

**DEVON AREA CHILD PROTECTION COMMITTEE and SHADOW LOCAL  
SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD**

**Minutes of a meeting  
Held on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2006 at Buckfast Abbey**

**Present:**

Anne Whiteley, (Chair), Director Devon Children's Services  
Chris Dimmelow, County Child Protection Manager, Devon Children's Services Directorate  
Helen Hyland, Designated Nurse, North & East/South & West Devon Health Community  
Derek Moore, Assistant Director, NCH  
Carole Town, Clinical Psychologist, JACAT and CAMHS  
Laura Hubbard- Fielder, Devon Partnership NHS Trust  
Jane Richards, Portfolio Holder Child Protection, Devon Local Medical Council  
Ann Wilson, Learning & Development Advisor, Human Resource Directorate  
Juliet Hammacott, Acting P.E.W.O. Devon Children's Services  
Ann Morecraft, Designated Manager Child Protection  
Charles Holme, Designated Doctor, South & West Devon Health Community  
Martin Spragg, Youth Offending Service Manager  
John Clements, Crime Manager, Devon & Cornwall Police  
Bob Brown, Devon & Cornwall Police  
Martin Gladwin, CAF/CASS  
Dave Brander, Superintendent South & West Devon BCU  
Peter Jeffs, Corporate Director – Communities, East Devon District Council  
John Shaw, Lead Officer, JAS  
John Davey, Director of Partnerships, Connexions  
Alison Kearnes, ACSM, NSPCC Devon, Dorset & Cornwall  
Louisa Grimes, Child Protection Administrator (minute taker)

---

**Apologies**

Tony Sweeney, Assistant County Solicitor, Devon County Council  
Deborah Booth, Group Manager, Inclusion, Devon Local Education Authority  
Alison Lewis Smith, Children's PCT  
Claire Mitchell, Exeter PCT  
Debra Lapthorne, Director of Public Health, South & West Health Community  
Adrian Childs, Devon Partnership Trust  
Mary Mitchell, Devon & Cornwall Probation Services

Chris Dimmelow advised that Debra Lapthorne had now actually resigned from the ACPC.

---

## **1. MINUTES OF 21<sup>ST</sup> OCTOBER AND MATTERS ARISING**

### **Page 2 – Common Assessment Framework**

John Shaw advised the meeting that the visit by a team from the DfES had taken place, to look at the IT systems of Devon Social Services and those used by the joint agency team and how the systems were being used in terms of sharing information. The outcomes of this visit had been:-

- the issue about problems with integrated IT had been put forward, but no solutions had been given by the DfES;
- the DfES would not necessarily support Devon to resolve this problem, as other parts of the country had been able to integrate the new working arrangements into their current systems.

Anne Whiteley advised that a steering group would be taking these matters forward. This steering group was now in place and consisted of representatives from Health, the Police and the Local Authority. Helen Hyland asked if there was anybody specifically for Child Protection on that group. Membership details to be included with the minutes of this meeting. It was confirmed that Anne Whiteley would be Chairing this steering group.

John Shaw advised that the team from the DfES had felt that Devon were 2½ years ahead of others areas in terms of the joint agency IT system.

#### **ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO ATTACH THE MEMBERSHIP DETAILS OF THE STEERING GROUP TO THESE MINUTES FOR CIRCULATION.**

### **Page 2 – Ensuring Compliance of P.A.F. 20:**

Chris Dimmelow advised that Devon had achieved 100% of Child Protection Reviews being held on time in December 2005. Anne Whiteley explained that the national expectation was for all Local Authorities to achieve 100% in this area, but it was dependent on all of the involved agencies putting priority on attendance at Child Protection Reviews.

### **Page 3 – Sudden Infant Death Response Team**

Chris Dimmelow advised that he was awaiting further guidance on this.

Charles Holme advised that a paper was being worked on, with part of its focus to try and get funding from the DfES and this would be forwarded to Chris Dimmelow in due course.

### **Page 3 – Children & Young People's Plan for Devon**

Anne Whiteley advised that this was in the final draft and currently going through the final stages of consultation, through to the formal process of agreement through all of

the agencies, boards and committees. It was expected that a comprehensive plan would be ready for publication by 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006.

#### Page 4 – Part 8 Training for Managers

Chris Dimmelow advised that a date of 7<sup>th</sup> March 2006 had been arranged for the training of Senior Managers who undertake management reviews within individual agencies. The target group was for 20-25 delegates in total (two managers per key agency) and the training would be an all day event, looking at the process of undertaking in-house management reviews of Part 8 Reviews, the key elements of Part 8 Reviews and new procedures.

In response to a question from Peter Jeffs, Chris Dimmelow explained the process of a Part 8 Review and when it would need to be undertaken. Peter Jeffs queried whether managers from District Councils would need to take part in the training / a Part 8 Review. Chris Dimmelow said that would be possible, for example if a child died in a leisure facility. Peter Jeffs asked if a letter could be set out to the District Councils about the arranged training. Chris Dimmelow said that this would depend on the response from the core agencies, as it would be the managers of the key agencies who would need to undertake this training as a priority.

#### **ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO WRITE TO ALL KEY AGENCIES ABOUT THE TRAINING**

#### Page 4- Risk Awareness Training

Martin Spragg advised that he was still trying to organise who would attend this training. Chris Dimmelow said that in light of the 2005 circular concerning the changes in terms of people who pose a risk to children, a lot of work was being undertaken about this. Chris had written to all agencies and would be discussing this matter further at next week's MAPPAs, as a consistent and reliable way of assessing people who posed a risk to children was needed. Chris confirmed that a report on this would be available at the next meeting.

Carole Town asked how far down the age range this issue extended, given the number of people in families who posed a risk to their own siblings. Martin Spragg said that it was aimed more at adolescents, but would be applicable to all children. The concept was that the risk assessment would be carried out by pairs of people from different agencies, in order to get a multi-agency perspective and it would be important for the ACPC to organise trained people into a body that would be deployable in post-training situations and a commitment would be needed by the involved agencies to lend their staff out at times.

#### **ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO PROVIDE A REPORT TO THE NEXT MEETING.**
- **MARTIN SPRAGG TO CONTINUE TO ORGANISE WHO WOULD BE ATTENDING THIS TRAINING.**

#### Page 4 – Child Protection Training in Schools

Juliet Hammacott advised that this training had gone well and was on target to meet APA action plan.

#### Page 8 – Child Concern Pathway

John Shaw advised that the consultation around the Child Concern Pathway had finished on 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2005 and that there had been a high response rate. The responses were currently being put together and would be coming out with guidance around concepts of the framework. In addition, a steering group would be formed to look at supporting pilot areas across Devon, the principle being to look at multi-agency teams from all agencies, a multi-agency panel and a prevention concept. John Shaw suggesting putting this item on as a future agency item for a more formal discussion, which was agreed.

#### **ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO PUT THIS ITEM ON THE AGENDA FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

#### Page 9 – Sexual Assault Referral Centre

Charles Holme updated the meeting on this matter and advised that there was now a modified Victim Support Centre at Pynes Hill in Exeter which was slowly becoming a Sexual Assault Referral Centre. However, the Home Office bid for funding had been unsuccessful, although it was hopeful that the next bid would be successful.

#### Page 9 – Police Central Referral Unit

Bob Brown advised that the Police were awaiting a response to proposals and recommendations on this and that part of the plan put to the Home Office included a Central Referral Unit. A response was due by 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2006. If the bid was accepted and the Devon & Cornwall Constabulary remained as a stand alone force in its own right, then there would be a lot of work to do in a short space of time. Anne Whiteley said that the ACPC would be keen to be involved in these discussions. Bob Brown said that the Central Referral Unit would be bigger than child protection and would need to look to include domestic violence, adult protection, etc, as well as child protection.

#### Page 9 – Joint Chief Inspectors Report

Chris Dimmelow advised that he had met with Charles Holme about this, but had not yet been able to distribute the papers to ACPC members, although he would do so by e-mail as soon as possible.

Chris Dimmelow advised that the key focus of the first joint area review for Devon would be the general work of this committee and the LCSB and how they were responding to the Joint Chief Inspectors Report. Time would be needed to demonstrate that they had analysed the report and were making the appropriate changes.

Anne Whiteley said that the performance of the ACPC / LCSB would be judged on safeguarding and local partnership arrangements. However, as yet there were no further details on the Joint Area Review (JAR) process.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW WILL DISTRIBUTE THE PAPER FROM HIS DISCUSSIONS WITH CHARLES HOLME.**
- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO PREPARE AND SEND OUT AN ACTION PLAN FROM THE SUMMARY REPORT SUBMITTED AT THE LAST MEETING.**
- **ANNE WHITELEY TO BRING AN EXTRACT FROM THE DOCUMENT WHICH SHOWS HOW THE JAR FINDINGS FIT INTO ALL OF THE AGENCIES REGIMES TO THE NEXT MEETING.**

**2. REPORT OF THE EDUCATION SUB-COMMITTEE**

Juliet Hammacott provided a report on this item and advised that:-

- Schools had been asking for Child Protection training when they were due a visit by OFSTED. Because of these high demands for training, EWO's were undertaking some of the training.
- Juliet Hammacott would be attending a meeting next week to look at the governor training set for March 2006.

The meeting discussed the following main points:-

- MARAC's, with Chris Dimmelow giving an explanation of what these meetings were and when they should be convened.
- Trigger points, which were an issue for District Councils.
- The YOT's recent audit of the top 40 high risk offenders to see what common factors were present. The result of this had shown the most consistent were those who had been witnesses or victims of domestic violence (85%).

**3. REPORT OF THE TRAINING SUB-COMMITTEE**

Anne Wilson presented her report to the meeting.

The meeting discuss the following issues:-

- Problems experienced with CAMAT-trained Social Workers, in that a lot of Social Workers were trained, but then had difficulties remembering all of the training when they came to use it. It was suggested that the localities would need to monitor the amount of interviews each individual did and those who did not do them on a regular basis should be taken off the list.
- Whether the Local Authority could provide some extra venues for the training to take place. Anne Wilson confirmed that she had had some contact with the Local Authority about venues. Martin Gladwin advised that CAF/CASS had a small room in Exeter that would hold about 10 people.

- People were very keen to do the training course and be a trainer, but this was not backed up by their Managers and this issue needed to be addressed.

#### **4. REPORT OF HEALTH SUB-COMMITTEE**

Ann Morecraft advised that the Health Sub-Committee had not yet met and therefore there was no report to present to this meeting.

#### **5. CASE REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE**

Chris Dimmelow advised that the sub-committee had met on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2005 and reported as follows:-

AP

- The Police had informed the sub-committee that the CPS had decided that none of the professionals involved in this case would be prosecuted.
- There will be an inquest, anticipated to take place in the autumn of 2006 and it was acknowledged that this would be an equally difficult process for the professionals involved.
- Chris Dimmelow and the Director of Social Services met some time ago with ACC Dick Stowe to look at the details of the inquest, as it would be high profile.

AC

- It had not been possible to identify who had been responsible for the injuries sustained by this child.
- AC was now making good progress medically and there were no implications from the serious head injuries sustained.
- AC was now back in foster care in Devon and was subject to care proceedings.
- A number of issues had been raised after the incident and the view was that a Part 8 Review should be undertaken and the details of that had been sent to the relevant agencies with a deadline of 20<sup>th</sup> January 2006.

#### **ACTION:**

- **ALL AGENCIES WHO HAVE HAD A FORMAL REQUEST LETTER ARE ASKED TO GIVE THIS MATTER PRIORITY.**

FO

- No direct child protection concerns have been linked with this death, although information provided by Laura Hubbard-Fielder confirmed that FO had been known to the Partnership Trust for issues of depression, cannabis use and a previous threat to take his own life.
- It had been decided not to undertake a Part 8 Review, but a query had been raised as to whether the Partnership Trust was duty bound to do so. Laura Hubbard-Fielder advised that as FO had not been a patient for over a year, this was unlikely.

KT

- Work had been taken forward to the Substance Misuse Sub-Committee.

- A completed action plan was needed in relation to individual recommendations made by individual agencies and the ACPC.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO E-MAIL A MATRIX TO ALL INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES AND ASK THEM TO COMPLETE IT FOR THE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THEIR AGENCY – ACTION TAKEN, TO BE TAKEN, WHO IS RESPONSIBLE AND TIMESCALE.**

TF

- The circumstances of this death were thought to be a natural cot death and the Sudden Infant Death Team was involved.
- The initial response from the post mortem indicated possible significant liver disease.
- Because of a lack of paediatric pathology services in the Devon area, this baby has had to go to Birmingham for a full paediatric post mortem and because of the waiting list involved, it might be some time before verification of no child protection concerns around this child's death.
- Two older siblings had been on the Child Protection Register for a short period of time, for concerns around neglect, but not related to any physical abuse. The registration had been contested by the extended family and a complaint submitted.
- Chris Dimmelow had informed CSCI of the death and they are happy that no further action will be taken until further information is received following the full paediatric post mortem.

Part 8 Training

- This will take place on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2006.

Chris Dimmelow advised of an historical case of a childminder who had been accused of abusing a number of children she had been minding. Steps had been taken to de-register this person, but had not been successful. Following a second Police investigation, a complaint had been made by three sets of parents of the children involved and this had been responded to by initiating an independent review of the investigations by Andy Pearce and Sandra Owen. However, it had become clear that the costs were now exceeding initial estimations and whilst it was recognised that there was a need for this review, the ACPC needed to be aware of the significant cost implications for which there was no budget at the moment, although it had been agreed in principle that this would be multi-agency funded. Andy Pearce and Sandra Owen had put their review on hold for the time being.

**ACTION:**

- **BOB BROWN TO CHECK THE POSITION RE THE COMPLAINANTS AT THE MOMENT.**
- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO MEET WITH ANDY PIERCE AND SANDRA OWEN ASAP THIS MONTH, TO SEE WHERE THEY ARE AND WHAT CAN BE CONCLUDED WITH A MINIMAL AMOUNT OF WORK.**

The meeting discussed the e-learning package, the salient points being:-

- Concerns had been raised that cases were still very recognisable during training sessions. Jane Richards said that she had developed a training programme for GPs that mixed facts and names to keep them as anonymous as possible and offered to discuss this further with Ann Wilson.
- Anne Whiteley suggested contacting the Plymouth locality, as they had said previously that they would share their findings of Part 8 reviews.
- Ann Wilson had shared Charles Holme's and Helen Hyland's research findings with the consultancy and they were looking to have a completed package available for use from June 2006 onwards.
- The NSPCC were looking at their own process and although this was not ready yet, they might be able to bring a model to Anne Wilson over the next six months.
- The CSCI Business Manager would be attending the next ACPC meeting.

## **6. NOTIFICATION OF CHILD DEATHS**

Bob Brown presented his report on this item to the meeting, advising that screening groups were needed to look at how to prevent incidents from happening in the future. Bob Brown advised that an advert was being placed for a full time Case Review Sergeant, who would undertake serious case reviews.

The meeting discussed whether the screening group should be separate from or a part of the Part 8 Sub-Group, with concern being expressed that there were now numerous different sub-groups identified as part of the Safeguarding Board and that the Safeguarding Board would dilute child protection and lose sight of it. Anne Whiteley confirmed that the Safeguarding Board would have to retain an absolute focus on child protection, but would also have to look at how that linked into broader issues of children's wellbeing.

## **7. PROGRESS TOWARDS ESTABLISHING THE LSCB**

Anne Whiteley advised that following on from consultation on Working Together in autumn 2005, the revised Chapter 3 had now been released nationally. This was being published in advance in order to help local authorities and their partners set up the Safeguarding Board and set out the role, functions, governments and operational requirements of the Safeguarding Boards.

### **ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO E-MAIL THE REVISED VERSION OF CHAPTER 3 TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE ACPC, TOGETHER WITH A BRIEFING DOCUMENT.**

Anne Whiteley advised the meeting of the main functions of the LSCB and advised that Chapter 3 stressed the importance of safeguarding being everyone's responsibility and advised that:-

- the group would be identified as raising key issues, including vulnerable groups raising major concerns – Anne Whiteley read the relevant section from the briefing document on this matter;
- there were two significant new inclusions – three paragraphs on the relationship between the Safeguarding Board and the Children’s Trust and two paragraphs on the role of elected members;
- there was also a section on non-statutory and other members, which had been re-worded to place greater importance on the role of the NSPCC;
- final guidance also stipulated that members should have a clear written statement of their roles and responsibilities;
- she had a copy of what the Bristol local authority had implemented, which was a statement for every individual member of the Safeguarding Board, which captured their roles and responsibilities, together with a letter of appointment to underline this.

Anne Whiteley advised the meeting of the other amendments that had been made to Chapter 3 and it was agreed that this would be looked into further at the next meeting.

**ACTION:**

**- CHAPTER 3 TO BE LOOKED AT IN MORE DETAIL AT THE NEXT MEETING.**

Chris Dimmelow advised that he had made an initial attempt at making a draft of the initial functions of the LSCB, but he would need to clarify certain points from the final guidance before it could be distributed.

Chris Dimmelow referred to the membership of the LSCB and said that draft guidance available at the time had been followed and interpreted directly in terms of the core membership recommendations. However, a response had not yet been received from all of the agencies listed in the guidance and issues such as District Councils being represented on the Board also needed discussing. Chris Dimmelow advised the meeting of the nominated representatives from the District Councils, as follows:-

- Peter Hancock, Mid Devon District Council
- Peter Jeffs, East Devon District Council
- Counsellor David Howe, Teignbridge District Council
- Counsellor Trish Dean, West Devon District Council

It was noted that both Teignbridge and West Devon had nominated political members, which Peter Hancock had not felt was appropriate. Chris Dimmelow referred to Chapter 3 and read out the relevant section to the meeting, which stated that political members could not be nominated.

**ACTION:**

**- CHRIS DIMMELOW TO ADVISE TEIGNBRIDGE AND WEST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCILS OF THE GUIDANCE AROUND THE NOMINATION OF POLITICAL MEMBERS.**

Chris Dimmelow advised that Hazel Ball had been nominated for Exeter City Council. Peter Jeffs said that he had a meeting coming up, when he would raise this matter.

Anne Whiteley said that it would be important that the people nominated attended on a consistent basis and they would need to commit to that.

The meeting discussed the future length of meetings, with Anne Whiteley advising that the business would not lessen, but they might need to review how it was conducted to try and shorten the length of the meeting. Anne Whiteley suggested using the next ACPC meeting to discuss some of those issues.

Chris Dimmelow referred to the representation from the District Councils and suggested writing to all of the nominated people from District Councils to advise them that political members should not be members of this board, but that it would be helpful if the District Councils could discuss amongst themselves how they wished to be represented.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO WRITE TO THOSE NOMINATED BY DISTRICT COUNCILS TO ADVISE THAT POLITICAL MEMBERS SHOULD NOT BE MEMBERS OF THE LSCB.**

Peter Jeffs said that there were other issues in that most of the child protection matters seemed to focus around the housing and leisure services within the District Councils. Bearing in mind that some councils had out-sourced these services, those councils might have a different relationship to the LSCB than others. Anne Whiteley suggested that should be debated between the District Councils, to ensure a mixed representation.

Chris Dimmelow advised the meeting of the nominations from the PCTs, as follows:-

- Elizabeth Shaw (East)
- Miles Hapgood (Exeter)
- Alison Lewis-Smith (North)
- Karen Grimshaw (South Hams & West Devon)
- Kath Crompton (Mid)

There had not yet been a response from Teignbridge. A letter to Pam Smith was proposed.

Chris Dimmelow advised that he had been invited to attend the next Children's Leads PCT meeting, but unfortunately would be unable to attend. He had had an exchange of e-mails with Miles Hapgood about how the PCTs wanted to be represented on the board, but felt it was important they had the same debate as the District Councils. Chris would confirm with Miles Hapgood that the preference of the emerging board would be for nominees to be from the Children's Leads.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO FOLLOW UP LETTERS TO PAM SMITH.**
- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO CONFIRM WITH MILES HAPGOOD THAT THE PREFERENCE WOULD BE FOR NOMINEES TO BE FROM THE CHILDREN'S LEADS.**

Anne Whiteley queried what was happening with the Acute Trusts. Chris Dimmelow advised that Corinne Hayes and Clare Mitchell had been nominated from the Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital, but there had not been a nomination from North Devon.

**ACTION:**

- **CHARLES HOLME TO RAISE THIS MATTER WITH THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF NORTH DEVON HOSPITAL IN WRITING.**

Chris Dimmelow advised that he had not yet had a reply from the Chief Constable in terms of formal representation from the Police. Bob Brown advised that a reply had been drafted some time ago and that the Police would be looking at representation from a level no lower than Superintendent.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO RE-WRITE TO THE CHIEF CONSTABLE ASKING FOR THE NOMINATION FROM THE POLICE.**

The meeting discussed how GPs would be represented on the Board and various issues were raised and discussed, including:-

- Whether the PCTs should represent GPs.
- Whether GPs should have a nominated person sitting on the Board.
- Whether GPs / Dentists, etc should go to their own bodies for representation at the Board.

**ACTION:**

- **ANN MORECRAFT TO RAISE THE ISSUE OF GPS REPRESENTATION AT THE LSCB AT THE NEXT PCT MEETING.**

The meeting discussed the representation of the voluntary sector, the main issues raised and discussed being:-

- That there was a clear statement that the NSPCC should have membership on the Safeguarding Boards, however in Devon there was dual representation, as the NCH were also represented.
- The NSPCC was mentioned in its own right and had statutory duties. This did not necessarily mean that the NSPCC would represent the voluntary sector and it was therefore important for the voluntary sector to have its own voice on the board.
- SW NCVCCO had now been developed and if it was felt appropriate, they could make a representative available who would speak for the voluntary services across the board. However, if it was decided that the voluntary sector should not have representation on the Board, all of the thematic and sub-groups appropriate to the voluntary sector would still need to be managed.

- The NSPCC would be unable to represent the whole of the voluntary sector and had never agreed to do so.
- Derek Moore said that he would put his name down for nomination.

Other points discussed were:-

- Martin Spragg had been formally nominated as a representative for YOT.
- The Strategic Health Authorities had not responded to the letter asking for a nomination. Chris Dimmelow would chase this up at a meeting next week.
- John Davey had been nominated from Connexions, Martin Gladwin from CAFCASS and Mary Mitchell from Devon & Cornwall Probation Services.
- The meeting was advised of the current situation in terms of what funding had or had not been agreed as yet.
- The meeting discussed which current members would remain on the Board and Anne Whiteley suggested that between now and the next meeting, members should think about who would continue on the Board.
- The meeting was informed that other ACPC's had increased the number of meetings held in order to get through the amount of transition work necessary. Anne Whiteley agreed that this would also need to be discussed at the next meeting.
- Martin Spragg asked about DAT representation. Chris Dimmelow advised that could be formally agreed at the next meeting.

Chris Dimmelow advised that he would put all of the other points into a paper for the next meeting.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO CHASE UP NOMINATIONS FROM THE STRATEGIC HEALTH AUTHORITIES NEXT MEETING.**
- **DISCUSSION AT THE NEXT MEETING ABOUT RELEVANT MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD.**
- **DISCUSSION AT THE NEXT MEETING ABOUT HOW TO GET THROUGH THE NECESSARY TRANSITION WORK.**
- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO PREPARE A PAPER FOR THE NEXT MEETING ON ALL OF THE POINTS THAT NEED TO BE DISCUSSED.**

**8. PRIVATE FOSTERING UPDATE**

Alison Davis presented her report to the meeting.

A discussion took place and the following issues were raised and discussed:-

- There were a lot of children within the YOT who were in a private fostering arrangement, some of which had gone on for a number of years and the new assessments could make this an unsettled element of a child's life.
- How Devon compared to Cornwall and Gloucestershire, who had approximately 100 children in private fostering arrangements.
- This would be a key area of responsibility for the LSCB.

- There was concern about 15 year old girls living with much older boyfriends and it had been suggested that private fostering assessments could be undertaken if a carer was considered inappropriate. If the carer was to breach that assessment, then the final outcome would be a prison sentence, as they would be going against the law.
- Which relatives would be excluded from a private fostering assessment and the definition of disabled in this context.

Alison Davis confirmed that Monica Summers would be picking up the work on the Private Fostering Group.

## **9. NOTIFICATION OF FAMILIES PLACED IN TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION**

Jo Gunner was welcomed to the meeting and presented her report about homeless families being placed in temporary accommodation.

The meeting discussed the various issues, the main points being as follows:-

- The target Local Authorities had been set for halving the number of children in temporary accommodation by 2010.
- The definition of “temporary accommodation”, which now captured a variety of types and seemed to be more about the legal arrangement between the landlord and tenant than the timescales involved.
- The links with women’s refuges.
- Some children may not be deemed at risk, may not be offending, etc so the statutory agencies may not have a need to be involved with them.
- Children living in temporary accommodation tended not to be attending school so were not known about. If they were known about, then something would be done for them, as that was the Local Authority’s responsibility.
- The services firstly needed to know these children were in the area and then co-ordinate universal services for them.
- If it was known that a child was in temporary accommodation, but was not attending school, that would be picked up on and gave the agencies an opportunity to advise the family of services they could access.
- It was suggested that the focus should be widened to include children with special needs.
- It was felt to be significant that a number of the children in temporary accommodation were using A&E rather than a GP for their medical needs.
- The timescales for when this notification process would be in place.
- How families who were considered to be intentionally homeless were currently notified to other agencies.
- Those children who were homeless, but had not been “placed” anywhere, as that aspect would need to be given consideration.
- Issues of demarcation disputes between agencies, which would need to be avoided wherever possible.

Anne Whiteley noted that Jo Gunner was putting a proposal together around the work going on with regard to 16-17 year olds, which were potentially a very vulnerable

group and said that the ACPC would welcome a more detailed paper coming back with regard to the next steps forward.

Anne Whiteley suggested going through Project Amethyst in terms of trying to identify the needs around the different issues.

**ACTION:**

- **JO GUNNER TO RETURN TO ACPC IN SIX MONTHS' TIME WITH MORE DETAILED INFORMATION ON 16-17 YEAR OLDS.**

**10. SAFER RECRUITMENT IN EDUCATION & DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS AGAINST TEACHERS**

Sue Williams was welcomed to the meeting and gave a presentation on this subject.

Anne Whiteley asked if it would be ensured that a person who had undertaken interview training would be a part of OFSTED. Sue Williams confirmed that it would. Anne Whiteley also asked if every School Governor would be CRB checked, which Sue Williams confirmed would happen.

The meeting discussed the supply of teachers through agencies, the main points being:-

- Agencies should be inspected and it should be made clear what requirements, if any, were on the agencies to demonstrate to schools that checks had been made on the supply teachers.
- Whose responsibility it was to ensure the relevant checks had been carried out and to request evidence that this had happened.
- Devon County Council had been criticised by CSCI for using supply staff within children's homes, where agencies had carried out checks but Devon County Council had not seen the evidence of those checks.
- The improvements suggested by Safe Recruitment Guidance.
- The current review of the CRB check, following the new vetting and barring recommendations.

Chris Dimmelow thanked Sue Williams for the work and support she had given to ACPCs and individual LEAs across the region, as she would no longer be in her current role.

**11. CAFCASS POLICY – SECTION 20 ADOPTION & CHILDREN ACT 2002**

Martin Gladwin explained to the meeting what CAFCASS stood for and their role and then presented the CAFCASS policy to the meeting.

The meeting discussed seeking parental consent and whether either parent could give this. It was clarified that unless it would be of damage to the child, parental consent needed to be gained.

**ACTION:**

- **MARTIN GLADWIN TO UPDATE THE NEXT MEETING ON THIS SUBJECT.**

- **ACPC TO BE ENGAGED IN THE DISCUSSIONS IN THIS POLICY.**

## **12. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UPDATE**

Roy Tomlinson was welcomed to the meeting and presented his report on the above.

The meeting raised and discussed the following issues:-

- Whether it would be possible for the YOT to buy into the schools-based training – Roy Tomlinson agreed to discuss that with Martin Spragg.
- Jane Richards asked Roy Tomlinson to let her know of where problems areas were with regard to GPs taking the training, in order for that to be targeted.
- John Shaw suggested discussing the Child Concern Pathway with Roy Tomlinson.
- Who reported on children in women's refuges. Roy Tomlinson advised that funding for work in refuges was currently funded by ADVA on an ad-hoc basis; each refuge now had a link to a named EWO and Educational Psychologist; the link with family support services was weaker and could be improved; work was currently being undertaken with homeless people to provide a stronger link with agencies, although each refuge did have a named Health Visitor.

Anne Whiteley asked if any consideration had been given as to how the audit could be pursued. Roy Tomlinson said that this had evolved from discussions with the Children's Task Group. Chris Dimmelow suggested taking the document back to the Children's Task Group, to see who could undertake work on this. Whilst it was recognised that responsibilities were placed on LSCBs in terms of children affected by domestic violence, there were a number of other issues that impacted on child protection. Alison Kearnes said that it could be argued that domestic violence had only recently been formally recognised within child protection as being so damaging to children.

Anne Whiteley advised that the ACPC was still at a formative stage of working out the role of the LSCB and although there was no doubt that domestic violence was a key issue, the LCSB had a big remit and responsibility and must ensure that was focused.

### **ACTION:**

- **ROY TOMLINSON TO TAKE THE DOCUMENT BACK TO THE CHILDREN'S GROUP OF THE ADVA PARTNERSHIP AND LOOK FOR CROSS-REPRESENTATION FROM ADVA AND ACPC.**

## **13. SAFE PARENTING HANDBOOK**

Chris Dimmelow advised that he had looked at the Safe Parenting Handbook and that the ACPC could pick and choose from a whole menu of contents to create the required document. Devon had now entered negotiations with Torbay and Plymouth in order to purchase in bulk and hopefully reduce the costs to each locality. However, organisations had not come forward with a commitment to buy into the process and thus reduce the costs further. Chris Dimmelow said that the LSCB would need to do

something to promote, publish and communicate the requirements around child safeguarding directly to the community and to parents and re-request that anyone who could have a role in putting these documents out through their organisations consider that.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO FORMALLY WRITE TO MEMBERS ASKING FOR A COMMITMENT TO BE GIVEN AND TO TRANSLATE THAT INTO MONEY AVAILABLE.**

The meeting had a brief discussion about which pages could be included, with Jane Richards asking the meeting to re-visit the list that had previously been drawn up.

Charles Holme referred to the Red Book and said that this was regarded as a Health document, but should be cross-referenced to the Safe Parenting Handbook, although without duplication. There was a new national edition of the Red Book, which might contain some of the items on the Safe Parenting Handbook's menu.

**ACTION:**

- **HELEN HYLAND TO CHECK THE NEW RED BOOK AGAINST THE MENU LIST FOR THE SAFE PARENTING HANDBOOK.**

Chris Dimmelow advised that he had met with Plymouth and Torbay and with Coles McConnell, to see if they would be interested in a joint venture, to which they had said yes. It had been agreed that after all of the ACPC's had discussed the matter in principle, they would meet again to look at putting the document together.

The meeting agreed going for a 44 page document.

John Shaw advised that there was a possibility that CAMHS could put some money towards this, but it would depend on the timing. Martin Spragg said that he could commit £1000 towards the publication if it was undertaken within this financial year.

#### **14. SINGLE CHILD INDEX & INFORMATION SHARING INDEX**

Anne Whiteley advised that this would be established nationally, to be implemented locally. It would not replace the Child Protection Register and would be passed on the DWP Child Reference No. Further guidance was currently awaiting and nothing further would be done about this at the moment.

Chris Dimmelow advised that there was a meeting due next week and that the Child Protection Register had been on the agenda for this meeting. However, the meeting had now been put back until April and the final version of Working Together would now not be available until March.

**ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO LOOK INTO THE FINAL VERSION OF WORKING TOGETHER AND E-MAIL ALL MEMBERS WITH AN UPDATE.**

## **15. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

- a) Sexual Development in Primary Aged Children – this was circulated to the meeting. Chris Dimmelow supported Anne Whiteley's view that this was an excellent document and advised that financial support had been given on behalf of ACPC.
- b) The BASPCAN Seminar was confirmed to be taking place in Exeter on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2006.

## **16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Helen Hyland asked if a letter could be circulated about the new multi-agency handbook. Chris Dimmelow advised that this would need to be revised again in light of the new Working Together, but agreed to send out a letter to advise there was a temporary document on the website.

### **ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO SEND OUT A LETTER TO MEMBERS, ADVISING THEM THAT A TEMPORARY MULTI-AGENCY HANDBOOK WAS AVAILABLE TO VIEW ON THE WEBSITE.**

Charles Holme advised that Miles Hapford had raised a query of whether an assessment could be made of the children on the Child Protection Register by GP practice. Charles Holme said that he did not agree with this suggestion, but queried whether it should be discussed openly in this forum. Chris Dimmelow advised that the national procedures advised against issuing all or part of the Child Protection Register for administrative purposes and notification should be done through the local notification process following a Case Conference. The Register was provided to hospitals, which had proved useful in terms of children going through A&E whose names were on the Child Protection Register. The meeting discussed the practicalities of this, with Chris Dimmelow suggesting he discuss with Miles Hapford and Jane Richards the issues and whether this matter could be resolved in any way.

### **ACTION:**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO DISCUSS THIS MATTER FURTHER WITH MILES HAPFORD AND JANE RICHARDS.**

## **17. NEXT MEETING**

The next ACPC meeting was scheduled for 17<sup>th</sup> March 2006 at Buckfast Abbey. Anne gave her apologies. Deborah Booth will chair.