

MINUTES

Subject: **Dudley Safeguarding Children Board**

Venue: Saltwells Education Centre

Date: 15th May 2015

Time: 9.30 am – 12.30 pm

Attendees	Agency	Apologies	Agency
Roger Clayton	Independent Chair	Karen Jackson	Office of Public Health
Merlin Joseph	DMBC	Remley Mann	FE Representative
Chris Ballinger	DMBC	Annette Callear	Early Years
Karen Palk	Lay Advisor	Kate McConnell	Probation – CRC
Rachael Doyle	Health & Wellbeing DMBC	Jayne Sargeant	Phase Trust (voluntary)
Julie Winpenny	West Midlands Fire Service		
Tabetha Darman	BCPFT		
Su Vincent	Dudley CCG		
Pam Smith	Dudley Group NHS Foundation Trust		
Nicki Burrows	DCVS		
Helen Ellis	DMBC – Integrated Youth Services		
Marie Hunter	Primary & Special rep		
Viv Townsend	National Probation Service		
Zala Ibrahim	Dudley Group NHS Foundation Trust		
Nicola Campbell	Cafcass		
Anne Harris	DMBC – Adult Safeguarding		
Mayada AbuAffan	Office of Public Health		
Mike Galikowski	DMBC – YOS		
Jo Forbes	DMBC – Housing		
Sue Haywood	DMBC - Community Safety		
Jassi Broadmeadow	DMBC – Children Safeguarding		
Martine McFadden	DSCB		
Richard Fisher	West Midlands Police		
Sally Holmes	West Midlands Police		
Tony Oakman	DMBC – Directorate of People		

NEXT MEETING

Friday 10th July 2015
10:00 – 14:00
At Saltwells EDC

1.	<p><u>Introductions & Apologies</u></p> <p><u>Welcome new members</u></p> <p>Tony Oakman wished to thank everyone for the warm reception he has received from partners who have shown an openness and willingness to work together to achieve the DSCB's aims in Dudley for children and young people. A lot of work has been done to get the basics right and there are clear strengths within the partnership. The DSCB needs to build on these strengths to ensure the fundamentals are in place. Partnership arrangements are in the process of development and some further work is being done around improved models. Dudley will be having a MASH (Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub).</p> <p><u>Minutes and Matters Arising from previous meeting – 13th March 2015</u></p> <p>The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record</p>
----	---

2.	<p><u>Action Tracker Review</u></p> <p>Points highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCG – independent review of safeguarding arrangements: Workshop held to determine the model to be used to progress. The Children’s Commissioner is producing a report which will be presented to the senior leadership team which will hopefully be completed by July. Action: agenda item for DSCB after tabled at the senior leadership team meeting. • Website: ongoing item – to be removed from the Action tracker. However, pointed out that a report re the number of “hits” will be sent out when available. Action: Anthea Jones. • DSCB Member Annual appraisal: Action: all members to complete and return to Martine McFadden by end June 2015. • Board Management: Action: all sub group chairs to submit their group’s Terms of Reference to Martine McFadden as soon as possible, (if they have not already done so). • Review of CAMHS Services: Figures for children admitted to the hospital have increased. Sue Vincent has met with Anne-Marie Carey who has written a report about outcomes for children receiving a service where practitioners assess children in hospital and provide intensive treatment at home. Dudley does not currently commission these services. Tony Oakman advised that this issue had been discussed at the last CCG Board – he suggested the Independent Chair of the DSCB should write a letter to the CCG highlighting the significant concerns the DSCB has in respect of this issue. Also noted that Dudley does not have a CAMHS Strategy. Sue Vincent pointed out that the CCG covers Walsall & Dudley. There is a strategy, but this does not apply to Dudley as it does not commission the services. • Zala Ibrahim pointed out she had raised the issue as a concern at the previous meeting – Dudley Group does not have the provision for these young people and there is no on-call service available on nights or weekends. There is a Black Country CAMHS initiative to see if a 0 – 25 pathway can be developed. Concerns and risks expressed by Tony Oakman and Merlin Joseph supported by the DSCB.
3.	<p><u>Ofsted Preparation</u></p> <p>Risk Register: Action: item deferred to QA & Comms group – report back to DSCB on high risk areas only.</p> <p>DSCB Alert & SafER Newsletter: 5000 practitioners have been included on the distribution list to receive the first alert. The SafER Newsletter will re ready at the same time and the DSCB needs to consider whether this should be used as the first alert.</p> <p>The Newsletter will contain an item about a practitioner’s forum so that the Board can start to get feedback from front line staff.</p> <p>It was agreed at the DSCB in March that the QA & Comms will decide what practitioners are alerted to. Alerts will be sent out as and when appropriate.</p> <p>Action: Anyone who has not submitted their distribution list to the Safeguarding & Review Service to forward to Martine.McFadden@dudley.gov.uk as soon as possible. Agreed: 1st alert – SafER Newsletter, 2nd Alert – CSE pathways and strategies.</p>
12.	<p><u>Change of agenda order</u></p> <p><u>Item 12: Probation – new structure presentation</u></p> <p>Presentation shown on screen. As Kate McConnell was unable to attend today’s meeting, Viv Townsend advised she would also do the presentation in respect of the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).</p> <p>Viv explained that the government had decided something different needed to be done in Probation which has not changed since its creation 105 years ago. The government wanted better delivery with less cost and therefore proposed to split the Probation Service into the National Probation Service (NPS) and the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).</p> <p>In 2014, a transformation programme began to change how offenders are managed. Dudley was previously in the Staffordshire & West Midlands Trust, but the probation service is now a national organisation and Dudley is in the Midlands Division.</p>

The NPS retained responsibility for high and very high risk offenders. A tender was put out for bidding for the CRC which would deal with medium and low risk offenders.

The NPS and CRC remain in the same building, but are two different organisations. The services retain the same telephone number – reception staff will direct the calls to the appropriate Duty or Duty Senior Probation Officer on that particular day.

Viv highlighted the following in respect of the NPS:

- The NPS is responsible for the management of high and very high risk and all MAPPA cases.
- It is responsible for staff in the Courts and approved premises (high risk offenders coming out of prison are likely to go into approved premises as a half-way stage).
- There are 19 approved premises in the Midlands – Dudley has none.
- The NPS is responsible for YOS – Probation has a member of staff within the YOS who deals with cases up to the age of 18, after which cases transfer to Probation via an appropriate pathway.
- Offenders are the responsibility of Probation after the age of 18 and up to 100.
- The NPS has retained responsibility for the Sex Offender Programmes and victims.
- CRC is responsible for low and medium cases, but if the risk escalates, CRC liaises with NPS who makes the decision on whether the case should be transferred to their services. If this happens, NPS manage the case, but the CRC retain the funding.
- The NPS is responsible for the staff in a MASH setting.
- The NPS and CRC remain committed in terms of safeguarding all children and adults and protecting the public.
- Viv Townsend attends all MAPPA meetings (high risk offenders) chaired by police and police attend the MAPPA chaired by Viv. These meetings are attended by various organisations and formalise the plans to manage individual high risk offenders.
- Viv is responsible for the recall of high risk offenders if necessary – CRC would recall medium and low risk.
- There is a lot of interface between NPS and CRC and although now split, there are clear responsibilities for each organisation.
- The government has not yet finished its reorganisation, so there is likely to be further changes in the NPS.
- More reports are being written by less staff in the NPS. There are also issues in respect of staff moving between the 2 organisations – staff wishing to move from the CRC to the NPS have to go through the Ministry of Justice which takes 109 days. Additional issues emerging include CRC staff being able to do less now than they could do under Staffs & West Midlands Probation.
- The NPS is responsible for funding to the DSCB and DSAB. The NPS also contributes money and staffing to the YOS.

Viv highlighted the following in respect of the CRC:

- CRC remains as Staffordshire & West Midlands whereas the NPS is a broader midlands division.
- The CRC is a model of probation staff joined up with other organisations to deliver a service. These are the St Giles Trust (a Criminal Justice charity in terms of offering peer support). Ingeus which promotes the right support for each individual via employment programmes and the CRI which encourages and empowers people support people in making better choices and to lead a crime free life.
- Work is ongoing in Dudley to develop new ways of delivering services with the objective of reducing re-offending.
- The CRC talks about the whole journey of the individual – how did they get into the criminal justice system and how do they get out. A lot is based on risk assessment, education, employment, family life and background.
- The NPS do all of the Court reports.
- Risk Assessments are carried out with the offenders, but they have to have some ownership and responsibility for what they feel can be done to help them.
- The CRC gets payment by results and have to demonstrate they have reduced offending.
- Although the NPS is civil service, the CRC is not and is part of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS). The SLA is very complex..
- The CRC has a responsibility for intervention.

Action: Presentation to be circulated – Viv Townsend

<p>4.</p>	<p><u>Board Funding</u></p> <p>Roger Clayton noted that the issue of funding for the Board was raised via a paper to the last meeting. Issues around funding limit the aspirations of the DSCB. There are certain demands that have to be met and have to be funded. In addition there are issues in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of a QA Officer to lead the audit work. • CSE – Funding has been secured for one year for the CSE Coordinator via a POCA bid which has been match funded by the DSCB. This funding is not sustainable and more permanent funding is required to ensure the post continues along with the CSE processes and administration. • Board administration has been admirable, but resourced by the good will of members of the local authority and part time working and is not robust. • The DSCB is currently training to capacity – there are inherent dangers in not improving training capacity. • One of the biggest issues is the development of a MASH which will need resourcing. • DSCB members have been struggling with completing S11 and S175 audits not through lack of good will or focus, but due to a lack of resources and funding. • The lack of appropriate funding and resources reduces the DSCB's ability to function. <p>There are two possible approaches</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roger Clayton, as independent Chair, to approach Chief Executives/budget holders of the partner agencies individually. Roger has tried this and although the need was fully recognised, his attempts were not successful. 2. A collective and more dynamic approach – a meeting of key stakeholders to resolve this issue together. Before trying to plan any of the business for the Board, the DSCB needs to determine what it has, what it needs and what can and cannot be done –it is pointless to plan for things it is not possible to do. <p>Tony Oakman pointed out that an Ofsted inspection will look to see whether the DSCB is doing the fundamental things in the right way and whether the partnership is working collectively to achieve outcomes. There does not appear to be a collective sense of where the priorities are in terms of what needs to be done and what needs to be focused on. Tony challenged the DSCB to explore what it is spending its funding on and whether resources are being used smartly and to their best purpose. There are some things that all agencies need to ensure are carried out such as the audits. DSCB members are people dedicated to safeguarding children, but need to change their behaviours to ensure capacity is available to make things happen – the MASH for example and the CSE work will require recurring funding rather than struggling to locate funding each year.</p> <p>It was noted there has been no increase in funding by partner agencies for over 5 years and that 5 years ago there was no independent chair and no CSE agenda. A meeting in December 2014 concluded contributions were inequitable, but no progress has been made in addressing the funding difficulties.</p> <p>The following suggestions/points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DSCB currently does not charge for the majority of training unless a delegate does not attend. Perhaps all training should be chargeable. • Within the local authority, charging would mean moving money from one resource into another. There are other ways of funding the DSCB, for example Rachael Doyle is a trainer for the Board funded via her salary from her employer. • There may be a way of a mutual accessing of training in other local authorities. A bid has been put in to the Home office for funding to develop joint training – Roger Clayton has put himself forward to lead on developing Black Country joint training..
<p>5.</p>	<p><u>Board Priorities, Annual Report and Business Plan</u></p> <p>A half-day workshop is planned for the afternoon of 19th June to flesh out specific objectives for the DSCB for the coming year to sit under the 3 key priorities. Invitations will be sent out to chairs of the sub groups plus some additional people. An agenda planning event has already been set.</p> <p>For information to the DSCB, Tony Oakman advised Roger Clayton is now a full member of the CYP Strategic Partnership Board.</p> <p><i>Proposed constitution:</i> A copy of the proposed constitution was circulated to the meeting. A</p>

	<p>similar one has already been accepted by the DSAB. The document details the responsibility of Board and sub group members and includes a declaration of interest form. Members are requested to read the proposed constitution.</p> <p><i>Questions and Answers:</i></p> <p>Q: on page 9 under “I will contribute to the effective functioning of the Safeguarding Board by”, the first bullet point states that the member will attend all meetings and if unable to attend will send a nominated deputy who will be able to act with the same level of authority. The Board has previously had discussions and agreed that deputies should not be sent. A: The compromise is to send a named representative who attends when the DSCB member cannot.</p> <p>Q: do we have an escalation process as it does not appear in the proposed constitution? A: Yes, it can be included. Action: Martine McFadden to ensure current version is circulated to DSCB members.</p> <p>Q: On page 3 of the constitution under “Purpose”, it should include helping the community to keep children safe. A: agreed.</p> <p>Q: on page 3 under “Purpose” it states “to empower and protect those children who are vulnerable” – it should actually state empower and protect all children”. A: agreed.</p> <p>Q: On page 3 under “Objectives” – the board should also learn from SCR’s and national reports to inform its approach. A: agreed.</p> <p>Q: on page 9 in the Memorandum of Understanding “As a member of the Board I will...”: There should be mention about openness, challenge, tenacity and perseverance and not to let things ride.</p> <p>Q: something needs to be included in respect of including the voice of the child. A: agreed.</p> <p>Page 7, Accountability – bullet point 3 – matter of accuracy: Director of Children’s Services - to be changed to the Director of People.</p> <p>Action: Signed off by the DSCB pending amendments. Action: All members to complete Page 9, sign and return to Martine McFadden</p>
6.	<p><u>MASH</u></p> <p>Dudley is currently working towards MASH arrangements and a standing item on the DSCB agenda will now be MASH Development.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nicky Campbell advised Cafcass feels it has a better working relationship and communication with authorities that have a MASH and Dudley’s intentions are welcome from a Cafcass perspective. • Roger Clayton will be meeting with all partners to determine resources being put in. A Task & Finish Group will carry out some of the work in preparation for the MASH and will be the reference group in terms of designing to fit Dudley’s needs. • Accommodation has already been secured at Corbyn Road, Dudley, although there will be a delay in respect of police due to the secure systems needed. • The aim is to go live in 12 months, but work will be ongoing to achieve this sooner if possible. • This piece of work will be held to account by Roger Clayton and the DSCB. Ofsted will want to see which providers are signed up to the project.
7.	<p><u>DSCB Audit Activity</u></p> <p>S11: Still awaiting S11 audits from Probation, police and DWMHT. There are implications for Police and DWMHT who cover several areas. Police have indicated they have done a number of S11 audits for the West Midlands, but will provide an analysis specific to Dudley. There has been a similar discussion with DWMHT Action: Sally Holmes (Police).</p> <p>S11 – voluntary sector: There is no dedicated safeguarding lead for the voluntary sector and no standardised approach to safeguarding. Historically, a S11 audit only had to be completed if there was an SLA with the local authority or other agencies. Under the new Working Together, this is now a duty although S11 is probably not appropriate. The Safe Network has developed a tool which also generates an action plan which may be more appropriate for the voluntary sector.</p> <p>S175: An analysis of the returns has been completed. 56% of the 114 audits have been completed and 21% have not yet been started. The rest are in progress. There had been a review of the questions in the 175 led by a Head Teacher reference group. The recommendation from the reference group is to ensure the question sets are fit for purpose, but the 175 also needs to be</p>

	<p>linked to the chair of governors which will assist in terms of accountability and action planning. Schools governors have not been advised re the schools audit unless their head teachers have informed them. This needs to be an item for the governors agenda.</p> <p>Multi agency audits: The QA & Comms group needs to agree a themed calendar of audits. This will be tabled at a future meeting of the DSCB. It is important for the calendar to be drawn up so that staff are able to make time in their diaries to complete the work and attend panels as appropriate.</p> <p>CSE Audit: Two audit panels have been arranged for 18th and 22nd May.</p> <p>Participation audit: A few more have been received, but the response has been poor. The young people will be going through the responses after their examinations, but their enthusiasm is likely to be dampened if the response does not improve. Action: all outstanding participation audits to be returned to Nicki Burrows as soon as possible.</p>
8.	<p>CSE Team – report circulated.</p> <p>The regional strategic group reviewed the framework and pathway. The DSCB endorsed the plan for developing a CSE team and this plan has continued to be progressed via Helen Ellis, Mike Galikowski and Jassi Broadmeadow.</p> <p>The guidance and processes are currently being reviewed and Jassi Broadmeadow intends to produce a paper for the Board to sign off which will then need to be disseminated across all partner agencies. It is important in the interim period to have a consistent approach until the final processes, guidance, pathway and framework are in place</p>
9.	<p>CDOP Annual report</p> <p>The 2013-14 report was circulated to the meeting. It talks about legislation around having a CDOP and its relationship to the DSCB. To explore the wider picture, the CDOP carried out a mapping exercise of the 0 – 18 year old population to determine where they were living and what level of deprivation there was around different areas of the Dudley borough. The Panel also looked at infant mortality rates to determine what supports can be put in place pre-pregnancy and during pregnancy to lessen infant deaths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOP looked at figures for England which has between 4000 and 5000 deaths per year most of which were due to drowning, homicide, SUDI and RTAs. • The Dudley CDOP reviewed 18 deaths in the year – deaths in males showed a higher rate than females which mirrors the national trend. The ethnic breakdown of child deaths shows the majority to be white which is expected because of the population distribution in Dudley. There did not appear to be any link between deprivation and the number of child deaths, but certain causes of death (eg chromosomal) would not necessarily relate to deprivation. • Dudley decided to explore still birth which is associated with deprivation together with other factors such as smoking during pregnancy. • Cause of death and lessons learned continue to identify themes. Recommendations are included in the report. • As a Panel, the Dudley CDOP wishes to move to a more proactive approach to prevention rather than to wait for learning from a child death. For example, using the learning to educate parents about smoking during and after pregnancy, safety guidance and all the other known factors relating to child death. • Page 15 of the report contains the action plan which includes a water safety campaign and the implementation of the safe sleep policy. The asthma policy is ongoing. • The next CDOP report is expected to be completed within the next 8 weeks. <p>Mike Galikowski questioned whether any information was monitored in respect of “near misses”. This is not collated by the CDOP, but the hospital has a serious incident process when a child attends A&E. However, this is not reported on. A report used to be produced by the Accident Prevention strategy which is no longer in existence, but accident prevention will form part of the Infant Mortality group. The West Midlands Fire Services also carries out a lot of accident prevention work within schools.</p> <p>Richard Fisher noted there had been an increase in admissions to hospital around children self-harming and a national trend around child suicide. He questioned whether this should be included</p>

	<p>within the Action Plan. Mayada Abuaffan advised that Worcester had sent a copy of their strategy because they had a number of suicides. A member of their Mental Health Team attended the CDOP to talk about the strategy.</p>
11.	<p>Change of agenda order</p> <p><u>Water Safety Campaign</u> – report circulated</p> <p>Rachael Doyle advised that following the death of a 14 year old in Gornal in 2012, a water safety campaign was launched and the West Midlands Fire Service designed a poster which was e-mailed around various agencies to print off and display. There appears to be a spike in drowning in the summer periods, especially around open water.</p> <p>Since the death of a 2 year old in a family swimming pool, a review showed the need to raise awareness of safety around residential pools and ponds. Statistics from ROSPA showed that 147 children under 6 died in residential pools between 1995 and 2005. Recommendations from the review was to draw attention to younger children and water activities and also to review the water safety campaign, expanding to include garden ponds and residential swimming pools. To review and update the campaign will require a sum of £250. Action: Tony Oakman approved the Office of Public Health to fund the £250 for the campaign.</p> <p>Richard Fisher suggested the media can also be approached to assist in raising awareness.</p>
10.	<p><u>DSCB Structure and Membership</u></p> <p>The structure of the DSCB was reviewed in 2014 and shared out responsibility and ownership of the various sub groups. It empowered the lay advisor role and the community and voluntary sector. This was seen as a clear move in the right direction. Membership of the board was reviewed to reduce the size to a more workable level. Since the review, the new sub groups have been established and reporting into the DSCB has been standardised.</p> <p>The middle tier of the DSCB structure was designed as a coordination group called the Quality Assurance & Communications group.</p> <p>The review produced a new and more vibrant community strategy and the website was redesigned to be better than before, although this has suffered a few “teething problems”. The Board is now able to self-assess its effectiveness.</p> <p>Despite all the developments, Roger Clayton still feels there is a need for the DSCB to separate even more the strategic from the operational. Working Together dictates certain things about board membership and also states an LSCB should have an operational group with a strategic overview. It suggests members of the main board should have the strategic authority and power to make things happen and to commit resources. Roger questioned whether membership of the board should include people at a higher level with some of the current members having input to the sub groups and coordination group. He questioned whether the middle tier of the structure should be given more power to act on the DSCB’s behalf. He pointed out that the DSCB needs to retain ownership of the main strategic work and should not be seen as a “rubber-stamping” group.</p> <p>If the DSCB goes down the route of restructure phase 2, Roger Clayton asked how it should be done. The previous review was a totally inclusive process with everyone who wanted to contribute being given an opportunity. The review took a considerable amount of time to finalise. People have less time now than 12 months ago and therefore Roger feels it needs to be done smarter, quicker and more effectively than last time. Someone had suggested the independent chair carried out the review, but he feels this would be wrong, as would following the same process as last time.</p> <p>Rachael Doyle suggested from a council point of view that each Directorate should have a safeguarding lead that attends the board, carries out S11 audits, is responsible for policy development and deals with management of allegations issues. This would ease the pressure on people to attend the board. Other people with expertise could attend the operational groups.</p> <p>Tony Oakman agreed this was something to think about, but there is also a need to get all the partners around the table, but for them to be the right people with the right authority to deliver the outcomes. Tony pointed out that he was able to commit the £250 to the water safety campaign because he has responsibility for the Office of Public Health and can therefore commit spending</p>

	<p>from their budget. Other representatives on the board are not able to do this and have to go back to their organisations. The review of membership may be simply a matter that the DSCB already has the right people, but need to put them into the right group. Some membership may require bringing in someone who can make decisions on resources and funding.</p> <p>Roger Clayton pointed out that LSCB's are governed by the membership described in Working Together. The DSCB already knows which agencies it should and must have. Some agencies, such as police will not be able to send a representative who can commit as the budget is held in a different way to (eg) the local authority.</p> <p>As part of the half-day workshop arranged for 19th June, the sub-groups that sit under the DSCB will be explored.</p> <p>Sue Vincent pointed out that the people who can make decisions and hold the budget sit on the CYPP, she suggested it may be worth targeting that group. Sue is able to influence from a safeguarding aspect, but Trish Curran is the budget holder who can commit to resources and funding.</p> <p>Tabetha Darman commented there are two tiers of decision making. On behalf of the BCPFT, there are strategic decisions Tabetha can make in terms of board plans and priorities. Funding on the other hand sits with contracting, not because Tabetha does not agree, but she has to go to the Executive director of Finance to determine what is available to each of the 7 LSCB's the BCPFT services.</p> <p>Zala Ibrahim feels the DSCB benefits from different professionals with different skills to advise about what is important in the borough. The aim of the DSCB is to determine what is important for Dudley, to make a plan and then pass on to someone who can implement it. As for funding, perhaps the independent chair needs to sit on the different boards in the different organisations so that the DSCB needs can be passed on directly.</p> <p>Tony Oakman agreed that contribution to the DSCB is not just about money, it is about professional views and how the DSCB makes things better. It is about a partnership of the right people to make decisions and implement agreed plans.</p> <p>Action: agenda item 10th July.</p>
13.	<p><u>Quality Assurance & Communications Group</u></p> <p>The following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S11 audits completed/not completed were outlined. • Part of the Workshop on 19th June will be to explore the new self-improvement tool and What does good look like – suggestions will be brought to the next DSCB meeting. The Workshop will also consider the Risk Register to ensure appropriate risks are listed. • The group looked at the current dataset – Matt Smith will be leading on designing a new and more appropriate data set and will be liaising with the performance sections in each organisation to ensure it is fit for Dudley's purpose. • A multi-agency audit programme will be drawn up and the group will look at key themes arising from the audits. • The CDOP Annual report was tabled and ways of raising awareness of various issues in the community were discussed.
14.	<p><u>Sub Groups – Exception Reporting</u></p> <p>CDOP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Palk (Lay Advisor) now sits on the CDOP and will champion the views of children and families, ensuring this is embedded in any preventative work. • The GP safeguarding lead has also been invited to the Panel. • Discussion took place in respect of raising the profile of annual reporting re child deaths in respect of prevention work. This was presented to the Health & Wellbeing Board to ensure people across the agencies own the prevention agenda. <p>Vulnerable Children's Strategic Group: Helen Ellis chaired the last VCSG. The main discussion was in respect of CSE.</p>

The last meeting discussed e-safety and gangs. The group intends to spend some more time in respect of e-safety given issues coming through in relation to “sexting” and young people becoming criminalised. Work is required to get the message out to young people to make them understand that what they are doing is wrong. Further debate is planned for the next meeting, but conversations will be held with primary and secondary schools to determine what support can be provided to them and also support for young people and their parents/carers to ensure they gain an understanding of this issue and realise that what they are doing is a criminal act and can have an impact later in life when trying to gain employment.

The group received a report from the national working group for CSE which is currently working on a strategy.

Serious Case Review Sub:

- Chris Ballinger advised there are a number of practice learning events as a result of identifying areas which require some additional attention. The SCR Sub needs to discuss this with the Workforce Development Group to give some thought to when it will reach a stage where more practice based learning events need to be put on for staff to encourage the learning cycle.
- The SCR’s in Birmingham and Lancashire are not yet completed.
- There are two case reviews ongoing below the level of SCR. The group is progressing implementation of the Action Plans.

Policy, Procedures & Practice:

Procedures in the core areas are all up to date. However, new guidance published by the DfE in March has meant the procedures writer being commissioned to update in the light of this guidance. The next stage of the work in respect of the rest of the procedures is in progress.

RC/SER
30.06.2015