

Meeting Title:	Kent Safeguarding Children Board
Date:	12 th February 2014
Time:	1pm – 5pm
Location:	Medway Room, Sessions House
Chaired by:	Mairead MacNeil

Members Attendance at Meeting:

Name	Title	Representing	Apologies	Attended
Mairead MacNeil	Director of Specialist Children's Services (Chair)	KCC		✓
Aisha Paulose	Named GP for Safeguarding Children for Kent and Medway	NHS England	✓	
Andrew Ireland	Corporate Director	Families and Social Care, KCC		✓
Angela Slaven	Director of Service Improvement	Customer and Communities, KCC	✓	
Bethan Haskins	Chief Nurse – NHS Ashford CCG and NHS Canterbury & Coastal CCG	NHS England	✓	
Jay Pye	Executive Headteacher	Loose Schools Federation	✓	
Jenny Whittle	Cabinet Member for Specialist Children's Services	KCC		✓
Julie Pearce	Chief Nurse & Director of Quality & Operations	EKHUFT		✓
Karen Proctor	Director of Nursing and Quality	KCHT		✓
Lesley Ellis	Headteacher	The North School	✓	
Mark Janaway	Programme and Performance Manager	KSCB		✓
Meradin Peachey	Director of Public Health	KCC		✓
Mike Stevens	Lay Member	KSCB		✓
Nadeem Aziz	Chief Executive	Dover District Council	✓	

Nick Sherlock	Head of Adult Safeguarding	KCC	✓	
Patricia Denney	Assistant Director	Safeguarding and Quality Assurance, KCC		✓
Patrick Leeson	Corporate Director	Education, Learning & Skills, KCC		✓
Roger Sykes	Lay Member	KSCB		✓
Sally Allum	Director of Nursing and Quality	NHS England	✓	Carol Cassam attended
Sean Kearns	Chief Executive	CXK Limited	✓	
Stephen Bell	Director of Business Improvement	CXK Limited		✓
Steve Hunt	Head of Service	CAFCASS Kent		✓
Tim Smith	Detective Superintendent	Public Protection Unit, Kent Police		✓
Tina Hughes	Acting Director	North Kent LDU, Kent Probation	✓	
Helen Crook	Board Support Assistant / Minute taker	KSCB		✓

No.	Agenda Item
1.	<p>Apologies, Minutes, Matters Arising</p> <p>Andrew Ireland welcomed members to the meeting prior to Mairead’s arrival. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>The minutes of the last Board meeting were discussed by members:</p> <p>Tim Smith asked for a small amendment to be made to paragraph 6 of page 6: It’s not that there is an issue with the sharing of referrals, it’s that the Human Trafficking Centre do not <i>routinely</i> share referrals from other agencies with the Police unless specifically asked. Tim clarified this point with members and KSCB will make the relevant amendment to the minutes.</p> <p>The action log was discussed and updates will be made to the log accordingly.</p> <p>Members agreed that the minutes could now been signed off as a true and accurate account.</p>
2.	<p>Appointment of Independent Chair</p> <p>A new KSCB Independent Chair has been appointed: Gill Rigg.</p> <p>Mark Janaway explained that Gill will be in post from 1st March. A contract has been drafted and passed to Andrew Ireland’s office for to sign off. Gill will be in Sessions House for three dates in March to meet with key Board members. She will also get a chance to meet with more agency representatives at the KSCB Executive meeting on 19th March.</p>

	<p>With regards to an induction for Gill, Mark explained that apart from meeting Board members, Gill can also use the three dates to familiarise herself with practices and documentation and also put forward her views on how she would like to take the role forward, which may include walkabouts, the annual report and relevant processes and procedures.</p> <p>At the last Executive meeting on 29th January 2014, members discussed a Vice Chair and felt that Andrew Ireland would be most appropriate. There were however a lot of deputies at the Executive meeting on this occasion who may not have had the relevant delegated authority in which to make decisions.</p> <p>Board members had a discussion on how to nominate a Vice Chair. The decision was made for nominations to be put forward and for Board members to then hold a vote.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1 - Mark Janaway will lead on the process for the nominations of the Vice Chair of the Board and Executive.
3.	<p>Quality and Effectiveness Report</p> <p>Karen Proctor presented the item.</p> <p>There has been a struggle to obtain correct representation at the QE Group and also to get meaningful analysis of data. Since this report was written a meeting has taken place (7th February 2014) with good attendance from agencies. Following this meeting, a way forward has been identified with committed agreements on how to undertake work. Mark Janaway will speak with Gill Rigg regarding the proposals.</p> <p>There is a requirement to change some of the reporting formats as the previous procedures seemed to be hindering agencies in terms of being able to report on the data. The QE will not be asking for new data but will look into using existing mechanisms to analyse data. The findings from the data and commentary can then be presented at future Board meetings.</p> <p>Four key areas have been identified that require further work and exploration and are being taken forward by the most appropriate agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCS Audit on CiN cases • Children being placed in Kent by other local authorities • Adolescents • Sexual Abuse • Meeting preparedness <p>Members discussed the report and commented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jenny Whittle brought up children placed in Kent and the safeguarding of those children. She questioned whether this is being looked into and specifically the risk of placing children in particular areas of Kent. • Mark Janaway responded by explaining that there is a requirement to look at the numbers being provided and where those children are placed from as this is not yet being reported to the Board. Mark explained that the QE group is working with MIU (Management Information Unit) as they receive the notifications. They will be looking into where the children are from and how long they have been in placement. They will also look at Kent based children placed outside of Kent. One of the main aims is to ensure that the process of receiving and providing notifications is sound. Staff can then identify vulnerabilities as a result. • Jenny Whittle responded by saying that there is a requirement to scope where children are being placed and why. She felt that professionals need to have assurance and in turn keep Board members apprised. • Meradin Peachey expressed her thoughts about the Sexually Harmful Behavior Task and Finish Group

	<p>and how helpful this has been so far. She then explained that a Public Health consultant, Helen Buttivant will be conducting a needs assessment around CiN in the future. Members discussed CAFs and whether the numbers actually match what is being experienced. The Barnardo's report concentrating on young people suffering from sexual abuse was also brought up. Members felt that the national picture is useful but a local picture is obviously needed for Kent. Meradin felt that Helen Buttivant could assist with this and members were in agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tim Smith explained that the number of reports of sexual abuse to the Police are going up significantly (averaging 30 a month). There is therefore an expectation of a correlation in the amount of referrals into the child protection system but this does not seem to be occurring. • Patricia Denney asked whether the referrals are CSE or family abuse referrals as the title will actually affect the plan that the child is placed on. • Tim Smith responded by saying that Police reports are based on crime reports so will include some details of sexual exploitation but this is not a specific crime and therefore the family may not be placed onto a plan. • Mairead MacNeil questioned why there are still a low number of children subject to plans for the primary reason of sexual abuse. Members discussed that there is a sense that sexual abuse cases are under reported. Tim Smith was in agreement. • Patricia Denney felt that there may be an anxiety for Professionals to use sexual abuse as a category for referral when it is not yet proven. Neglect however may be more easily put forward as the main reason for referral without it having to be proven at the time. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 – The issue around Other Local Authority Placements (and Kent's placing of children out of Kent) and Sexual Abuse is to be further explored through the QE Sub Group and will be reported back to the Board through the QE reports.
4.	<p>Ofsted Inspection Guidance for LSCBs</p> <p>Mark Janaway presented the item.</p> <p>Mark talked members through the details relating to the future Ofsted inspection of the KSCB. This time the Safeguarding Board will be inspected as a single entity. Mark presented the key issues relevant to the Safeguarding Board and explained that the summary paper details what will happen and the process involved.</p> <p>Mark outlined the activity that needs to be undertaken and has put together a framework with suggested evidence that needs to be provided, linking into Sub Group activity. The format should support the Business Plan to provide the relevant evidence that Ofsted will expect. Mark has taken out key descriptors of the framework and has included examples of what evidence needs to be demonstrated.</p> <p>The framework will be circulated to all Sub Group chairs so that it can be discussed as part of their next meeting agenda and form part of their work plan. Mark asked the chairs of the Sub Groups to ensure that the agendas for the groups are structured in such a way as to meet the targets required for Ofsted. Mark will also sit down with Gill Rigg in March to decide upon the best way to report back to the Board.</p> <p>Members discussed the document and commented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrew Ireland explained that three Inspection Reports of Local Authorities were published yesterday (11/02/2014). Two LA's (Derbyshire and Hartlepool) were judged as 'good' but the LSCB 'requires improvement'. The Hillingdon judgement was 'requires improvement' for both the LA and the LSCB. • Mairead MacNeil mentioned participation from Sub Groups and ensuring that the right representatives are attending meetings, especially in light of the work that needs to be undertaken by the Sub Group. Also, business needs to be undertaken in between meetings so this can be reported upon. • Patrick Leeson asked whether a self-assessment document would be a good idea, to ensure that all actions and tasks are undertaken properly. Members agreed that this would be useful. Mark Janaway will lead on putting this together.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Hunt felt that it may be useful for Gill Rigg to get in touch with the three Boards who have been inspected already and obtain their advice on what Ofsted are seeking. Mark Janaway will take this forward. <p>Members discussed the importance of bringing evidence of work undertaken by Sub Groups back to the Board for assessment and challenge by members (a form of internal quality assurance). Members agreed that they all need to be critical about their own evidence and demonstrate an element of internal challenge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julie Pearce felt that it would be useful to have a clear understanding of what ‘outstanding’, ‘good’ ‘requires improvement’ look like. This could involve speaking to those who have been through the process (as also mentioned above). • Stephen Bell brought up the subject of areas for improvement and the fact that if action plans are in place then Ofsted may see this positively as the LSCB being aware of any shortfalls and the fact that they are aiming to do something about them. <p>Members discussed the possibility of a professional conversation with Ofsted on whether the understanding of the Safeguarding Board is currently correct. Mark Janaway will lead on looking into the best way to obtain advice and information on prepare for the Ofsted inspection; whether it be a masterclass, conference, professional discussion etc.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 - Mark Janaway will lead on putting together a self-assessment document for each agency to ensure that all actions and tasks (as a result of the Ofsted evidence framework) are being undertaken accurately. • 4.2 – Mark Janaway will liaise with Gill Rigg regarding communication with the three LSCBs who have already experienced the Ofsted inspection. • 4.3 - Mark Janaway will lead on looking into the best way to obtain advice and information on prepare for the Ofsted inspection; whether it be a masterclass, conference, professional discussion etc.
<p>5.</p>	<p>CAF Progress</p> <p>Mairead MacNeil distributed item ‘Update report on CAF/TAF Progress’.</p> <p>Mairead explained that there has been an increase in the number of CAFs and the engagement of partner agencies in the process. There was a 58.8% increase in 2012/13.</p> <p>Mairead has asked the Early Intervention team for some information on age distribution and will advise further when this information is received.</p> <p>Mairead took members through the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a significant increase within Health – 17.7% compared to 11% last year. • The outcomes for families are being looked into. • Themed network meetings are taking place in each district to offer advice, support and guidance to practitioners. • 84 child-minders have been trained as a result of increasing awareness of the CAF process. • The quality assurance audit programme has continued with monthly audits undertaken to identify best practice, lessons learned and areas of improvement. • Longitudinal studies are obviously on-going but there have been short term positive outcomes. • The test will be what happens post intervention and whether the action taken is sustainable. The Board need to concentrate on whether interventions are right and ensuring that families do not step back into difficulties. <p>Mairead then took members through the recommendations from the report as detailed in the embedded</p>

documents:



KSCB CAF TAF
Report February 201:CAF Data - Feb 2014.



Appendix A KSCB

Members discussed the report and commented as follows:

- Patrick Lesson looked at the data and asked about the time delay between the initiation of a CAF and the response. Headteachers have brought up this issue with him and reported to members that this is having an impact on how those in Education see the CAF process. Sometimes weeks can go past before any action is taken.
- Mairead MacNeil mentioned the idea of having a thematic audit on timescales and response times. Mark Janaway will take this forward. The audit should concentrate on when the issue was identified, what happened after this and what the timescales were.
- Stephen bell brought up the frequency of TAF meetings and the fact that not all agencies will always be able to attend.
- Roger Sykes asked about the lack of evidence of the views of families and children in the CAF/TAF processes.
- Mairead MacNeil agreed with Roger and felt that this should be looked into as part of the proposed audit.
- Mark Janaway informed members of a pilot being undertaken using CAF cards. These are cards which practitioners can use when speaking with young people to aid and prompt discussion. There are a number of practitioners who have already been trained in using these and a 'train the trainer' course is in the process of being put together in order for practitioners to train colleagues. Mark can provide evidence to the Board on their success in due course.
- Jenny Whittle questioned the value of the CAF and what practitioners really think about how helpful it is. She also explained that the recommendations in the report do not provide any timelines at all on when actions are going to be carried out and reported back on. She felt that there is a requirement for a structured timely feedback mechanism to be implemented to ensure information is given to the Board.
- Mairead MacNeil felt that there should be a focus (when looking at the CAF process) of integrated working and shared expertise to get to the best possible solution.
- Patrick Leeson explained that although CAFs can be very useful, there still seems to be some confusion for practitioners over when to use the CAF assessment process or the referral process. It is obviously incorrect to rely on the CAF to do the integrating of what practitioners should be doing. Professionals should not be brought together purely because of a CAF but should be sharing important information as a matter of course.
- Stephen Bell felt that when CAF works well it's an excellent tool. He has seen evidence of great outcomes. He felt that it would be of value to compare data with other local authority areas of where processes are embedded and see how Kent compares. He also felt that Kent have not managed to embed CAF properly throughout the system and that this is a genuine on-going challenge.
- Andrew Ireland expressed his thoughts that the report looks at how many CAFs are being undertaken but that it really needs to look into the outcomes and how effective they are, not simply how many there are.
- Meradin Peachey informed members that she has received feedback of CAFs working well. School Nurses have reported using CAF as a method of referral and that they are being advised that they need to complete a CAF before using the Young Healthy Minds (YHM) service. It looks therefore like there could be some confusion here that needs to be clarified. The tiers of need may therefore not be right as the YHM service should be available anyway, not just through the process of CAF.
- Members felt strongly that the 'so what' question is not being answered here. The Board needs to be assured that early help is being implemented accurately and appropriately. Mairead MacNeil responded by saying that the agency representatives on the Board are responsible for ensuring that Professionals are aware of their responsibilities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patricia Denney explained that the details put into the CAF paperwork vary so much as, for example those in Children’s Centre’s generally input a lot of information but a casualty Nurse may only see a patient very briefly and therefore only input very minimal information. • Julie Pearce explained that the perception is still that CAF is not a straight forward process and that there is therefore a requirement to ensure that it is made as easy as possible for Professionals to understand. • Karen Proctor felt that the report does not show whether different parts of Kent are doing better than others. Andrew Ireland brought up the possibility of a piece of work being undertaken that looks at the journey of the CAF. He also mentioned that Kent assesses more cases than other local authorities which then result in more S47 but a low proportion are going through to conference (lower than 50%). This is actually lower than other local authorities. Members agreed that this is an issue that needs to be looked into. • Meradin Peachey felt that a lookback exercise could be of some value. For example, taking six cases of referrals as CIN and having a multi-agency discussion on this. Themes could then be identified. • Jenny Whittle asked how learning is fed back to frontline staff. Mairead MacNeil explained that this is undertaken through the Learning and Development Sub Group. • Mairead MacNeil felt that more qualitative information is required and timelines needed. The outcomes over time need to be looked into to see if improvement is sustained. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1 - Mark Janaway will lead on looking into the possibility of undertaking an audit on CAF timescales and themes emerging from different referrals, to include when the issue was identified, what happened after this and what the timescales were. There is also a requirement to obtain the views of families and children in the CAF/TAF processes. Mark Janaway and Mairead MacNeil will discuss the above in the first instance and agree on a way to take this forward.
<p>6.</p>	<p>Priority Setting 2014-15</p> <p>Mark Janaway presented the item and took members through the document.</p> <p>The strategic priorities from last year are included for members to look through. Mark explained that he then identified items that are topical at the moment and that may be worthy of debate and discussion. Also included in the document are examples from other Safeguarding Boards. Mark has shown the document to Gill Rigg and is now inviting members to discuss and collate views, looking through his suggested priority topics and adding to/amending as necessary.</p> <p>Members discussed the document and what they feel should be the Board’s priorities for 2014/15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tim Smith felt that the 2013/14 priorities were very generic statements that all Boards should have in place as a matter of course. He felt that the Wandsworth style was very good as it demonstrates the plans that sit below the priorities and how to deliver them. • Patrick lesson was in agreement and felt that the Wandsworth priorities were specific and focused. • Steve Hunt mentioned looking at the three Ofsted Inspection Reports (referred to in section 4 of the minutes) to see what themes come across. • Patrick Leeson also mentioned accountability and making priorities out of what isn’t necessarily working as well as it should be. • Members discussed the idea of having a fewer number of priorities but threads that go through those priorities, e.g. voice of a child, voice of families. • Steve Hunt felt that the priorities could be CSE and trafficking and involving children and families in the work of the Board. Also, strategic arrangements with the Health and Wellbeing Board and Family and Justice Board. • Mairead MacNeil agreed that CSE needs to be prioritised and also the outcomes from those involved in CAFs. • Tim Smith felt strongly that online safety should be a priority. Distributing posters and leaflets may no

longer be as effective as it once was as young people are now using technology such as phone applications as their main source of information. There is a real requirement to educate them about risks. Also, Tim felt that a priority should be to provide a more cohesive response to the threat of CSE and children who go missing.

- Jenny Whittle felt that missing children must be a priority, to include the process of implementing the missing children multi-agency protocol. Members could also look into how to implement return interviews.
- Andrew Ireland felt that Board members should hold agencies to account in doing their job properly. Also, children and young people mental health is a big issue; not just CAMHS but issues of mental health of young people across the board. Adult substance misuse should also be thought about and the children exposed to this.
- Stephen Bell brought up the provision of early help the voice of children and young people. Also inter agency working and sharing of information. He agreed to CSE and Trafficking being high up on the agenda and also that mental health and wellbeing is a top priority.
- Patrick Leeson mentioned adolescents and also how the LSCB evaluates and monitors its own impact, evaluating its own work.

The main priority areas to come out of the discussion were therefore:

- CSE
- Trafficking
- CAF procedures and outcomes
- The voice of children, young people and families
- Missing Children
- Online Safety
- Mental Health and wellbeing

Members further discussed the implementation of the priorities:

- Tim Smith mentioned high risk areas and how to ensure we involve these as much as possible.
- Meradin Peachey explained that some Boards see parental smoking in the home as a contributory factor to child death and therefore a safeguarding issue. 80% of child deaths involve smoking in the home.
- Mairead MacNeil mentioned child suicide and links to mental health provision. This may not count as a priority but could sit underneath the issue of mental health.

Members discussed mental health and CAMHS:

- Jenny Whittle mentioned the lack of tier 4 provision in Kent. Mairead MacNeil explained that referrals may be higher as tiers 2 and 3 are not functioning properly. This could therefore result in a delay in treatment. The timings for assessment seem to be getting better but not treatment times.
- CAMHS specifications were for 140 tier 4 referrals per year but they are actually heading towards 160 in only the first quarter. Members felt that provision needs to be in place at a much earlier stage and that mental health requires a stronger multi-agency approach.
- CAMHS is a commissioning issue.
- A referral has also been made to the Secretary of State.

Mark Janaway will collate these priorities into a framework and discuss with Patricia Denney, Mairead MacNeil and Gill Rigg. He will then circulate to Board members for comment. Members agreed with Stephen Bell when he mentioned that families and children could look over the final document to ensure it is actually relevant to them.

Mark Janaway will then lead on ensuring that updates come from all Sub Groups and are fed into the Board as

	<p>evidence that the priorities are being focused on.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1 - Mark Janaway will collate the priorities as discussed by Board members into a framework and discuss with Patricia Denney, Mairead MacNeil and Gill Rigg. He will then circulate to Board members for comment. Members agreed with Stephen Bell when he mentioned that families and children could look over the final document to ensure it is actually relevant to them. 6.2 - Mark Janaway will then lead on ensuring that updates come from all Sub Groups and are fed into the Board as evidence that the priorities are being focused on.
<p>7.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Attendance at Sub group meetings:</p> <p>Mark Janaway explained that he will be sending to each Sub Group chair a list of attendees at each of the Sub Group meetings during 2013. Following on from discussions at the Executive meeting, this should prompt action on ensuring that the relevant agency representatives sit on each Sub Group and that deputies are provided on occasions when standing members cannot attend. The deputies MUST have delegated authority to make decisions and commit to their agency undertaking work for the Sub Group between meetings.</p> <p>Members agreed that the practice needs to be tighter and more professional (attendance is also detailed in the Constitution) and that absences should really be an exception.</p> <p>Mairead MacNeil brought up the issue of Sub Group members inviting observers to meetings. This MUST be pre-arranged with the chair of the Sub Group.</p> <p>Meradin Peachey explained that Andrew Scott-Clark will attend the Board meetings in the future and also chair the Child Death Overview Panel meetings.</p>

Future Board Meetings:		
23 rd April 2014	2pm – 5pm	Medway Room, Sessions House, Maidstone
30 th July 2014	2pm – 5pm	Medway Room, Sessions House, Maidstone
5 th November 2014	2pm – 5pm	Medway Room, Sessions House, Maidstone
25 th February 2015	2pm – 5pm	Cabinet Room, Sessions House, Maidstone