

DEVON LOCAL CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARD

Minutes of a Meeting held on Friday 21st April 2006 at Follaton House, Totnes

Present:

Anne Whiteley (Chair), Director of Devon Children's Services
Chris Dimmelow, Children's Safeguarding Manager, Devon Children and Young People's Directorate
Helen Hyland, Designated Nurse, North & East/South and West Devon Health Community
Laura Hubbard-Fielder, Named Nurse – Child Protection, Devon Partnership NHS Trust
Dr Jane Richards, Portfolio Holder – Child Protection – Devon Local Medical Community
Ann Morecraft, Designated Manager – Child Protection
Dr Charles Holme, Designated Doctor, South & West Devon Health Community
John Clements, Crime Manager, Devon & Cornwall Police
Alison Kearnes, Area Children's Services Manager for the NSPCC
Martin Gladwin, CAF/CASS
Alison Allen, Child and Family Protection Advisor, North Devon PCT
Peter Hancock, Director of Community Services, Mid-Devon District Council
Juliet Hammacott, Acting Principal Education Welfare Officer
Christine Ellison, EWS Child Employment (attended for part only)
Julie Phillips, Exeter/East Devon Independent Reviewing Unit Administrator (minute taker)

Others Invited/Apologies/Copy of Minutes to:

Deborah Booth, (Chair), Group Manager (Inclusion) Devon Children and Young People's Directorate
Derek Moore, Assistant Director, NCH
Carole Town, Clinical Psychologist, JACAT and CAMHS
Ann Wilson, Learning & Development Advisor, Human Resources Directorate
Martin Spragg, Youth Offending Service Manager
DS Bob Brown, Devon & Cornwall Police
Madeleine Jackson, Senior Crown Prosecutor, Crown Prosecution Service
Claire Mitchell, Nurse Consultant (Safeguarding Children) RD&E NHS Trust
Dr Corinne Hayes, RD&E NHS Trust
Janet Phipps, North Devon NHS Trust
John Rom, South/West Strategic Health Authority
Karen Grimshaw, South Hams & West Devon PCT
Christine Reilly, South Hams & West Devon PCT
Peter Jeffs, East Devon District Council
Elizabeth Smith, East Devon PCT
Mary Mitchell, Assistant Chief Officer, Devon & Cornwall Probation Service
Adrian Childs, Devon Partnership Trust
John Shaw, Joint Agency Manager, CSN
John Davies, Connexions
Miles Hapgood, Exeter PCT
Alison Lewis-Smith, North Devon PCT
Tony Sweeney, Assistant County Solicitor, Devon County Council

REPORT OF MEETING

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from:

Deborah Booth	Tony Sweeney
DS Bob Brown	Ann Wilson
Adrian Childs	Janet Phipps
Mary Mitchell	Claire Mitchell
Elizabeth Smith	Alison Lewis-Smith
Peter Jeffs	Corinne Hayes
Kath Crompton	Miles Hapgood

Anne Whiteley welcomed those present to the inaugural meeting of the Devon Local Children's Safeguarding Board and thanked participants for fitting this additional meeting into their schedule. The joint area review was imminent and it was important to have this opportunity to remind ourselves of our contribution to this.

2. CHILDREN'S ENTERTAINMENT LICENSING

Christine Ellison explained that she provided licensed chaperones for young people acting in the theatre, appearing on television or undertake modelling assignments. Over the past 3-5 years, demand for this service had increased greatly – in 2002, a total of 39 chaperone licenses were issued. Last year, 179 licenses were issued and this year, to date, Ms Ellison had had to license 100 people with another 63 persons waiting for Criminal Record Bureau checks, and a further 24 persons waiting to see Ms Ellison. In addition, as part of her role, Ms Ellison would talk to new committees and at the same time check over their premises.

Ms Ellison explained that she was a counter-signatory for CRB checks. People coming to see her should have enhanced disclosure of less than 12 months old and she had been asked why this was. She had contacted the CRB to see if there was anything more she should do, and been told there was nothing in writing about that. The difficult is that the practice of other authorities varies, but if people coming to Ms Ellison do not have an enhanced CRB check, she does one from scratch and these are valid for 3 years.

It has clarified that Devon County Council pays for CRB checks for these volunteers. Some people have multiple CRB checks, for example if they have worked for a number of voluntary organisations.

More and more clubs in Devon are becoming aware of the need for young people to be chaperoned, and so Ms Ellison's workload was getting out of control. She hoped the LCSB could give her some advice.

Ann Morecraft commented that so far as dentists were concerned, if they already had an enhanced CRB check, her practice was not to arrange for a further one to be undertaken. A person who was the subject of an enhanced CRB check had a legal obligation to tell their employer any time they were facing legal proceedings. The CRB struggled to cope with the amount of checks they were asked to undertake.

Chris Dimmelow noted that Bichard Report states that volunteers should be CRB

checked. Devon County Council had had similar issues with relief staff to that outlined by Ms Ellison above. DCC had a strict policy of insisting on undertaking their own CRB check of persons who had significant and at times unsupervised contact with children/young people. There was a need to consider if multiple CRB checks were undertaken by the same process or differently in another part of the country.

In response to Chris Dimmelow, Ms Ellison stated that some parents volunteered to act as chaperones, because of their children's involvement. Conversely it was her experience that other parents used the chaperone service as a type of unpaid babysitter.

In response to Dr Richards, Ms Ellison stated that chaperones should be organised for young people taking part in amateur productions such as village pantomimes.

Anne Whiteley suggested that Chris Dimmelow raise the issue of CRB checks for chaperones at next week's meeting with CSCI:

- (a) to ascertain their consensus view on the issue
- (b) to make clear the increase in demand for CRB checks of chaperones given that this increase is not resourced but DCC is increasingly accountable

Anne Whiteley further proposed that the LCSB accept that when a volunteer presented with an enhanced CRB check, DCC did not arrange for another one to be undertaken until the current check expired.

The Meeting felt that Ms Ellison carried out an important and valuable service. Alison Kearnes referred to an NSPCC publication entitled 'Staying Safe – Commitment Scheme – Protecting children and young people in organisations.' **copy attached** and stated that the NSPCC would be pleased to assist with regard to providing leaflets for chaperones (e.g. around the nature of sexual abuse) if it was felt this would be helpful.

Helen Hyland asked Ms Ellison whether there were any areas of work which she considered to be particularly risk for children/young people. Ms Ellison responded that there was a potential risk around some premises – old buildings with dark corridors and shared toilet facilities. Many theatres fitted this description.

Mrs Hyland asked about chaperone arrangements for young people doing Saturday jobs, or newspaper delivery rounds, for example. Ms Ellison responded that any working child had to have a work permit if they were of statutory school age. If they had an accident or caused an accident whilst working without such a permit, their employer probably could not rely upon their insurance given that it is illegal to employ young people of statutory school age without a permit.

Ms Ellison added that young people of statutory school age undertaking work placements did not need a work permit and she could not, by law, give them a permit, but such young people were supposed to be fully supervised.

Ms Ellison pointed out that it was thought that nationally there were only around 10% of children in employment who had work permits. In view of the amount of time she was spending licensing children's entertainment chaperones, the amount of work permits consequently being issued was down because she did not have the time to do

this.

ACTION

- **CHRISTINE ELLISON TO CONTINUE HER CURRENT PRACTICE WITH REGARD TO THE LICENSING OF CHILDREN'S ENTERTAINMENT CHAPERONES.**
- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO RAISE THE ISSUE OF CRB CHECKS FOR CHAPERONES AT NEXT WEEK'S MEETING WITH CSCI, AND AT REGIONAL LEVEL.**
- **ALISON KEARNES TO MAKE DEREK MOORE AWARE OF THE NSPCC LEAFLET 'STAYING SAFE COMMITMENT SCHEME: PROTECTING CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IN ORGANISATIONS'.**
- **CHRISTINE ELLISON TO LIAISE WITH HUGH GRIFFITHS REGARDING HER SERVICE ALSO CHECKING APPLICANTS FOR CHAPARONE LICENSES AGAINST DEVON'S APPLICANTS REFERRALS LIST.**

Ms Ellison left the Meeting following her presentation.

3. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17TH MARCH 2006 AND MATTER ARISING**

Page 3 – Ann Morecraft reported that Devon and Cornwall SHA were to merge with Dorset, Somerset and Gloucester to become one large Strategic Health Authority. This replicated the regional situation. It was proposed by the SHA that the 6 PCTs in Devon merge into one, with Plymouth and Torbay remaining as unitary authorities. The new PCT configuration had to be in place for October 2006. With the new SHAs the development of policy function would move to PCTs.

ACTION

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO RAISE AT NEXT WEEK'S MEETING WITH CSCI THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE ABOVE ON THE LOCAL CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARDS, NOTING THAT THE ORIGINAL RATIONALE FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE SHA ON THE OLD ACPC WAS IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT ROLE.**

Page 3 – Chris Dimmelow reported that there was to be a more in-depth presentation re ADVA. He had suggested both to ADVA Children's Group that the latter is formally adopted as a working group to the LCSB. Roy Tomlinson was to present a paper outlining more detailed proposals to the May 2006 LSCB.

Page 4 – Anne Whiteley reported that the revised 'Working Together' document was now published, and it was important that all board members read this. Ms Whiteley observed that there was a useful section on the Safeguarding Board and its link to the Children's Trust.

Page 4 – Chris Dimmelow circulated a second draft of individual board members' responsibilities **copy attached.**

With regard to point 3.1, Anne Whiteley remarked that the board could not possibly be effective if members were not committed to attending, plus there would be a danger of statutory responsibilities not being fulfilled.

It was suggested that there might have been some confusion at the last meeting (ACPC 17th March) as to the LCSB's accountability, and the role and responsibility of individual board members. There was a need for clarity around accountability.

With regard to the LCSB's Terms of Reference, Anne Whiteley stated that the children and young persons' service had an extremely complex set of arrangements which were dictated by legislation. The children and young persons' service had a number of different partnership arrangements, including Local Area Agreements, Crime and Disorder and Reduction Partnerships – all of which had to have governance arrangements. Ms Whiteley was meeting next week with the Chief Executives of District Councils, and was already meeting with the Chief Executives of the current Primary Care Trusts. There had been a major local review of governance arrangements in respect of the Devon Children's Trust. There were papers due out for consultation in the summer which would describe a set of governance arrangements. There was a need now to move into a different phase of the Children's Trust which would have a revised set of governance arrangements. At the centre of this was the Children and Young Persons' Plan which was an agreed set of priorities which various agencies had signed up to. The responsibility of the Children's Trust therefore focussed on the delivery of this plan and the LCSB had a responsibility to contribute to the five outcomes of 'Every Child Matters'. The LCSB had the additional responsibility to act as a source of scrutiny and check to the Children's Trust to make sure it followed safeguarding principles with regard to the procurement of services.

Ms Whiteley advised that the Children's Trust Board would have an independent Chair, and the Board would be made up of parents, parent governors and organisations which would have a scrutiny function to check on delivery of C&YPP. There would be a small group consisting of the chief commissioning (key) officers responsible for committing resources, decision-making and key commissioning decisions. What was currently the Children's Trust Executive was likely to change its name and its focus would change to be more around performance management of the plan.

Ann Morecraft remarked that she felt the LCSB needed to make representations should it transpire that some members of the board had not attended meetings for six months. Dr Richards suggested that perhaps there was a need to have named deputies for board members to try to ensure that organisations were always represented at LCSB meetings. Chris Dimmelow responded that, within the rules, agencies were given a great deal of flexibility as to how they would be represented. He noted that the Primary Care Trusts had insisted on having one name representative per PCT at this board.

ACTION

- **THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE DEVON LCSB, AND ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS, TO BE KEPT UNDER REVIEW.**

- **ANNE WHITELEY, AT THE NEXT MEETING WITH THE CHILDREN'S BOARD, TO RAISE WITH THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF THE PCTS THAT THEIR ATTENDANCE AT LCSB MEETINGS APPEARS TO BE PROBLEMATIC FOR SOME REASON.**
- **CONSIDERATION TO BE GIVEN, BY THE RECONVENED LCSB PLANNING GROUP, AS TO WHETHER IT IS POSSIBLE TO HAVE OPERATION DISCUSSIONS AND SEPARATE THIS FROM STRATEGIC GROUP MEETINGS HELD A FEW TIMES EACH YEAR. THIS SUB-GROUP TO REPORT BACK WITH PROPOSALS TO A MEETING OF THE DEVON LSCB.**

Peter Hancock remarked that district councils believed themselves to be strategic, but he personally felt district councils to be more of a deliverer of key services to children and young people. It might be helpful for board members to ask themselves what they were contributing. Anne Whiteley responded that these sorts of development opportunities had yet to be built in to the board's functioning.

Anne Whiteley at this stage asked the meeting if the second draft of the individual members' responsibilities document was agreed, or should those present take a copy away for further consideration. Chris Dimmelow responded that a number of organisations were not represented at today's meeting, and so not all parties would have had sight of the document. He would arrange for a copy to be appended to the minutes with a request for an urgent response.

With regard to debate about the appropriateness of the Director of Children's Services chairing the LCSB as well as the Children's Trust, Anne Whiteley clarified that she chaired the officers' group of the Children's Trust rather than the Board itself. The Director of Children's Services is the accountable officer within the legislation for the effective working of the LSCB. Given the accountability she had for this area of work, Ms Whiteley would feel uncomfortable having accountability and responsibility if she did not chair the Board. She would not be happy to recommend to the County Council at this stage that an independent Chair be sought.

Dr Holmes responded that he thought the concern had centred around the potential for conflict if there was any malfunction within the Children's Trust. Ms Whiteley responded that if there was any perceived malfunction, that would need to be raised with the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, Cllr John Smith, who was an elected member of Devon County Council. The Director of Children's Services is accountable to the Portfolio holder as explained in working together. Ms Whiteley suggested that Cllr Smith be invited to a meeting of the LCSB so that members had the opportunity to meet him and Cllr Smith could explain how children and young people's services functioned within a political environment.

In response to Alison Kearnes, Ms Whiteley explained that there was a DCC Scrutiny Panel, and she and Cllr Smith were accountable to that panel. Ms Whiteley considered there to be many checks and balances in place within the system.

Page 5 – Budget Proposals – Chris Dimmelow reported that since the last meeting, he had received one additional response – from South & West PCT – who had made a

commitment to providing half the amount stated, and had advised that they would have to review their position in October 2006 when the new PCT arrangements came into force.

The total concrete budget commitments which had been made were as follows:

Children's Services	£42,000
Connexions	£ 2,400
PCTs – S & W	half of their share
YOT	£ 5,500
CAFCASS	£ 558 (but would pay more later if they could)

Chris Dimmelow felt there was a need for invoices to be issued to agencies who had not paid up, as well as those who had, for the business support element of their agreed totals.

ACTION

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO CHECK OUT AT NEXT WEEK'S REGIONAL MEETING THE EXPERIENCE OF OTHER LOCAL CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARDS IN SECURING AGREED FUNDING FROM MEMBER AGENCIES.**

Page 6 – Working Groups and Chairs – Chris Dimmelow reported that Karen Grimshaw had nominated Chris Riley to sit on the Health and Training Group, and Alison Allen had offered to sit on any Working Group other than Quality and Performance and Education.

Mr Dimmelow advised that consideration had been given to the formation of a New Technology Sub Group, but he did not think the issue was large enough to warrant this. Mr Dimmelow noted that BECTA had published guidelines with regard to the safe use of technology, including computers.

Mr Dimmelow reported that he had met with the North Devon Local Forum a couple of days ago to discuss with them the proposal that they become much more formally adopted by the LCSB so that the LCSB could retain a link with front-line practitioners. This was overwhelmingly welcomed by the Forum. Mr Dimmelow had asked the North Devon Local Forum to draw up formal terms of reference in accordance with national guidelines and LCSB terms of reference, and give some thought as to how they would like to be represented on the board, coming back with a completed document as soon as possible.

Martin Gladwin at this point advised that he would be prepared to serve on the Annual Business Plan sub-group.

Anne Whiteley reminded the Meeting that all of the LCSB sub-groups had to have terms of reference.

Page 8 – CSCI Feedback on Devon Serious Case Reviews -

Anne Whiteley felt that Lynn Flatt had made an interesting point in her report – that the Part 8 Reviews undertaken in Devon were always from the agency perspective,

and did not necessarily deal with implications across the whole system and agencies working together as a group. Ms Whiteley suggested that the Serious Case Review Sub-Group should look into this. Dr Richards added a suggestion that it would be worthwhile this Sub-Group also looking into suicides as an issue, as there had been such a number of them recently.

ACTION

- **ANNE WHITELEY TO ASK LYNN FLATT IF THE SERIOUS CASE REVIEW SUB-GROUP COULD HAVE SIGHT OF HER REPORT SO THAT THEY COULD GIVE FURTHER CONSIDERATION TO THIS DOCUMENT AND FORMULATE PROPOSALS BACK TO A FUTURE MEETING OF THE LCSB.**

Ann Morecraft suggested there was a need to give some consideration to the merger of the three Serious Case Review Sub-Groups in order to minimise the prospect of overlap.

Chris Dimmelow remarked that he did not think serious case reviews should be undertaken by representatives from agencies on this Board who were not directly involved. Another option might be to task the production of an overview report out to an independent individual, although there would be a cost implication in that. Mr Dimmelow noted that there were a number of serious case reviews pending.

Page 10 – Report from the Case Review Committee – Neither DS Bob Brown nor Bill Pascoe were present today and able to provide an update report. Chris Dimmelow advised that he had received no feedback from either. He was however aware, with regard to Operation Rowan, that counsel had decided not to go ahead with the prosecution of any of the professionals involved in that case.

ACTION

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO CHASE UP DS BOB BROWN FOR A COPY OF THE UPDATE REPORT.**

Page 12 – Joint Chief Inspector’s Report – Chris Dimmelow reported that he had only received one response with regard to the updated Action Plan. It would be helpful to have a Police response to the Police section, and an LEA response to the LEA section of this report.

ACTION

- **JOHN CLEMENTS TO CHASE UP DS BOB BROWN FOR THE POLICE RESPONSE TO THE POLICE SECTION OF THE JOINT CHIEF INSPECTOR’S REPORT.**

Ann Morecraft reported that at a recent MAPPA Meeting, it had been agreed there was a need for there to be much closer links with ADVA and also to build up and develop links with vulnerable adults. Chris Dimmelow responded that the first draft of the MAPPA Annual Business Plan had been received, and there was a need to harmonise this as far as possible with the LCSB’s Business Plan. The draft document would be issued to the Devon Board for comment in due course.

ACTION

- **HELEN HYLAND AND DR CHARLES HOLME TO CHECK WHETHER THERE ARE ANY OVERLAPS BETWEEN THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE SAFE PARENTING HANDBOOK AND IN THE RED BOOK.**

Page 14 – Any Other Business – Performance Indicators – Anne Whiteley remarked that all the child protection performance indicators were still in the top band so far as DCC was concerned.

Page 14 – Any Other Business – Advocacy Service – Dr Richards asked what the advocacy service had achieved. The Children's Society was, with effect from 31st March 2006, no longer providing an advocacy service as the contract had ended. Devon County Council had intended to 're-tender' for a new service, however the impact of the Governments withdrawal of the £800k safeguarding grant means a rethink was necessary. What was now required as a slightly different advocacy service. All Local Authorities now had to have arrangements for the independent review of children in care, rather than this function being undertaken by a child's Social Worker, or the Social Worker's line manager. There was now an independent review team consisting of around 15 members of staff. There was no advocacy service at present, but there would be. The new arrangements would be reviewed in-house.

4. **'STOP IT NOW' CAMPAIGN**

Dr Charles Holme reported that a number of months ago, the then ACPC had a presentation on the 'Stop it Now' Campaign. He and others had looked into seeing whether it would be possible to get a Devon initiative started, but were now thinking in terms of a regional initiative. The ultimate aim would be to raise awareness of child sexual abuse as a large public health issue.

Dr Holme and Alison Kearnes had recently discussed the NSPCC campaign and the fact that the South West was a major focus area nationally in this. Dr Holmes thought Devon would be dependant on the national 'Stop it Now' campaign for co-ordinator cover to this area. It would be useful if organisations represented on the Devon LCSB would be prepared to act as a conduit for the distribution of leaflets and other material.

Dr Holme suggested the next step be a joint presentation to the LCSB by 'Stop it Now' and the NSPCC. Alison Kearnes clarified that the NSPCC campaign was initially targeted at teenagers. The NSPCC could provide outcome data for Devon and Cornwall in relation to calls made to their helpline. Ms Kearnes added that the Childline service had recently joined the NSPCC, and they were not yet able to extract data in respect of their service in Devon and Cornwall as easily as the NSPCC was.

Ms Kearnes advised that she could provide a briefing sheet to Chris Dimmelow for circulation with the minutes.

The general view of the LCSB was that agencies would be prepared to act as a conduit for information. It was felt leaflets and other material needed to be made available in all facilities used by families.

ACTION

- **ALISON KEARNES AND DR CHARLES HOLME TO MAKE A JOINT BRIEFING/SHORT PRESENTATION TO THE JULY 2006 MEETING OF THE DEVON LOCAL CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARD.**

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

There had been no Training Sub-Committee meetings held since the ACPC of 17th March 2006.

6. **REPORT OF THE HEALTH SUB-COMMITTEE**

The LCSB was advised that the next meeting of the Health Sub-Committee was due to take place on Friday 28th March 2006.

7. **REPORT OF THE CASE REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE**

Chris Dimmelow reported that the last meeting of the Case Review Sub-Committee was a single issue meeting which received the report commissioned by them regarding an investigation undertaken into allegations in respect of a child minder in the Exeter area, which had been ongoing since 1999 and had now been subject to complaint by the parents of the three children concerned. Three separate children from three separate families had suffered significant injuries whilst in the care of the same child minder, and two separate investigations were undertaken.

A number of recommendations were made for improvements for the future. The original investigation was severely flawed and the consequence of this was that this childminder was still licensed to child mind, although they had voluntarily agreed with OFSTED not to work in that capacity. There was a need to look into whether this person could go before a deregistration panel for formal deregistration, and also what measures could be taken to list this person as someone who posed a risk to children.

ACTION

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO PROVIDE MORE FORMAL FEEDBACK TO THE MAY 2006 LOCAL CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARD AS TO ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BOARD.**

Dr Jane Richards expressed concern that OFSTED had allowed an appeal by the childminder, not to be deregistered.

Ann Morecraft noted that one set of parents had not really raised complaint, and also that none of the children concerned were in the care of the childminder at the same time. Mrs Morecraft made the point that the childminder would have been CRB checked, but it seemed there was nothing of note about them coming to light this way. Anne Whiteley felt there was a need for discussions with OFSTED as a response to the investigation.

ACTION

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO CONTACT OFSTED TO ARRANGE A MEETING AT WHICH TO SHARE THE INVESTIGATION REPORT AND VERIFY WHETHER OR NOT IT IS POSSIBLE TO TAKE THE CHILDMINDER TO A DEREGISTRATION PANEL.**

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO CIRCULATE THE INVESTIGATION REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE MAY 2006 LOCAL CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARD, AND, PRIOR TO THEN, MEET WITH OFSTED TO DISCUSS THE CONCERNS PERTINENT TO THAT ORGANISATION.**

In response to Dr Charles Holme, Chris Dimmelow said he felt it would be appropriate to provide feedback to CSCI and other appropriate organisations.

Chris Dimmelow at this point advised that two very serious incidents had been notified to CSCI, as follows:

(a) serious injury to a child who was the subject of a Supervision Order. This was a skull fracture which was almost certainly attributable to child abuse, and Police enquiries were under way. John Clements at this point advised that a family member was arrested yesterday (Thursday 20th April). Chris Dimmelow added that the child was recovering in hospital in Bristol, but was still unwell. The incident had happened whilst Mr Dimmelow was on leave and he understood a multi-agency meeting to have taken place. Martin Gladwin added that a Children's Guardian was involved, and he thought the chair of the meeting referred to had been Mr Ian Stewart-Watson. Mr Dimmelow had spoken to Bill Pascoe who had advised he would be able to give better information once an arrest had been made.

ACTION

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO SPEAK TO BILL PASCOE AND ANNE WHITELEY REGARDING PUTTING THIS CASE FORWARD FOR A SERIOUS CASE REVIEW.**

(b) serious injury to a 10 year old girl placed with an adoptive family in Devon by Bedfordshire County Council in October 2005, the adoptive family having been assessed and approved by Plymouth Social Services. This girl was attacked with a knife by her 17 year old adoptive brother, who had Cerebral Palsy. The girl was hospitalised but had since been discharged and was now living within an independent sector foster home in Devon.

Mr Dimmelow said he was aware there were issues around recognition of child protection concerns prior to when the Adoption Order was made. He had not been able to ascertain from Bedfordshire County Council whether they would undertake a serious case review, but Mr Dimmelow thought it most likely that Bedfordshire would want Devon to undertake this task as Devon was the county in which the incident happened.

Dr Charles Holme asked if the girl had received satisfactory support in respect of her emotional and mental health needs as a consequence of the incident. Mr Dimmelow

responded that she had spoken to the Head Teacher of the girls' school about this. Members of staff and students were very upset at this incident. Issues had arisen since with regard to parental commitment to adoption.

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

Juliet Hammacott reported that the Education Sub-Committee had set up a steering committee with regard to young people who were missing education, and a draft policy was ready to go out to consultation in May 2006.

The Education Sub-Committee would like the LCSB to agree the **attached form** 'Notification to all Children's Services of a Child not Attending School' as a means of being able to track children out of school more effectively.

Dr Charles Holme raised the issue of children who were out of school because they were being educated at home. Anne Whiteley responded that some parents educated their children at home and did not inform the LA, and so in effect these children were invisible. There was pressure to rectify this state of affairs.

Ann Morecraft felt there was a need to be clear whether children in part time or link education should be included.

Peter Hancock raised the issue of children from homeless and gypsy/traveller families. Gypsy Liaison Officers notified authorities when they became aware of children moving into their catchment area.

Mrs Hammacott reported that Beverley Dubash, Senior Education Welfare Officer, had identified an issue about a number of people who were subject to Probation Service involvement who brought their children with them to office meetings.

As a response to this state of affairs, the Education Sub-Committee would like agreement to approach the Probation Service to see if they would be prepared to use the attached form in the rest of Devon (not Torbay and South Devon where currently in use).

Ann Morecraft remarked that she had never come across a parent using as an excuse for missing a Probation appointment that they had to look after their children.

Chris Dimmelow noted that the issue Mrs Hammacott was topical as it linked into the need to supervise dangerous offenders.

Anne Whiteley suggested that this and other such documents needed to be dated, so one could see whether or not it was a current publication.

AGREED

- **JULIET HAMMACOTT TO RE-WORK BOTH FORMS ?AND BRING REVISED DRAFTS BACK FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE LOCAL CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARD.**

Child Protection Training

Mrs Hammacott reported that since the first training sessions last year, the Education Welfare Service had completed 158 child protection procedures with 1,049 staff being trained within these sessions. A further 35 sessions had been booked. There were currently 19 schools with designated child protection teachers who were not trained. Two further training dates had been set up for this term to cover these personnel.

Mrs Hammacott made the point that Jane ?surname and Beverley Dubash had undertaken the bulk of this training – at the rate of two or three sessions per week in after school hours. This level of training could not be sustained indefinitely and so Beverley was sending a letter to local learning communities to advise that this training was still being offered, but the intention was to train local learning communities rather than individual schools as to do so was a more effective use of time.

In addition, the Education Welfare Service had also provided training for school governors on two nights and received some good feedback about this.

Mrs Hammacott stated that the Education Welfare Service had a database which showed when people were last trained and when they were due for refresher training.

9. **CHILD CONCERN PATHWAY**

Anne Whiteley reported that the DfES was impressed with the work Devon had undertaken and had put it on their website as an exemplar of good practice. The feedback was that this was much clearer and simpler to understand.

The Child Concern Pathway was being piloted in nine learning communities which included Tiverton, North Devon, Exeter, Exmouth, Dawlish and Okehampton.

Mrs Whiteley remarked that there was a need to develop the role of the Referrals Co-ordinator. Within the Children and Young People's Directorate, efforts had been made to look at funding so that it would be possible to establish Referral Co-ordination across all learning communities in Devon. It was felt it would be possible to achieve this aim. At the same time, the DfES has invited opportunities to bid to be a pilot for "budget holding lead professional". National timescales in terms of the bid had slipped, and Devon's bid was now in. If Devon's bid was successful, it would be possible to 'buy in' services with which to facilitate earlier intervention.

The Meeting heard that Devon was a partner in the DfES implementation programme Information Sharing Index Local Authority Implementation Support Group. Implementation date would be 1st April 2008. Devon was one of the additional four Local Authorities to have joined – working with the DfES on the design and implementation of the Child Index. Anne Whiteley considered that this involvement would be helpful in that Devon would benefit from being part of a national project team through learning from other projects.

10. **JOINT AREA REVIEW UPDATE REPORT**

Anne Whiteley spoke to the **attached** Joint Area Review Summary Briefing document.

Since the last briefing, a meeting had been arranged to take place on 3rd April with Lisa Williams, Lead Inspector (who has a youth work and OFSTED background, and

was involved in the annual performance assessment of Devon last year) and with Heather Brown, Deputy Lead Inspector (who has a SSI and CSCI background). Ms Brown would be leading and co-ordinating the social care part of the review.

Ms Whiteley additionally reported that on the 4th April 2006, there was a well attended partnership event which looked more specifically at how to complete the self-assessment, attended by approximately 60 'partners'.

Judgement would be made on how Devon collectively worked together to improve the five outcomes of "Every Child Matters", as well as with regard to DCC services re education and social services.

Information was given about the 'Tellus' survey completed by 600 children and young people in Devon.

With regard to the study of 10 case files, Ms Whiteley stated that Devon had had to submit 100 names (which had to meet various criteria) and it was from this number that the chosen 10 cases were picked. Briefings were being organised for all the multi-agency teams involved in these cases. In terms of consents and parental consent to access their child's health records, all whom had been contacted had agreed to this disclosure. Face-to-face contact had been made with the parents to secure this, rather than written contact, and the consents were coming back to Maria Kasprzyk, who was the co-ordinator with all the agencies in respect of the 10 cases.

Chris Dimmelow advised that the latest information he had from Ms Kasprzyk was that she was encountering no problems in seeking and obtaining all the necessary consents, and co-operations from all agencies.

Dr Holme advised that he had had to complete a case tracking record in respect of one of his patients.

Ms Whiteley noted that in respect of one case, Devon had to go to Court with regard to parental responsibility and in another case, all the records had to be translated into French and a French interpreter had to be on hand whilst the family were interviewed by the investigating team.

Dr Jane Richards asked whether the children's parents would have access to any of the information gathered. Dr Holmes responded that the parents would have to make application through the PCT or Trust if they wanted this. Ms Whiteley added that in any event some of the cases would have had very little health involvement.

ACTION

- **ANNE WHITELEY TO OBTAIN AN UPDATE REPORT FROM MARIA KASPRZYK.**

With regard to the proposed study of two neighbourhoods, the JAR would be looking at the Bideford Learning Community (contact Liz Hitchens) and at Wonford (contact Anne Beveridge). Briefings would be arranged to explain what the neighbourhood study was about and what was required. There was a need to identify key local people for the inspectors to meet, such as Community Midwives running clinics in local community centres.

Ms Whiteley asked if anyone at the meeting had any thoughts as to specific people who should be involved, or knew of any key events (such as the fun day planned at the Chestnut Avenue Centre and the young carers' service at Exeter Cathedral) could pass information on to her so that this would be passed to the appropriate persons.

The Meeting heard that the self assessment event was attended by Ms Whiteley, Dr Holme, Mrs Hyland , who sat in on the 'Stay Safe' Group.

Ms Whiteley drew the Meeting's attention to the 10 key judgements part of the JAR Summary Briefing, in particular 'action is taken to promote children and young people's mental health' and 'the incidence of child abuse and neglect is minimised.' The latter was of particular interest to the LCSB.

Dr Holme remarked that he felt there was proof of interventions such as Child In Need involvement prior to Child Protection, and Family Group Conferencing, but questioned how one expressed in writing the impact of such initiatives. Ms White agreed that it was very hard to actually 'measure' prevention, and added that consideration also needed to be given to the impact of other preventative initiatives such as Sure Start.

Ms Whiteley advised the Meeting of the www.jar.dev.gov website which gives simple staff briefings on what the Joint Area Review involves.

AGREED

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO RAISE THE JAR AS AN ISSUE AT THE MONDAY 24TH APRIL 2006 MEETING.**

Ms Whiteley additionally reported that focus groups were being set up for the inspectors to meet. One of these should include members of the Children's Services Board and sub-groups.

11. MISSING CHILDREN'S PROJECT

John Clements gave a presentation on the above initiative, the key points of which were as follows:

Exeter has a large issue with missing children in that many of these children were Looked After, or in children's homes or other substitute care facilities.

Between 18th August 2004 and 17th August 2005, there were a total number of 1,425 missing person reports. Of these, 973 incidents concerned young people under the age of 18, and a total of 600 Looked After Children had gone missing – representing 68% of the total number.

Many young people had gone missing on many separate occasions – one young person accounting for 53 separate missing person reports.

The risks arising from this were:

- decline in morale
- disengagement

- anti-social behaviour
- volume crime
- involvement in drug/alcohol abuse
- sexual abuse
- prostitution
- complacency
- abduction
- homicide (cost to the Police of investigating per case approximately £1 million)

The costs to Exeter Police were in terms of:

- time – initial reporting process of missing person involved an additional 20 policing tasks
- financial - £1,000 cost of investigation per missing person incident + almost £1 million per year as well as additional subsequent costs in terms of crime/anti-social behaviour committed.

The Lancashire Pilot

on which the Devon model is based, showed a total of 9,000 missing person reports annually, of which 6,200 became investigations. Of these 6,200, 4,800 (77%) of investigations involved young people under the age of 18 years. Virtually all frequently reported cases involved under 18 year olds (peak ages being 13-15 years) and girls more often than boys (the opposite to the Exeter situation).

A profile of 6 individuals undertaken in 2004 showed that they accounted for:

201 missing person investigations
 78 arrests
 60 offences proceeded with – drugs/firearms and prostitution

and were also themselves victims of violent crimes on 9 occasions the Police knew about.

The Lancashire Pilot involved a joint working arrangement with Lancashire SSD with agreed protocols and a clear structure to resolve interagency disputes and problem cases. Referrals were based on three reports being made within a three month period, with escalation processes through strategy meeting and executive review levels.

The results of the Lancashire Pilot were that, in the first year, a 32% reduction in missing person reports was achieved from 508 to 343, set against a 7.5% increase elsewhere in Lancashire. The second year of the pilot saw a further reduction of 44%, and the worse individual's missing person record reduced from 78 to 18 reports. There was also a reduction in the number of referrals for strategy meetings from 14 to 3.

Exeter Police adopted a similar way of operating, and results to date are as follows:

(a) there had been 8 pilot scheme interventions since 1st September 2005, 6 of which related to Looked After Children. The repeat activity of the 8 accounted for 104 reports;

(b) these 104 reports accounted for 59% of the total for the review period

(c) since the interventions with the 8 above, only 5 further reports had been made, which represented a 95% reduction.

Anne Whiteley asked why these young people were running away. John Clements responded that one was the case of a girl running away to be with her boyfriend. In this case there was a risk assessment of their relationship, the outcome of which was that she had not gone missing since.

The Meeting felt that after each incident, there was a need for someone to always talk to the child to find out why they had run away.

The Way Ahead?

John Clements made the following suggestions:

- to ensure a multi-agency protocol is formulated between DCC Children's Services and the Devon & Cornwall Constabulary – the protocol being a functioning and living agreement;
- to sign up to agreed protocols DCC residential homes and all other care placements managed by Local Authorities;
- to sign up private sector residential homes and specialist units to agreed protocols;
- all agencies to use a standard and consistent risk assessment tool;
- intervention activity to be co-ordinated by the Police and Social Services;
- support to be provided by other 'youth service' providers;
- Local Children's Safeguarding Board to oversee performance?

What will it look like?

- identification of 3 reports in a 3 month period = youth intervention
- multi-agency problem solving approach
- review process if intervention does not solve the problem, i.e. a further 3 reports
- executive level panel to resolve professional disagreements and review those still not responding
- performance monitoring/evaluation

Commitment

Proposal to put youth intervention officer at Pynes Hill offices, with support from SSD

Alison Kearnes commented that there was commitment to extending the capacity of Childline. The Newton Abbot facility was due to transfer to premises in Exeter, so with regard to this area, the NSPCC would be interested in working together with other agencies.

Martin Gladwin asked how many of the children who went missing had made contact with Childline. John Clements responded that he did not know.

Anne Whiteley asked there was a pattern as to where children were running away from. John Clements responded that the Police dealt with many incidences of young people running from Brookhayes, Rifford Road etc., but some young people would abscond from wherever they were placed. Ms Whiteley recalled that around two years ago, there had been a large study undertaken into missing children. The study showed that many children were technically not missing in that they had returned to their family, or were merely late getting back to their residential home for example. Such young people were not out and about committing crime. Ms Whiteley felt that it must surely be a basic requirement for the debriefing of children who ran away to happen as a matter of course. John Clements noted that the Police received referrals of children reported as missing, when they had just not arrived back when expected. Chris Dimmelow advised that work had been undertaken with residential homes around the need for them to be clear as to what constituted “missing” – i.e. not arriving back half an hour late.

The Meeting considered that there was a need to also make a commitment to non Looked After Children who went missing, as some were currently being abused within their family home.

ACTION

- **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO ENSURE THE CHILDREN’S SERVICES BOARD RECEIVES THE DRAFT DOCUMENT FOR PERUSAL IN DUE COURSE.**

Anne Whiteley felt all present would agree that missing children were at risk. This was something which the Children’s Services Board had an interest in and, as a matter of principle, supported the Exeter Police initiative. Social Workers, including Residential Social Workers had accountability, and there was a need to be clear as to the extent of this.

Chris Dimmelow remarked that the ultimate responsibility for the tracking of missing Looked After Children was put out to DCC’s customer services department. A review was currently underway to ensure that there was clear consistency between this scheme and the DCC missing children’s policy. Owing to the decision to split responsibilities between customer services and residential care, it had become less clear exactly who was responsible for what.

Anne Whiteley commented that if a missing young person made contact with the NSPCC or Childline but would not disclose their whereabouts, there was a need to be able to report them on as being safe.

ACTION

- **A PROTOCOL TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE MAY 2006 LOCAL CHILDREN’S SAFEGUARDING BOARD MEETING.**

12. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

(a) Chris Dimmelow commended as many LCSB members as possible attend the second 'Hidden Harm' conference in May 2006. A 'for information' document about this had been sent out with the LCSB agenda and supporting papers for today's Meeting.

(b) Chris Dimmelow reported that the NSPCC in conjunction with the I&DEA had produced a CD ROM entitled "Signpost → Safeguarding Children". He had some copies with him which Board members could take away, and could obtain others if required.

(c) Laura Hubbard-Fielder reported that she and Amir Qureshy would be undertaking a joint presentation with regard to Part 8 Reviews.

ACTION

- **THE ABOVE PRESENTATION ON PART 8 REVIEWS TO BE PUT FORWARD TO THE APPROPRIATE PERSONS FOR CONSIDERATION AMONGST A NUMBER OF KEY EVENTS FOR THE INSPECTIONS TO GO TO**
- **(AT THE SUGGESTION OF HELEN HYLAND) SIMILAR CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO PUTTING FORWARD THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SPECIALIST MIDWIFE INITIATIVE.**

Signed Date

**Ms A Whiteley
Chair
Director of Devon Children's Services**

P:\JULIE\DEVONLCSB210406