		
(CS)	Headteacher, <i>City Primary Heads Representative</i>	Education		✓	
(CW)	Director of Nursing and Quality	Leicester Clinical Commissioning Group	✓		
(CM)	Head of Service	CAFCASS	✓		
(JDF)	Head of Service, Early Help	Leicester City Council	✓		
(JH)	Designated Nurse, Children and Adult Safeguarding	CCG	✓		
(JB)	Principal, Representing Secondary Heads	New College Leicester	✓		
(MD)	Head of Serious Crime	Leicestershire Police	✓		
(MH)	Senior Operational Support Manager	HMPPS, Nation Probation Service		✓	
(NT)	Children's Service Manager	Barnardos	✓		
(PT)	Director of Learning & Inclusion	Leicester City Council	✓		
(PP)	Head of Law, <i>LSCB Legal Advisor</i>	Leicester City Council	✓		
(RH)	LLR CDOP Public Health Consultant	Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland CDOP		✓	
(RL)	Director of Adult Social Care	Leicester City Council	✓		
(RT)	Director of Public Health	Leicester City Council		✓	
(SR)	Lead Member, <i>Participant Observer</i>	Leicester City Council	✓		
(SI)	Deputy Principal, <i>Further Education Representative</i>	Leicester College		✓	
(SH)	Director of Clinical Quality	University Hospitals Leicester NHS Trust		✓	
(SF)	Strategic Director Social Care & Education	Leicester City Council	✓		

(TB)	HoS Children's Safeguarding and Quality Assurance,	Leicester City Council	✓		
------	--	------------------------	---	--	--

In Attendance

Name	Role	Agency	Role at Meeting
OR	Admin and Business Support Officer	LSCB	Minutes and Business Support.
(PrP)	Policy Officer	LSCB	Advisor to the Board.
(CC)	Programme Officer	Leicester City Council	Presented Adverse Childhood Experiences report.
(EC)	Service Manager, Education Welfare Service	Leicester City Council	Presented Child Missing from education report.
(JA)	Public Health Consultant	Leicester City Council	Deputising for RT, representing Public Health.
(LC)	Programme Officer	Leicester City Council	Presented Adverse Childhood Experiences report.
(LB)	LSAB Manager	LSAB	Representing LSAB.
(NK)	Trust Lead for Safeguarding	Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust	Representing LPT.
(RC)	Independent Reviewer	N/A	Presented LSAB Serious Case Review.

1.	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies.
1.1	The Chair welcomed members and noted the above apologies.
Part 1	LSCB Strategic Board Business
2.	Minutes and matters arising from Board meeting on 20.09.2018 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Board Meeting Minutes • Action Log • LSCB Forward Plan
2.1	<p>The minutes of the last meeting that took place on 20/09/2018 were agreed as an accurate record.</p> <p>BC confirmed that all outstanding actions are progressing according to their timelines.</p> <p>The Chair briefly introduced the LSCB Forward Plan and noted that the document aims to assist partners in providing timely reports for subsequent meetings.</p>
3.	Chair's Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AILC Annual Conference
3.1	<p>The Board were informed that both The Chair and BC attended the AILC Annual Conference.</p> <p>Presentations that took place included one from the Children's Minister and the Chair of National Panel. Edward Timpson discussed future plans regarding safeguarding learning reviews. PT queried whether Exclusions Reviews were discussed, and BC confirmed they were not mentioned.</p> <p>It was noted that multi-agency safeguarding arrangements were discussed and that the majority of safeguarding boards across the UK have effectively stayed the same. It was stated that there is no appetite to change if partnership arrangements have been deemed to be working well and Boards have just remodelled the arrangements.</p>

	<p>BC informed the Board of a presentation from the National Crime Agency around exploitation and their approach to secure convictions.</p> <p>It was also noted that the CDOP work-shop was very interesting and details will be shared when published. It was agreed that steps will be taken to consider how the Board can take forward some of the key messages.</p> <p>Discussions around the setting up of a multi-agency safeguarding alliance also took place at the conference and it seemed very positive in terms of information sharing.</p> <p>It was confirmed that a letter from the Chair has gone out to headteachers across Leicester schools and has been added to the School's Extranet, regarding quoracy at Child Protection meetings.</p> <p>It was noted that a Children's Trust discussion about the Early Help offer took place and information went out to schools. An offer to get in contact if unsure what to do was confirmed to have been made.</p> <p>AEJ stated that the agreement for earlier treatment of children with ADHD, from the age of five, may also help schools. SR noted that queries were raised about alternative provisions, how they are looked at and if they are used carefully.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that the LSCB Annual Report went to the Scrutiny Panel and some helpful discussions with Young People (YP) took place. It was noted that the YP are holding an enquiry into mental health and asked the Chair to support the work and be a witness to their call for action. The Chair stated that it is a very interesting piece of work and that the YP are keen that Mental Health services are improved for young people in schools. SR clarified that the YP conduct a vote to acquire nine topics. Discussions took place to consider the positives and negatives for the topics as the main item for the following year. SR noted that hearing young people talk about such things is very powerful and discussions are run in a similar way to select committees at the House of Commons and it is the Young People's decision as to how feedback is provided. It was suggested that Board members watch the young people's debate that took place in the Council Chambers as it is interesting to see how topics are selected.</p> <p>The Chair reported on the LLR Joint Executive Group meeting that took place on 22/11/2018 and noted that concerns were raised regarding how smaller voluntary organisations are commissioned. A good response was received around agencies checking their arrangements and loopholes were identified. It was agreed that this was very good in terms of providing assurance and governance.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Core Business and Chairs Executive Highlight Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSCB Risk Register

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSCB Budget Report • PAAG Highlight Report
4.1	<p>LSCB Risk Register The Chair presented the LSCB Risk Register to the group and requested any queries and/or comments from Board members.</p> <p>The following were discussed:</p> <p>No.7 – Not enough Early Help Assessments are led by other agencies other than Children’s Social Care and there is not sufficient assurance that the role of lead professional is undertaken equitably within all agencies.</p> <p>JDF requested this risk be re-worded as follows: “other than the City Council”. It was noted that the progress report provides some assurance, with Early Help assessment work with schools and the LPT pilot for Early Help assessment. It was agreed that if the model works, it will increase the number of Early Help assessments within own agencies.</p> <p>It was noted that risk no.9, concerning children missing from education will be discussed during agenda item</p> <p>No.5 – The waiting time for CAMHS assessment remains at 20 weeks. This remains a significant increase and further assurance is required around how the risk is being addressed should be provided.</p> <p>CW requested that this risk be moved down to amber from red. CT challenged this suggestion as the Local Authority is currently reviewing contributions to the service. CW noted that CCG did seek and receive assurance around wait list. It was confirmed that children on the wait list were managed, escalated appropriately and received care. The Board agreed that a 20-week waiting list is not acceptable and if the risk rating were changed to amber, the Board would, in effect, be saying it is acceptable.</p> <p>SR suggested the addition of a 2-column approach to level of risk on the Risk Register, which SF agreed would be of benefit.</p> <p>AP33/18 The Chair agreed that the suggested new process for the Risk Register will be considered and presented at the next Core Business and Chairs Executive (CBC) meeting, where the Register is managed. The revised Risk Register will then be presented at the next Board meeting.</p>
4.2	LSCB Budget Report

	<p>BC presented the LSCB Budget Report to the group and noted that the budget is broadly balanced. It was noted that there is no proposal for next year's budget as it is being dealt with separately by the safeguarding partners and will need to be confirmed. It was confirmed that any requests to support the work of the sub-groups would go through the CBC. It was confirmed that the purpose of the Budget report is to provide oversight to the Board. The Board agreed the report.</p>
<p>4.3</p>	<p>PAAG Highlight Report JH presented the report and confirmed the critical messages contained within.</p> <p>Impact of Austerity. It was noted that this critical message will be passed back to the LLR Joint Executive Group as it should allow better discussion. SR queried what indicators could be used for the impact of austerity to be seen, as it is clear that there is an impact and measurement of this is required. JH stated that further, broader discussions are required around this. BC noted the importance of linking it to what is already known and showing a correlation. The Chair noted a very shocking UN Report regrading this subject and agreed the significance of needing to consider this further, looking at how much understanding there is around what circumstances the families are living in. SR made an offer to the group to request that the Children's Trust (CT) Board consider that area. It was noted that the impact of working with people in dire poverty also has an impact on staff. SF agreed that the CT Board would be the better option for discussion and noted the need to consider what can achieved as a Board. Assurance that frontline staff are able to deal with this is also required, as they need to capture what they can around the impact of poverty as part of their assessments, where it is appropriate, and the link needs to be made and understood.</p> <p>Quoracy – Initial Child Protection Conferences. The Board were informed that work on quoracy at Child Protection conferences is due to be completed by end of Q4. Some further amendments to the report and data are still required.</p> <p>Increase in number Rape victims under 18 managed by Leicestershire Police. It was confirmed that Leicestershire Police are monitoring this. PAAG will also continue to monitor this into Q3 and remove it from the Board critical messages.</p> <p>CAMHS Waiting Times It was queried whether the current 4-week waiting period is too long and JH confirmed that PAAG will continue to monitor this. The Chair requested further information on this at the next Board meeting taking place in March. SR noted difficulties in holding partners to account for something that has not been commissioned. CW provided the Board with assurance that there is a refreshed approach being taken by CCG, with a robust risk</p>

	<p>management process in place that manages children that are known to them. CW feels that the management of risk is good and any escalations are being prioritised. CW confirmed that CCG triage was discussed at a previous meeting and will be in place by summer 2019. It was agreed that this will be kept as a critical message and will remain on the LSCB Risk Register.</p> <p>NK informed the Board that LPT are being asked to look at fire-starters. JH and NK agreed to discuss this outside of the meeting.</p> <p>BC noted that the Multi-Agency Referral Form MARF has been agreed and a paper is being presented at the Information Management and Technology Board. It was stated that decisions are still to be made around how agencies will imbed the new form within systems. The Chair noted that a communication briefing will be important when this work is complete. SF raised concerns about whether the new form is technically feasible for all agencies. JH confirmed that there be one form, that has improved questions and feels the embedding issue is unlikely to happen.</p> <p>LAC Assurance</p> <p>JH confirmed that PAAG will no longer be looking at LAC data and there is a great deal of work taking place on this elsewhere. SR noted that partnership engagement is essential regarding this.</p>			
Ref	Action	Person/s responsible	By	Desired outcome
4.1.1	<p>AP33/18 The Chair agreed that the suggested new process for the Risk Register will be considered and presented at the next Core Business and Chairs Executive (CBC) meeting, where the Register is managed. The revised Risk Register will then be presented at the next Board meeting.</p>	LSCB Office	09/01/2019	
5.	<p>Feedback from other Strategic Partnerships and Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCC CSC Ofsted Inspection Action Plan 			
5.1	<p>The Chair confirmed that no additional feedback had been tabled.</p> <p>SF noted that the CSC Ofsted inspection took place last year, a lot of time has passed since the previous inspection that took place in 2015. The Inspection in 2015 was focussed on compliance, whilst the more recent inspection is now looking at impact.</p>			

	<p>CT confirmed that the revised LCC CSC Ofsted Inspection Action Plan has gone to the City Mayor Briefing and reiterated that it is now focussed on impact. The action plan was also recently presented to scrutiny commissions. It was confirmed that a focus visit will occur between January and March 2019. The focus will be on Child Protection and CiN Services.</p> <p>It was noted that the decision has been made to reinstate an Improvement Board, which will commence in January 2019. The Improvement Board will be a small, independently led group, meeting on a monthly basis initially and the previous chair, Tony Crane, has been recommended to take up chairing duties. The next full Ofsted Inspection is expected in 2020.</p> <p>In summation, it was noted that, on the whole, CSC has moved on a lot since the last inspection, with the implementation of signs of safety a key highlight, as well as not losing focus on key business. It was agreed that the interface and link between the Improvement Board and the LSCB will be important in the coming year.</p>
Part II	LSCB Spotlight: Theme – Disability and Transitions
6.	SEND Inspection, Transformation and EHCPs
6.1	<p>PT presented the SEND Local Area Inspection Report to the Board.</p> <p>The Board were informed that the inspection did not go as well as hoped and the transformation journey is on-going. PT provided assurance that the SEN Board has now been reconfigured to the SEND Improvement Board and a written statement of action has been submitted to Ofsted. It was confirmed that the Improvement Board will oversee these actions and ensure that the transformation is as smooth and quick as possible. Assurance was also provided that the elements are beginning to come together, with lots of consultation taking place.</p> <p>It was noted that SEN is a hugely complex area. To assist people’s understanding a jigsaw puzzle has been added to SEN Newsletter to show all the different aspects of SEN.</p> <p>Education and Health Care Plans (EHCPs) were discussed and PT noted that work with parents is on-going to make them much more accessible and will potentially be made available online. The quality assurance of EHCPs was discussed and it was stated that they all now contain a full Social Care assessment and a new performance indicator has been introduced around EHCPs. EHCPs will go to the SEND Improvement Board to consider both compliance of social care engagement and quality. It was noted that a highlight report from the Chair of SEND Improvement Board may be appropriate for a future Board meeting.</p>

	<p>SF informed the Board that the Local Authority is on track with national trends for the number of EHCPs. AP34/18 It was requested that the disabled children audit be provided to SF as it was noted that practitioners were not aware of EHCPs. JB raised concerns around number of EHCPs and stated there were more statements produced previously than there are current EHCPs.</p> <p>SR noted a shift that advised that schools had to demonstrate that they had made adjustments within the classroom and schools in general. If a school is still unable to meet the required needs, SEN would be approached to offer additional funding for further support at the school. If beyond that, ECHPs would be offered.</p> <p>SF confirmed that the joint commissioning process is not going to the LSAB currently and is still in its early stages.</p> <p>AEJ noted an issue with funding, which is causing children to be unable to be part of EHCP process.</p> <p>AP35/18 SR raised that these concerns need to go to the SEND Improvement Board and suggested a letter from the Independent Chairs of the LSCB and LSAB be sent regarding concerns with SEND and ECHPs.</p> <p>The Chair, in summation, noted the need to ensure the quality of EHCPs and their impact.</p>			
Ref	Action	Person/s responsible	By	Desired outcome
6.1.1	AP34/18 It was requested that the disabled children audit report be provided to SF as it was noted that practitioners were not aware of EHCPs.	LSCB Office	09/01/2019	
6.1.2	AP35/18 SR raised that these concerns need to go to the SEND Improvement Board and suggested a letter from the Independent Chairs of the LSCB and LSAB be sent regarding concerns with SEND and ECHPs.	LSCB & LSAB Office	09/01/2019	
7.	Leicester Safeguarding Adults Board Serious Case Review			
7.1	Independent author, RC, made a presentation regarding the LSAB Serious Case Review 'Colin' Executive Summary to the Board.			

	<p>JB queried whether the system is geared up for YPs who have a disparity between physical and mental age and whether there is any capacity to treat the person via their mental capacity age. SF responded that everybody over 18 is deemed to have capacity and the nature of their condition cannot be used to make judgements regarding their capacity, instead, capacity must be assessed on its own merit. The Board were in agreement that issues around 'Colin' wanting to go out independently should have been picked up earlier. Another missed opportunity was that there was no real involvement of 'Colin's' paternal uncle, in terms of care planning or support planning.</p> <p>Overview Recommendation 1 regarding Children's and Adult's services CSC jointly reviewing a transition pathway process was discussed, as was the focus on positive risk taking. The Chair queried whether there a pattern or trend with any other cases, as this is likely an underlying issue.</p> <p>SF agreed that the review highlighted weakness with the transition process and informed the Board that an Improvement Plan has been worked on for over 6 months. The need to accept that there are levels of risk are unable to be assessed was noted and it was stated that a number of children are at risk of catastrophic event. There is no potential answer for children in this circumstance. SR confirmed that the review of the transition arrangement is open now and due to close on 8th February 2019.</p> <p>The Board discussed the fact that 'Colin' was charged with an offence of indecent exposure towards some girls on a bus in 2011. CT informed the Board that discussions have taken place around the labelling of young people as sexual perpetrators, as one incident does not make you a paedophile. The importance to ensure that young children do not end up having a label that they do not deserve was agreed.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the report will be published anonymously, and it was requested that Board members disseminate pertinent actions from the report within their agencies. The report itself is embargoed and cannot be shared, however the recommendations contained within can be shared.</p>
Part III	LSCB Learning and Assurance Reports
8.	<p>Serious Case Reviews Child D1 and Child E1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child D1 – Short Learning Summary • Child E1 – Short Learning Summary
8.1	<p>CT provided the group with an update regarding Serious Case Reviews for Child D1 and Child E1 and it was confirmed that the reviews took place over two years ago and there was a lot of discussion about what was published and how.</p>

	<p>It was noted that the current learning summary reports are as good as they can be and sign off is sought by the Board. It was stated that the learning from the cases was taken forward previously.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the full reports will not be published, but the two learning summaries will be published, fully anonymised, on the NSPCC Repository. It was confirmed that the learning summaries have been fully signed off from SIRG, and the SCR Media Planning group during the meeting that took place in October.</p> <p>BC advised that she had received a late request to revise the wording in paragraph 4.6 in the full report for E1 regarding changing the wording. SF noted that ‘should’ and ‘would’ are not interchangeable and that he would require legal advice regarding the wording and whether it could be agreed.</p> <p>As a learning point it was noted that there had been several opportunities to comment on the reports and therefore feedback on reports must be provided in a timely way, so issues can be addressed without delay to the process.</p> <p>The Board reached a decision to sign off the summary reports and agreed that they are the best possible considering the circumstances and should be published anonymously.</p>
9.	Adverse Childhood Experiences
9.1	<p>LC and CC presented the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) report, having been tasked to inform the Board about what has been done as a partnership. A large cross-over between ACEs and mental health was noted.</p> <p>A discussion took place around whether this information needs to go elsewhere, and whether there is something that can be done as a wider partnership to support this.</p> <p>CW noted that she does not feel that this is a piece of work for the Board and only assurance is required, whilst Public Health have a key role in this. SR raised that Route to Resilience, an evidence-based and practical approach to supporting schools and families in their work developing the character, resilience and emotional wellbeing of children and young people, is not included within the paper. SR confirmed that it has expanded massively recently and a great deal of work is being done around this.</p> <p>CT thanked LC and CC for their helpful report and stated that ACEs have been picked up across number of agendas and leadership meetings. It is expected that ACEs are picked up across all Children’s Services discussions and is expected to be relatively standard in terms of assessment.</p>

	<p>CW confirmed that the model has not currently been adopted and sign off by the Joint Integrated Commissioning Board would be required.</p> <p>SF raised the subject of living in care as an ACE and affirmed that living in care should be as positive an experience as possible. SF confirmed that the LA will not sign up to adapt this model in any formality, however, keeping it as a conversational piece is fine. It was agreed that it was a useful discussion and the report will be kept as a reference point.</p> <p>The Chair noted that people need to understand what ACEs are, and that they can be useful in assessments.</p> <p>In summation, it was agreed that the paper can be used by partners within their agencies. NK confirmed that LPT will use the information to consolidate current training around ACEs. NT made the Board aware of an animated film from Barnardo's around ACEs.</p> <p>The Chair and Board thanked LC and CC for the very useful report.</p>
10.	Child Missing from Education
10.1	<p>EC presented the Child Missing from Education report to the Board.</p> <p>The Chair thanked EC for the report and noted it was very helpful, as it provides assurance around the processes that are in place, whilst there are no striking demographics around children that have not been traced.</p> <p>It was agreed that elective home education continues to be a challenge and parents are not obliged to provide information. It was noted that evidence from SCRs may assist with this.</p> <p>SR confirmed the difference between children that have never been on a school roll/register and are effectively invisible, and children whose parents have formally removed them from education. It is important not to badge all home educators as putting their children at risk. The principal around lack of governance was noted as the issue.</p> <p>It was also noted that there is no obligation to visit home educated children. CT stated that the label of home education should not have any impact on whether parents are able to care for children. Any concerns would be picked up as a normal referral and would be treated as a safeguarding matter.</p>

	The Board agreed for this to be removed from the LSCB Risk Register.
11.	Reflections and Next Steps
11.1	No other business was discussed, and no new risks were identified.
12.	Next Meeting
11.1	Thursday 21 st March 2019 – Room to be confirmed.