

MINUTES OF THE DEVON SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD

12 December 2008

9.30am

Buckfast Abbey

Chairman: A J Wooderson



Attendees 12 December 2008

Surname	Forename	Agency	Role	Signature
Wooderson (AJW)	Alan J	Devon LSCB	Independent Chair	
Sargent (RS)	Rebecca	CAFCASS	Service Manager Quality Improvement - Stand in for Peter Mitchell	
Davey (JD)	John	Connexions Cornwall & Devon Ltd	Director	
Mitchell (MM)	Mary	Devon & Cornwall Probation Area	Assistant Chief Officer.	
Dimmelow (CD)	Chris	Devon County Council Children and Young People's Service	Head of Safeguarding	
Booth (DB)	Deborah	Devon County Council Children and Young People's Service	Strategic Project Manager for Education Achievement of Children in Care	
Brown (KB)	Karen	Devon County Council Children and Young People's Service	Senior Workforce Development Advisor	
Dubash (BD)	Beverley	Devon County Council Children and Young People's Service	Principal Education Welfare Officer	
Kasprzyk (MK)	Maria	Devon County Council Children and Young People's Service	Service Improvement Manager	
McCallum (RMCC)	Rory	Devon County Council Children and Young People's Service	Director of Early Years and Families	
Bird (LB)	Lesley	Devon County Council LSCB	Secretary Minute Taker	
Tomlinson (RT)	Roy	Devon County Council.	Community Strategy Officer	

Attendees 12 December 2008				
Surname	Forename	Agency	Role	Signature
Davenport (LD)	Liz	Devon NHS Partnership Trust	Director	Did not attend
Holme (CH)	Charles	Devon Primary Care Trust.	Designated Doctor Child Protection Devon	
Hyland (HHy)	Helen	Devon Primary Care Trust.	Designated Nurse Child Protection	
Gibbs (SG)	Sara	Devon Primary Care Trust.	Consultant in Public Health	
Allen (AA)	Alison	Devon Primary Care Trust.	Named Nurse Safeguarding.	
Thornberry (MT)	Michele	Devon Primary Care Trust.	Child Protection Lead Eastern.	
Spittles (LS)	Laura	Devon Partnership NHS Trust	Named Nurse, Safeguarding Children.	
Moore (DM)	Derek	NCH Action for Children	Assistant Director	
Scales (SB)	Barbara	Churches Housing Action Team (CHAT)	Team Manager	
Cox (MC)	Mandy	NHS South West Strategic Health Authority	Policy Lead CYP Maternity	
Tennant (JT)	Jo	Police. Devon and Cornwall Constabulary	Chief Superintendent. Basic Command Unit.	
Fielding (JF)	Julie	Police. Devon and Cornwall Constabulary	Acting Detective Chief Inspector Force Public Protection	Did not attend
Lamont (KL)	Ken	Police. Devon and Cornwall Constabulary	T/Detective Chief Inspector. Crime Manager Devon Basic Command Unit	
Tomlinson (RTo)	Richard	Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital Foundation Trust	Named Doctor	
Mitchell (CM)	Claire	Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital Foundation	Nurse Consultant Safeguarding Children	

Attendees 12 December 2008

Surname	Forename	Agency	Role	Signature
		Trust		
Lawrence (NL)	Nigel	Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital Foundation Trust	Lead Nurse - Stand in for Peter Adey	
Parker (LP)	Heather	South Devon Health care Foundation Trust	Associate Director of Nursing & Midwifery Women's & Children's Diagnostic & Therapies.	
Hulme (HH)	Helen	Youth Offending Team	Area Manager South	

Observer Speaker 12 Dec 08

Surname	Forename	Agency	Role	Signature
Ashforth (MA)	Christina	OBSERVER Devon County Council	New LSCB secretary	Did not attend
Hill (MH)	Michaila	OBSERVER Devon County Council	Media and Communications	
Pearce (NP)	Nick	Item 3 SPEAKER E-safety Strategy	Strategic Lead Officer. ICT Systems and Infrastructure.	
Lynch (JL)	Jeanie	Item 2 SPEAKER Anti-bullying Development Plan		
Lyons (AL)	Annette	Item 2 SPEAKER Anti-bullying Development Plan	Adviser for Personal, Social, Health Education and Citizenship	
Pritchard (DP)	Debbie	Item 2 SPEAKER Anti-bullying Development Plan	Devon County Council CYPS Assistant Director - Performance and Planning.	
Morris (AM)	Andrea	Item 10 SPEAKER Private Fostering Annual Report	Service Improvement Manager for Children in Care and Care Leavers.	

Apologies 12 December 2008

Surname	Forename	Agency	Role
Kearnes (AK)	Alison	NSPCC	Assistant Director MW NSPCC
Richards (JR)	Jane	Local Medical Committee	Portfolio Holder Devon Local Medical Committee

Apologies 12 December 2008

Surname	Forename	Agency	Role
Hancock (PH)	Peter	Mid Devon County Council	Director
Jefferies (PJ)	Peter	East Devon District Council	Director of Communities
Pearson (VP)	Virginia	Devon Primary Care Trust	Director of Public Health
Phipps (JP)	Janet	NHS North Devon Trust	General Manager. Women's and Children's Sexual Health
Northcott (PN)	Paul	Devon and Cornwall Police Crime Support	Detective Chief Inspector HQ Public Protection
Adey (PA)	Peter	Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital Foundation Trust	Divisional Manager Children and Women's Health & Cancer Services
McGrath (SM)	Sue	Devon County Council	Youth Offending Team

ABBREVIATIONS in the minutes.

LSCB	Local Safeguarding children Board
LMC	Local Medical Council
DPT	Devon Partnership Trust
PCT	Primary Care Trust
YOT	Youth Offending Team
ADVA	Against Domestic Violence Action
Becta	British Educational Communications and Technology Agency
CYPS	Children and Young People's Service
JAR	Joint Agency Review
DCSF	Department of Children Schools and Families
SCR	Serious Case Review
IMR	Individual Management Reviews
LA's	Local Authority
OR	Overview Report
AP	Action Plan
GOSW	Government Office South West
PI's	Performance Indicators
CP	Child Protection
DCC	Devon County Council
DH	Department of Health
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
RAG	Red, Amber, Green ratings
NHS	National Health Service
SHA	Strategic Health Authority

Agenda Item 1.	Minutes of meeting 26 September 2008 and matters arising	Presenter Alan Wooderson	
Discussion	<p>AJW welcomed Michaila Hill to the LSCB as the newly agreed dedicated PR/Media/Communications representative for the LSCB</p> <p>It was also noted that Jane Richards had stepped down as the LMC representative. There was general support for the proposal that Jane receive a gift from the LSCB in recognition of her outstanding work and contributions over many years, particularly to the Serious Case Review process</p> <p>Liz Davenport has replaced Graeme Barnell as the DPT Director representative on the LSCB AJW outlined his expectations for the future meetings of the LSCB.</p> <p>Agendas will be agreed 4 weeks prior to each meeting and should be driven by the work of the Executive and sub groups and national strategic issues.</p> <p>All agenda items will require a report with a front sheet. The current front sheets need revising to make them more fit for purpose</p> <p>Agendas and papers will be distributed one week before the meeting. Case sensitive material will be password protected in line with Data Protection and Caldicott requirements</p> <p>Minutes will be taken live at the meeting and will be agreed in draft form by the Chair within 3 working days of the meeting. These will then be distributed to attendees for comment as to accuracy and content. There will be a time limit of 5 working days for comment .The Chair will then amend and distribute the minutes as accurate and agreed.</p> <p>AJW explained that he had revised the minutes from the 26th Sept meeting into a new format that would be used from now on. The meeting considered the revisions and the following suggestions were agreed</p> <p>Documents referred to should always be fully titled and their publication date included.</p> <p>Dates should always be used in preference to phrases such as 'in a fortnight'.</p> <p>A convention of using initials rather than full names should be implemented for the minutes.</p> <p>Some minor factual changes were made to the revised minutes which were then agreed.</p> <p>Item 16 .AJW agreed to write in support of the proposal for a Managed Network of Paediatricians for the assessment of child sexual abuse to Gwen Pearson at Devon PCT.</p> <p>AJW reported his intention of publishing an Annual Report of the work of the</p>		

LSCB in April /May each year which will describe activities, achievements and progress on the published Business plan objectives. The report would be expected to be considered by all the Boards of the duty to co operate partners.

Matters arising from the minutes.

Section 11 Audits.

CD up dated the LSCB on the progress in completing the Section 11 Audit process including the feedback from the LSCB. There remain audit returns outstanding from all 8 District Councils, Devon YOT, Devon Education and ADVA.

This provoked considerable discussion about the importance of the Section 11 compliance process and how the LSCB had to insist on completion and responses.

The Audits occur annually. The 4 peninsula LSCBs have agreed to collaborate on the audit documentation which will mean that organisations such as the police and probation which cover all 4 LSCBs, will be asked only to do one return but within it to reflect any specific geographical variations

After discussion it was agreed that :

Devon Education should complete the Section 11 process in addition to the Section 175 process. This is particularly relevant given the array of independent schools present within Devon.

Devon YOT to urgently complete the audit and return to the Safeguarding Unit
The Devon District Councils to be urgently contacted by AJW to return their Audits

ADVA to complete a Section 11 Audit

It was further agreed that the peninsula LSCBs should devise an audit form for the independent and voluntary sector.

CD reported that of the 12 Audit forms returned only 2 were fully completed. They were of variable quality and Action Plans for improvement were missing from 50%

The LSCB were extremely anxious that this statutory process had to be complied with and that robust measures must be taken to improve the situation.

Therefore the Audits received so far which were incomplete will be returned to the relevant organisation's Chief Officer with an explanatory note and an absolute deadline of 31st January for completion and return .Sooner if at all possible. The person who completed the form for each organisation will be copied into the correspondence.

The LSCB will then respond to the Audits with comments and required actions. This would best be achieved via the Executive and the Quality Assurance process. The Executive will report back to the next LSCB on the completion of the process and the lessons learnt. This is particularly important as we need to plan now for the 2009/10 Audit process

Conclusion	The new minutes process should lead to a quicker implementation of the actions
-------------------	--

	<p>required at each LSCB meeting. A tighter process for agreeing and producing agenda items will mean that the executive needs to function effectively. An Annual Report will be produced outlining the work of the LSCB. The Section 11 process is a key compliance and quality responsibility of the LSCB that needs urgent action for completion and improvements.</p>		
Action points	Action owner	Deadline	
Letter of appreciation to be signed by the Chair and appropriate gift to be arranged for Jane Richards	CD	ASAP	
Revision to LSCB Report front sheet	RMcC	March 2009	
Revised minutes of 26 th September to be distributed and placed on Website	LB	18/12/08	
Letter to Devon PCT in support of the Managed Network of Paediatricians	AJW	18/12/08	
Section 11 Audits to be completed by Education , YOT, ADVA and District Councils	BD,HH,RT,DC Chief Execs	31/01/09	
Section 11 audits that are incomplete to be returned to organisations for review and revision. Executive to consider improvements to the process for 2009/10	CD RMcC	Immediate 31/03/09	

Agenda Item 2.	Strategic Item Reduce Bullying Development Plan	Presenters Annette Lyons, Jeanie Lynch, Debbie Pritchard	
Discussion	<p>Summary of Report</p> <p>There are 10 areas of focus within the CYPP 08-09, they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a culture where there is more honest recognition of bullying • Linking with the safer communities strategies and developing safe places in communities • Establishing effective ways of engaging children and young people in finding solutions • Addressing cyber bullying with a focus on secondary schools • Finding ways to help children and young people to feel safer travelling to and from school, particularly on buses • Identifying, communicating, and building on good anti-bullying practice across Devon and engaging partners with newsletters, conferences and workshops • Systematic reporting of incidents and using data to inform future actions • Engaging parents and those working with children and young people in an e-safety programme in partnership with the South West Grid for Learning • Establish a partnership approach to restorative justice across Devon • Making sure that vulnerable groups of children and young people, such as Travellers, children with special needs or children in care, get education 		

	<p>about prevention and intervention where necessary</p> <p>Within these 10 areas there are a wide range of activities involving over 19 partner organisations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All activities with the exception of cyp-PA-0632 (Systematic reporting of incidents and using data to inform future actions) are on target. The data issue is being addressed • 3 new resources have been published and distributed to Devon schools. These have been well received in the County and nationally. <p>DP, JL and AL engaged the LSCB in an interactive exercise around a case study of bullying which raised the issue of the impact of bullying, the potential for all agencies on the LSCB to have contact with victims, and the close link between bullying and other forms of abuse. A great deal of discussion focussed on the positive impact of the use of Restorative Justice as an intervention which has worked within schools, the YOT and in community settings. JT wanted to positively encourage the involvement of neighbourhood police in early interventions with bullying and in restorative justice initiatives.</p> <p>Bullying is a major concern for Devon’s children and young people and the LSCB has oversight on behalf of the Children’s Trust of implementing the reduce bullying strategy to improve safety and well being</p> <p>The Steering group for the strategy has concentrated so far mostly in school settings and now acknowledges the need to involve wider settings.</p>	
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>That the report be noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Devon Local Safeguarding Children's Board engage in the identification of gaps within the current provision for inclusion in the 09-10 activities and beyond. • The Devon Local Safeguarding Children's Board consider appropriate measures and indicators for targeting effort and evaluating outcomes. <p>Expected Outcomes would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly reduce the number of bullying incidents. • Reduce the fear of bullying. • Support those who have been bullied. <p>Links to Devon Local Safeguarding Children's Board Business Plan are clear.</p>	
<p>Action points The Reducing Bullying Plan 2009/10 needs approval by the LSCB at its March 2009 meeting</p>	<p>Action owner: Annette Lyons, Debbie Pritchard</p>	<p>Deadline 6 March 2009</p>

Agenda Item 3.	Strategic Item E-Safety Strategy	Presenter Nick Pearce	
Discussion	<p>Nick Pearce heads up the sub group responsible for developing and delivering the E safety Strategy NP advised the Board of the current issues concerning e safety and the initiatives so far developed and deployed including the guidance from Becta. The strategy has concentrated on school settings in the first instance, but the DVD clip shown indicated the wider risks that the development of technologies open children and young people to. The material so far delivered in school settings is very highly regarded locally and nationally.</p>		
Conclusion	<p>NP was thanked for his excellent presentation. The LSCB are aware of many initiatives in and out of schools, and feel that this is an area the LSCB should take leadership of, particularly impacting with parents and community groups to maximise keeping children safe from the potential abuse of being groomed via social networking sites etc. There are clear options to develop closer working with voluntary and community groups to help with delivery of the strategy</p>		
Action points		Action owner:	Deadline
<p>Executive to look at extending the membership of the E-safety group, simplifying the sub group structures and to develop the E-safety strategy including media PR and Communications as part of the wider LSCB Business Plan.</p>		Executive Group	6 March 2009

Agenda Item 4.	Item for discussion. Issues Arising from the Baby P case	Presenter Chris Dimmelow	
Discussion	<p>Summary of Report</p> <p>As a consequence of the Baby P Case in Haringey Lord Laming has been asked to undertake a further review of progress in implementing effective arrangements for safeguarding children. . Written contributions to this review, addressing the three key questions the Secretary of State has outlined have been requested, these are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What good practice has been successfully achieved in safeguarding children since the publication of the Victoria Climbié Inquiry Report? We would like you to set out the key features of this good practice, and whether it is being universally applied across the country, particularly in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effective implementation of safeguarding systems and procedures; • interagency working • the development and deployment of professional workforce capacity; and • effective systems of public accountability 2. What are the key barriers, including in the legal process, that may impede efficient and effective work with children and families that may be 		

	<p>preventing good safeguarding practice from becoming standard practice everywhere, for example in deciding whether an application should be made to take a child into care? Is the right balance being struck between the correct application of processes and the needs of the child?</p> <p>3. What specific actions should be taken by Government and national and local agencies to overcome these barriers and accelerate systematic improvements in safeguarding practice across the country?</p> <p>An initial response has been provided on behalf of DCC and CYPS. Lord Laming's letter and the DCC response are available from the LSCB office. Other groupings are being asked to contribute to Lord Laming's work including designated doctors , independent chairs of LSCBs, CAFCASS etc</p> <p>Loughborough University have been engaged by Lord Laming to undertake significant fact gathering for the review, including surveying LSCB structures.</p>								
Conclusion	<p>The follow on from the Baby P tragedy has meant that all LSCB members have been involved in reviewing aspects of their safeguarding accountabilities. The work of Lord Laming is due to report in February 2009 and will have significant impact on LSCB activity going forward. An immediate stocktake of all Child protection plans and their robustness has been undertaken by CYPS. It has also been acknowledged that additional capacity is required to service the LSCB and its' activity</p> <p>Additionally the current LSCB website is not acceptable as either a source of information or for professional guidance and needs a comprehensive redesign. There are also clearly issues in the legal process that need reviewing</p> <p>The statements from the Secretary of State following the Haringey JAR report publication on 1st December are on the DCSF website. Also published on the same day were the report from Ofsted on their evaluation and analysis of the first 50 SCRs they have assessed, and the Government's response to the 3rd Joint Chief Inspectors report on arrangements to safeguard children 'Safeguarding the young and the vulnerable '</p> <p>Finally there has been a joint announcement by Ed Balls and Alan Johnson on a task force headed by Moira Gibb into strengthening the Social Work workforce that is due to report in the summer 2009</p>								
Action points	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1114 1552 1310 1626">Action owner</th> <th data-bbox="1310 1552 1497 1626">Deadline</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1114 1626 1310 1738">CD to supply LSCB members with the CYPS response to Lord Laming s inquiry</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1626 1497 1738">CD as part of minutes</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1114 1738 1310 1850">Letter from Sec of State to Directors of CYPS following JAR to be appended to minutes</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1738 1497 1850">LB as part of minutes</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1114 1850 1310 1917">Recruitment of additional post for safeguarding</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1850 1497 1917">RMcC</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action owner	Deadline	CD to supply LSCB members with the CYPS response to Lord Laming s inquiry	CD as part of minutes	Letter from Sec of State to Directors of CYPS following JAR to be appended to minutes	LB as part of minutes	Recruitment of additional post for safeguarding	RMcC
Action owner	Deadline								
CD to supply LSCB members with the CYPS response to Lord Laming s inquiry	CD as part of minutes								
Letter from Sec of State to Directors of CYPS following JAR to be appended to minutes	LB as part of minutes								
Recruitment of additional post for safeguarding	RMcC								

Agenda Item 5.	Item for decision. Serious Case Reviews	Presenter Chris Dimmelow	
Discussion	<p>Summary of Report</p> <p>The responsibility for evaluating Serious Case Reviews was transferred to Ofsted from the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) in April 2007.</p> <p>Following this transfer Ofsted issued a comprehensive list of standards descriptors which significantly expanded upon the general guidance contained within Working Together. These descriptors attached specific standards to all components of SCRs including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the terms of reference set by the LSCB • the Individual Management Reports (IMRs) provided by the agencies involved • the overview report commissioned by the LSCB from an independent author • the action plan arising from the various recommendations • the time taken to complete the review <p>Following this more formal evaluation process LAs are then provided with a written evaluation of each SCR against these various standards.</p> <p>The recently published Ofsted report is based on an analysis of the outcomes of s evaluations of 50 serious case reviews between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2008.</p> <p>It brings together findings in relation to the conduct of serious case reviews and the main practice issues arising. It considers how the process of conducting serious case reviews affects the quality of the outcomes, and the lessons learned. It also makes recommendations about practice issues and how the process of conducting serious case reviews could be improved. Ofsted intend reporting SCR evaluations on a quarter year basis from now onwards</p> <p>The main recommendations arising are as follows:</p> <p>Local Safeguarding Children Boards should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ensure that all serious case reviews start from the experience and views of the child, and address how these were sought and taken into account by all the professionals involved 2. introduce a greater element of independence into the membership of panels by including a wider range of professionals from agencies not involved in the serious case review 3. ensure that staff working in universal services are included in multi-agency training programmes, and that these services are well represented on the Local Safeguarding Children Board 		

4. ensure that all multi-agency training programmes include the teaching of basic skills in communicating with children
5. include diversity and equality issues in multi-agency training programmes and ensure that, as far as possible, membership of the board reflects the profile of the local community
6. tackle the issues affecting timescales for completion of serious case reviews and adopt a more robust approach in negotiating with Coroners' Courts and the Crown Prosecution Service to enable information to be used for serious case reviews
7. provide local guidance and templates for the completion of individual management reviews which support the process in line with *Working together* and include explicit quality standards
8. ensure action is taken, especially where failings are serious.

The Department for Children, Schools and Families should:

1. clarify further the meaning of 'independence' in *Working together*, including providing guidance as to the degree of independence required of Chairs of Local Safeguarding Children Boards and Chairs of serious case review panels
2. provide quality standards for record keeping in schools and guidance to staff on expectations for maintaining and sharing records.

Agencies completing individual management reviews should:

1. make an explicit statement about the involvement of family members and the child, and give reasons if they do not involve them
2. provide a detailed chronology of the involvement of that agency including information about when the child was seen and the details of that meeting
3. address issues of race, language, culture, religion and disability explicitly
4. focus more attention on why procedures were not followed, as well as identify what procedures had not been followed or were lacking
5. ensure any recommendation about improving or developing new procedures is couched in terms of the expected practice outcomes and is followed through to ensure it happens.

Health agencies should:

1. ensure there are effective mechanisms in place to coordinate and maintain a comprehensive record of a child's engagement with health services – particularly for children under five.

Devon Serious Case Reviews

- Of the 50 SCRs evaluated by Ofsted, two were initiated by Devon LSCB.
- Both were judged to be inadequate.

- Two other SCRs have been submitted and evaluated by Ofsted, but did not form part of this Ofsted report. One was judged adequate the other inadequate.
- A further Devon SCR has recently been submitted to Ofsted and has yet to be formally evaluated.

All of the above reviews were commissioned and prepared before the publication of the Ofsted descriptors but have been assessed retrospectively against these standards.

Key Messages from A - INADEQUATE

- Individual Management Reviews (IMRs) inadequate
- IMRs fail to provide rigorous analysis and fail to address critical points in the history of the case
- Overview Report (OR) falls short in reaching clear conclusions on the findings of the review
- OR does not reconcile differences in professional opinion by forming a judgement on the assessment and decision making within the adoption process
- Action Plan (AP) is not robust
- Recommendations not prioritised or translated effectively into targeted multi-agency recommendations
- This makes it unclear how the LSCB which contributed to the review can evaluate its impact on practice.

Key Messages from B - INADEQUATE

- OR is inadequate and fails to provide rigorous analysis and fail to address critical points in the history of the case
- Does not address whether family had any ethnic, religious, linguistic or cultural needs.
- Does not comment whether parents' views had been sought
- OR falls short of reaching conclusions on the findings and it does not identify lessons to be learned
- Lacks reference to research and previous SCR findings
- AP is not robust
- Large number of recommendations are not prioritised or translated effectively into targeted multi-agency recommendations.
- This makes it unclear how the LSCB can evaluate the impact of the review

Key Messages from C - ADEQUATE

- OR provides a good and robust analysis of practice and addresses critical points in the history of the case.
- OR does not comment on why the parents' views were not sought or whether the family had any ethnic, religious, linguistic or cultural needs that should have been taken into account.
- Conclusions are clear and appropriate, but the report falls short of

specifying lessons to be learned.

- Reference to research and previous SCR findings is limited.
- The Action Plan is inadequate as recommendations directed towards single agency implementation thus missing the opportunity to develop joint agency learning.
- This makes it unclear how the LSCB can evaluate the impact of the review

Key Messages from D - INADEQUATE

- The quality of the SCR is inadequate overall
- Well formed terms of reference but omissions arising from these not being sufficiently addressed
- IMRs vary in quality from inadequate to good
- Few IMRs provide critical analysis of actions taken.
- Turning points that may have resulted in a different outcome for D are not clearly identified. OR makes no comment on this.
- OR has some good strengths – good analysis of practice and relevant reference to research. Also addresses critical points in the history.
- Within the limits of the information provided, lessons to be learned have been clearly identified and are appropriately formulated from a multi-agency perspective.
- OR does not address whether parents' views sought and no reference to ethnic, religious, linguistic or cultural needs.
- Action Plan is inadequate as recommendations directed towards single agency implementation.
- Not all IMRs have clear conclusions
- None commented on how recommendations would be implemented or monitored.
- This limits the scope as to how LSCB can effectively monitor and evaluate the impact of the review.

Following the receipt of the Ofsted evaluations, the Devon LSCB has taken the following action;

- Reviewed the local guidance and templates for the completion of individual management reviews which support the process in line with the Ofsted descriptors to include explicit quality standards
- Established a clear protocol with partner agencies to ensure the IMRs are undertaken by appropriate senior managers within their agencies in accordance with this revised guidance and within the required timescales
- Entered into negotiation with the three other peninsula LSCBs to establish a single set of local guidance and templates for undertaking SCRs across the South West Peninsula
- Working with advisors from the Government Office South West to provide training to senior managers within partner agencies on the completion of IMRs to the required standard
- Reviewing the commissioning of independent overview reports to ensure that they are provided in accordance with the Ofsted standards

- Provided a programme of multi-agency training, including staff from universal services and the independent sector, to promote the lessons to be learned from both the Devon SCRs, other SCRs and national research
- Invested in the Tri-X on-line training programme to provide a similar training package to the widest possible multi-agency audience

It is now clear that each LSCB agency must nominate a small number of IMR writers with sufficient skill, expertise and authority to undertake IMR responsibilities. Each agency confirmed they had identified such people and it was agreed that all names would be forwarded to the Safeguarding Office so that a comprehensive and agreed list could be maintained.

There is an URGENT requirement for this multi-agency group to receive training in the standards required of them, the new templates for completion and the Ofsted descriptors. This MUST be completed by 31st January 2009.

JT explained that D & C Constabulary have now instigated a completely changed process for completing IMRs including ensuring complete independence of the IMR writer from the operational responsibility for the case under review.

After discussion this was the commended approach of all LSCB organisations.

The police have also deployed a computer-based progress and improvement tool to follow through on SCR lessons learnt and to ensure implementation of any required changes.

CD assured the LSCB that the SCR sub-group have in place a process of monitoring the implementation of all recommendations and Action Plans from the 5 SCRs that have most recently been completed. Although as yet not all recommendations are in place.

AJW informed the LSCB of the follow-up requirements from the Secretary of State on those SCRs that have been judged by Ofsted as being inadequate. This includes some form of re-review with an independent SCR chair person. To be completed by the end of February 2009 and submitted to Ofsted for their judgement and advice to the Secretary of State. The process remains to be defined and AJW along with CD and Anne Whiteley are due to meet with GOSW and, DCSF officials on 17 December 2008 to be told of the details of the process and judgement arrangements.

Therefore there will be an urgent requirement to agree the re-review process after the 17th December and for LSCB members to be informed accordingly.

AJW also raised the possibility of a completely new SCR process for case D above as the characteristics of the case, the reasons for the inadequate judgement and the likely public interest in early 2009 would mean that the LSCB would be in a far stronger position to explain what had happened and to provide public reassurance about the safeguarding arrangements across Devon. The Ofsted letter concerning the case had only just been received and needs circulating to the LSCB.

JT suggested that from now on at every LSCB Executive meeting the implementation of recommendations from SCRs should be reviewed and then a

	<p>quarterly update provided to the LSCB</p> <p>Clearly there will be heightened media interest from now on with any SCRs, and any Ofsted comments and judgements. It is intended that the LSCB should deal with the media via MH on behalf of all partners. For this to occur discussions need to take place across Press and media representatives asap. Finally, given the potential changes to the governance of the SCR process being discussed nationally consideration needs to be given to reviewing the current SCR sub group. This needs early discussion by the Executive.</p>		
Conclusion	<p>Devon has a number of inadequate Ofsted judgements concerning SCRs and will be required to re review some of the SCRs by a process yet to be defined</p> <p>The recent letter from Ofsted regarding case D above needs circulating</p> <p>A new process for SCRs will need to be in place and for IMRs. Urgent training is required for IMR writers</p> <p>The LSCB Executive needs to ensure a review takes place at every meeting on the progress of implementation of SCR recommendations and to provide the Board with an update report at every Board meeting</p> <p>A complete re review of Case D should take place via the SCR sub group.</p>		
<p>Action points</p> <p>Each agency to identify and nominate IMR writers of sufficient skill , independence and authority to the Safeguarding Office</p> <p>IMR training to be completed by 31/01/09</p> <p>Recent letter ref case D from Ofsted to be circulated</p> <p>Executive to review SCR recommendations and ensure timely implementation of all and to provide the LSCB with assurance reports at every LSCB meeting</p> <p>A re review process for 2 SCRs with an independent chair to be completed in compliance with new guidance when received after 17/12/08. Reviews to be completed by February 2009</p> <p>A New SCR for Case D to be completed to answer all the elements judged inadequate by Ofsted.</p>	<p>Action owner</p> <p>All</p> <p>KB</p> <p>CD</p> <p>RMcC</p> <p>CD/RMcC/SCR subgroup</p> <p>SCR sub group</p>	<p>Deadline</p> <p>24/12/08</p> <p>31/01/09</p> <p>24/12/08</p> <p>5/03/09 and ongoing</p> <p>Feb 09</p> <p>Feb 09</p>	

Agenda Item 6.	Item for decision LSCB Case Audit Process	Presenter Rory McCallum	
Discussion	<p>Summary of Report</p> <p>Recent events surrounding critical child protection cases in Haringey, Manchester and South Yorkshire have highlighted the need for LSCBs to establish rigorous procedures to audit and monitor the compliance and quality of intervention across all partner agencies and to ensure processes are in place to deliver improvement.</p> <p>Discussions have taken place with the major duty to co-operate partners to explore how a multi-agency case audit process for the Devon LSCB can be established as soon as possible.</p> <p>The following draft proposals are made with regard to both the process and documentation to support a multi-agency case audit process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Case audits will be undertaken by a dedicated senior audit team consisting of representatives from the main duty to co-operate partners, to include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health – Primary Care Trust – Helen Hyland / Alison Allen • Health provider services – Alison Allen • Health adult mental health services – Simon Polak • Local Authority social care – Maria Kasprzyk • Local Authority education services – Beverley Dubash • Police – DI Andy Berry 2) The case audit will be undertaken as a dedicated exercise over a two week period. 3) Members of the audit team will be released by their agency from other duties and responsibilities for the period of the audit. 4) A total of ten cases will be subject to audit at any one time. 5) Cases will initially be selected from those involving children who are subject to a formal Child Protection Plans. 6) Other criteria for the selection of cases will be considered for future audits. 7) The audit process will commence with an initial centralised audit of compliance with key PI's and procedural requirements by the CYPS Performance Team. 8) Week 1 - The Multi Agency Audit Team will proceed to undertake a joint scrutiny exercise of agency case files. Ten cases, ½ day each. 9) The audit will analyse the quality of practice standards and professional decision making together with an assessment of how well information was shared and agencies worked together in fulfilling the requirements of the Child Protection Plan. 		

	<p>10) Relevant evidence and opinion in relation to this component of the audit will also be recorded on the audit tool.</p> <p>11) Week 2 - The Audit Team will undertake face to face meetings with the key practitioners involved in the case to discuss issues emerging from the file audit in relation to procedural compliance, practice standards and professional judgements.</p> <p>12) The Audit Team will then report back to the LSCB with any recommendations for action at both a single agency and multi agency level.</p> <p>13) This process is overseen and reported back to both the Executive and the Board via the Quality Assurance, Audit and Complaints Sub Group.</p>						
Conclusion	<p>The above proposals were fully accepted by the Board. To ensure the smoothest operation of the above it was agreed that Chief Executives and Caldicott Guardians in Health were fully informed immediately by communication from the LSCB Chair.</p>						
Action points	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1126 891 1307 965">Action owner</th> <th data-bbox="1307 891 1484 965">Deadline</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1126 965 1307 1039">Audit process to be undertaken week beginning 15th December 2008 and results reported to the Executive and the Board</td> <td data-bbox="1307 965 1484 1039">RMcC</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1126 1039 1307 1111">Correspondence to Chief Execs and Caldicott Guardians regarding the audit</td> <td data-bbox="1307 1039 1484 1111">AJW</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action owner	Deadline	Audit process to be undertaken week beginning 15th December 2008 and results reported to the Executive and the Board	RMcC	Correspondence to Chief Execs and Caldicott Guardians regarding the audit	AJW
Action owner	Deadline						
Audit process to be undertaken week beginning 15th December 2008 and results reported to the Executive and the Board	RMcC						
Correspondence to Chief Execs and Caldicott Guardians regarding the audit	AJW						

Agenda Item 7.	Item for decision. Provision of CP Cases List to Police and Health	Presenter Charles Holme, Helen Hyland	
Discussion	<p>There has been much previous discussion of the benefits and disadvantages of sharing list of names of children subject of CP Plans .These have been informed by guidance from DCSF and Information Commissioner. The issues have been once more brought into sharp relief following Baby P. The Police wish for regular information transfer and there is now in place an agreed protocol with DCC. However there are significant policy differences in some expectations nationally between DH, DCSF and ACPO. These have been highlighted and referred up for national resolution</p> <p>It became clear in discussion that there were differences of view across the Health communities about the best way for information on individuals to be transferred and stored. These need urgent resolution by the Health sub group in consultation with Caldicott guardians and PCT Commissioner expectations. It was made clear that CYPS wishes to transfer the information to Health in the same way as to the police but will work with whatever solution is proposed</p>		
Conclusion	<p>Police / DCC protocol to continue</p> <p>Health to clarify the preferred method of information transfer</p>		

Action points	Action owner	Deadline
LSCB requires that the Health organisations and Maria Kasprzyk and CD urgently resolve how to transfer information concerning children subject to CP plans.	CH /MK/SG	31/01/09

Agenda Item 8.	Item for decision	Presenter	
	Report to the Scrutiny Safeguarding Task Group	Chris Dimmelow	

Discussion	<p>Summary of Report</p> <p>The Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) undertook a priority review of LSCBs between September and December 2006. In response to this priority review the Devon LSCB commenced its own review of its structure and performance in October 2007. As a component of this review the Executive Director of Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) asked the Children and Young People's (CYP) Overview and Scrutiny Committee if they would set up a task group to review the effectiveness of the Devon LSCB.</p> <p>The final report of the CYPS Overview and Scrutiny Committee Task Group was considered by the Executive Committee meeting on the 4th November 2008. The Executive Committee resolved;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That the Task Group be thanked for its efforts and for producing such a well researched and constructive report ii) That the Task Groups recommendations, as amended by the CYPS Overview – Scrutiny Committee, be accepted in full and that a detailed report be submitted to a future meeting outlining precise actions needed to take these recommendations forward. <p>A report in response to the range of recommendations has been prepared but due to timetabling pressures has not been shared with LSCB partners before being tabled at today's meeting</p>
-------------------	--

Conclusion	<p>An initial response to the Task Group report will be submitted to the DCC Executive Committee on 16 December 2008.</p> <p>For future Scrutiny AJW suggested that a multi partner scrutiny approach could be developed to mirror the LSCB.</p> <p>Comments were made by JD and JT about the accuracy of some of the statements in the original Scrutiny Report which could be seen as misleading</p>
-------------------	--

Action points	Action owner	Deadline
LSCB via the Executive to consider the response to the Scrutiny Report and its recommendations	Executive	06/03/09

Agenda	Item for decision.	Presenter	

Item 9.	Executive, Subgroup & Business Plan Progress	Chris Dimmelow	
Discussion	<p>CD provided a summary report / update on establishing the LSCB Executive and Subgroups.</p> <p>Executive Group: Policy and Service Development Subgroup: Health Services Safeguarding Subgroup: Safeguarding in Education Services Subgroup: Domestic Violence and Abuse Subgroup: Communication and Communities Subgroup: Private Fostering Subgroup: E-Safety Subgroup: Serious Case Review Subgroup: Quality Assurance and Audit and Complaints Subgroup. Learning and Workforce Development Subgroup: Peninsular Child Death Review Panel:</p> <p>Terms of reference are in place for all the above but there are some gaps in representation. This is hampering progress and reflects poorly on the collective responsibility of LSCB partners to implement the newly agreed Business Plan and governance structures. In particular there remains too much emphasis on the Safeguarding Office and CD in particular to resolve all matters on behalf of partners</p> <p>The LSCB Executive must take responsibility for improving the situation.</p> <p>CD also provided a RAG analysis on achieving the Business Plan objectives. As above, there are significant areas of risk to progress and again the Executive now needs to drive forward the Business Plan objectives through the Sub Group structures linking Business Plan objectives to the work Plan of each Sub Group</p> <p>Linked to this latter point is the need for the LSCB to receive a performance report at each of its meetings from now on.</p>		
Conclusion	<p>The LSCB Executive to take responsibility for improving performance of the Business Plan , the Sub groups, and to report at every LSCB on performance</p> <p>An Annual Report of the LSCB to be produced in April /May 2009 Detailing progress against the Business Plan , achievements , challenges and the impact on the lives of Devon’s children and young people of the work of the LSCB. This will include comment on the contribution and performance of each of the duty to co operate partners</p> <p>R McC wishes to reconsider elements of the sub group structures with the Executive as soon as possible.</p>		
Action points Executive to review the Business Plan and sub group achievements and to make a performance and progress report to every LSCB	Action owner RMcC	Deadline 06/03/09	

Agenda Item 10.	Operational Item Private Fostering Annual Report	Presenter Andrea Morris	
Discussion	<p>AM attended the Board and presented the annual report of the Private Fostering sub group for 2007/8</p> <p>There have been significant changes in the staffing and management arrangements for this function that have meant progress has not been as anticipated. There remains some confusion as to the difference between private fostering , fostering through a private fostering agency , and caring for children through agencies such as language schools for short periods of time (below 28 days) which do not meet the private fostering regulatory requirements, and AM agreed to produce a VERY short and simple explanatory guidance note.</p>		
Conclusion	<p>There has been an increase in notifications but the staffing problems have meant that there has been a struggle to maintain and develop the service beyond current capacity. There is real concern about the potential number of private fostering arrangements in Devon that are never notified and therefore never regulated and vetted. There is also concern at the abundance of arrangements through agencies such as language schools where the private fostering regulations do not apply. It was felt strongly that this issue should be referred to the national stocktake review that the DCSF have announced into safeguarding arrangements in Independent Schools , non maintained special schools and Boarding Schools.</p> <p>The Executive need to ensure that the capacity of the private fostering service is sufficient to achieve the Business Plan objectives.</p>		
Action points		Action owner	Deadline
Executive to provide oversight of the progress of the private fostering service and link it effectively to a sub group and to the Executive		RMcC	06/03/09
Submission to be made to the national stocktake being undertaken by the DCSF		CD	In response to call for evidence
Short explanatory guidance note to be supplied outlining the definition of Private Fostering that is in legislation. To be distributed to LSCB members by Andrea Morris		AM	31/01/09

Agenda Item 11.	Operational Item NHS Action Plan Safeguarding Children	Presenter Sara Gibbs	
Discussion	<p>The Devon PCT Working Together to Safeguard Children Action Plan is as a result of an audit that the Strategic Health Authority asked PCTs to</p>		

	<p>undertake to ensure that health provider organisations' engagement, accountability and reporting arrangements for safeguarding were fully embedded in their organisations. A strengthening of their accountabilities will take place through the newly established Health subgroup chaired by CH.</p> <p>Challenges include ensuring that recommendations and learning from SCRs and CDRs are implemented across the health community and that GPs have met appropriate levels of safeguarding learning and development.</p> <p>Issue around contracts – concerned safeguarding gets missed out in process.</p> <p>David Nicholson NHS Chief Executive has written to SHA and all Chief Executives asking for assurances around safeguarding activity across the NHS.</p>		
Conclusion	The Action Plan shows mostly completion, and compliance with requirements though there are areas of amber and one of red that the Health sub group will progress and resolve at it's meeting in Feb 2009		
Action points	Action owner	Deadline	
Health sub group to ensure completion of the Action Plan	CH/SG	11/02/09	

Agenda Item 12.	Any Other Business	Presenter	
Discussion	<p>AJW had received correspondence from Virginia Pearson reminding the LSCB of the requirement to use password protection when e mailing any documents with personally identifiable material</p> <p>AJW also proposed the instituting of a What Went Well, Even Better If, slot at the end of each LSCB to capture improvements (www.ebi.)</p>		
Conclusion	<p>www.- Energy and commitment high ; some excellent discussion around SCRs and IMR arrangements ;</p> <p>ebi.-Executive functioning improved thus allowing the LSCB to have a strategic and performance monitoring role</p> <p>That the LSCB should always finish by lunch time.</p>		
Agenda Item 13.	Next meeting Friday 6 March 2009	Presenter	
Conclusion	The meeting closed at 15.50		