

## **DEVON LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN'S BOARD**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday 19<sup>th</sup> January 2007 at East Devon District Council  
Offices, The Knowle, Sidmouth**

### **Present**

Anne Whiteley, Director of Children & Young People's Services  
Chris Dimmelow, Children's Safeguarding Manager, Devon Children & Young People's Services  
Laura Spittles, Named Nurse – Child Protection, Devon NHS Partnership Trust  
Cathy Ellingford, Children's Lead Representative (SW Region) Devon PCT  
Derek Moore, Assistant Director of NCH  
Claire Mitchell, Nurse Consultant (Safeguarding Children) RD&E NHS Trust  
Jane Richards, Portfolio Holder, Devon Local Medical Committee  
Alison Kearnes, ACSM, NSPCC Devon, Dorset & Cornwall  
Bob Brown, Head of Community Support Unit, Devon & Cornwall Police  
Helen Hyland, Designated Nurse, North & East/South & West Devon Health Community  
Martin Gladwin, CAF/CASS  
Maria Kasprzyk, Policy & Performance Improvement Manager, Devon County Council  
Beverley Dubash, Senior Education Welfare Officer (part only)  
John Rom, South/West Devon Strategy Health Authority  
Charles Holme, Designated Doctor, South & West Devon Health Community  
Corinne Hayes, Consultant Paediatrician, RD&E NHS Trust (afternoon only)  
Ann Morecraft, Designated Manager – Child Protection, Devon PCT  
Deborah Booth, Strategic Project Manager for Educational Achievement  
Juliet Hammacott, Acting Principal Education Welfare Officer  
Roy Tomlinson  
Martin Spragg, Youth Offending Services Manager  
Peter Jeffs, Director of Communities, East Devon District Council  
Janet Phipps, General Manager for Women's and Children's Services, North Devon NHS Trust  
Liz Smith, Clinical Lead, Devon PCT  
Kathryn Kershaw, Procurement Officer, CYPS  
Kate Mulford, Procurement Officer, CYPS  
Julie Phillips, Administrator/Minute Taker

### **Others invited / apologies / copy of minutes to**

Mary Mitchell, Assistant Chief Officer, Devon & Cornwall Probation Service  
John Davey, Director of Service Delivery, Connexions  
Madeleine Jackson, Senior Crown Prosecutor, Crown Prosecution Service  
Adrian Childs, Devon Partnership Trust  
Peter Adey, Directorate Manager, RD&E  
John Clements, Crime Manager, Devon & Cornwall Police  
Piers Tetley, Devon County Council  
Graeme Barnell, Adult & Community Services  
Colin Terry, BCU Commander for North and East Devon, Devon & Cornwall Constabulary  
Liam McGrath, Devon CYPS Children's Trust  
Brian Grady

---

### **1. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UPDATE**

Roy Tomlinson reminded those present that he first presented the Joint Action Plan to the LSCB in January 2006. He noted that the ADVA partnership had always had a children and young people's sub-group and they had tried to 'bolt on' work which the LSCB had asked them to do, but that had not proved to be a very successful arrangement. There was a need to decide whether Domestic Violence should be a sub-group of the LSCB.

The Joint Action Plan was last considered in December 2006 and the view arrived at that this was a good document full of good practice. The sub-group decided the need to come back to the LSCB with a list of priority actions, in respect of which LSCB comments were sought.

The LSCB then considered the list of priority actions for 2007/8, as follows:

***Point 1- one point of contact should be identified in each school, youth and early years setting, and college to lead to DV and wherever possible and appropriate this should be added to the duties of the named child protection person. Those individuals should attend the ADVA Level 1 awareness and Level 2 work with children and young people courses.***

There was a need to identify someone in each setting to be a key contact around domestic violence and it made more sense for this to be added to the role of the Child Protection Lead.

***Point 2 – The healthy schools accreditation progress should include a requirement to demonstrate that domestic abuse issues are a part of the curriculum.***

Roy Tomlinson had raised this issue with Phil Norrey previously, and there was acceptance this was a good idea. Anne Whiteley reminded the LSCB that nationally, the accreditation process had changed. Roy Tomlinson was aware of that and added that there was a need for young people living in homes where there was domestic violence to be able to have some knowledge about what healthy relationships involved.

***Point 3 – Sustainable funding for the current Children’s Outreach and Refuge Workers should be planned for and implemented by 2008/9.***

ADVA through its partnership funding was currently funding Child Support Workers in the three Women’s Refuges in Devon and three Outreach Workers. Funding needed to be available in a more sustainable way.

***Point 4 – The development and expansion of parenting support should embrace how domestic violence issues are dealt with by families and the impact this had on parenting capacity.***

It was known that a high percentage of parents on parenting programmes lived in homes where there was domestic violence, and so there was a need to ensure programmes fully addressed this issue. Parenting UK were responsible for setting national occupational standards for parenting work, and there were several which covers the areas of safety and domestic violence. The current pattern of support to parents was extremely varied and there was a desire to bring about more uniformity but without losing the rich variety of work.

Roy Tomlinson pointed out that the ADVA partnership was already funding the REPAIR programme. Working with such women raised their self-esteem and so enhanced their parenting ability.

***Point 7 – Key workers are trained to provide skilled responses within specialist services e.g. CAMHS, YOT, EWS, EPS***

ADVA was trying to identify key staff to go on their courses, recognising the need for key people to have an understanding of what domestic violence involved.

***Point 8 – Joint work between ADVA and YOT and Youth Services should be developed aiming to reduce potential for repeat victimisation and perpetration of domestic violence amongst young people***

There is a general concern at the trend for people getting involved in domestically violent relationships at a young age – 20-25 years.

Roy Tomlinson then spoke to some additional points which he felt should be added to the list of priority actions:

***Point 10 – The development of a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC)***

The idea behind this being that every domestic violence incident the Police attend is assessed and very high risk cases become the subject of a MARAC. ADVA was currently working with the Police to evaluate MARACs, which Roy Tomlinson considered to be on a parallel with Child Protection Case Conferences. There was a question as to who would manage them, in that some MARACs would involve children whilst others would be between adults only.

***Point 11 – The forthcoming requirement to hold Homicide Reviews***

In the last year, there had been two domestic violence related homicides, one of which was in Plymouth and involved a parent and an adult sibling. Home Office guidance was required to clarify whether these Reviews were initiated by the Police or CYPS, and who managed them.

***Point 12 – Intervention in families where there is already a lot of agency involvement, leading to confusion for parents.***

There was a need to be able to quantify whether, if family intervention programmes around domestic violence worked, this resulted in a savings in terms of inputs from other agencies. ADVA would like to undertake case studies of some of these families.

*Anne Whiteley invited LSCB to make comments on Roy Tomlinson's presentation:*

Anne Morecraft stated that one of the serious case reviews she was currently dealing with involved a huge amount of agency contact and she thought this case would be a good one for ADVA to use as a case study.

Martin Spragg commented that in Tier 3 cases it was not uncommon to have three or four workers some of whom were particularly designated to do parenting work and others doing this as part of their role. There was also added confusion from the fact that professionals did not all work to the same model of parenting work. Anne Whiteley responded that she felt there was a need in Devon to come to a view as to what model(s) should be used – which one(s) had been appropriately researched and evaluated as good practice.

Kathryn Kershaw stated that she was involved in working on Phase 2 of the new Children's Centres and so the abovementioned work was of interest to her.

Charles Holme stated that the training sub-group had been very receptive to the ideal of overlapping into domestic violence training, but the two day foundation course was already extremely full and he considered this could not be expanded into a three day course because it would be harder to get participants freed up from their normal jobs for this length of time. Anne Whiteley observed that there were certain functions within the two day course which had to be fulfilled, but domestic violence was not one of these. There was a need to agree what professional needed which specific inputs from this course.

Deborah Booth stated that she welcomed the idea of a contact for domestic violence issues being identified within schools, and training around this key issue. There was a need to consider what resources were available from within CYPS. In terms of healthy schools, she would recommend the involvement of Annette Lyons.

Maria Kasprzyk advised that some work around thresholds (access pathway) had already commenced and in terms of Level 3 thresholds work was being undertaken on Police 121a forms.

Liz Smith stated that Devon had put in a bid to be one of the 3 pilot parenting schemes which the DoH funded to develop intensive programmes for identified families.

John Rom stated that at the Designated Professionals' Meeting what was picked up was the apparent difference in homicides where the perpetrators were in contact with the mental health services and the situation with children. There was some problem in going through systems which

identified issues then sharing this with other services and ensuring that they could pick them up. When Homicide Reviews became statutory, this would be worth looking at.

Janet Phipps felt there was a need to be mindful of the increased workload for Child Protection Leads which the addition of domestic violence would result in.

*Chris Dimmelow made the following responses to the comments made above by LSCB members:*

Chris Dimmelow was of the opinion that adding the domestic violence role to Child Protection Leads in school was logical theoretically but there was an issue around their capacity to be able to take on this extra work. There was a need for some discussions with DAPH and DASH and currently Beverley Dubash was experiencing difficulties obtaining annual child safeguarding reports from schools.

With regard to funding issues, Chris Dimmelow's view was that this was a challenge for the Children's Trust. The Trust needed to be asked and be in a position to use their joint commissioning powers to resolve the funding issue for ADVA. It would be a great pity if this service suffered for the want of more permanent funding.

With regard to MARACs it seemed logical that the LSCB took on this work. Chris Dimmelow understood it had been agreed that ADVA would become a sub-group of the LSCB, and so that would mean Roy Tomlinson would need to be a standing member of the Board and provide regular reports for consideration at Board meetings.

Chris Dimmelow advised that he had been in talks with Roy Tomlinson about Homicide Reviews, and they were thinking in terms of the regional Criminal Justice Board doing this work. If they did not want to take on this work, then LSCB and the MAPPA Board needed to decide which of them would do so. Sooner or later a Homicide Review would have to be undertaken in Devon. Martin Spragg observed that there were a number of parental, child and youth issues which overlapped between the criminal justice and children's systems. Plymouth had set up a local Criminal Justice Board but they did not have sufficient capacity to be able to take on Homicide Reviews. Anne Whiteley considered there to be a need for clearly articulated and written strategies which all had the opportunity to contribute to before they were signed off by the Children's Trust. In this way, it became easier to identify roles and responsibilities.

Anne Whiteley considered it was right for Roy Tomlinson to be a member of the LSCB and that there was a domestic violence sub-group. There was a need for a short list of objectives and which sub-group led on which priority action point. The Children's Trust was about to look at the revised Children and Young People's Plan. The Trust was also in the process of revising the governance arrangements and would be setting up a commissioning group. A paper needed to go to the Children's Trust Board which set out clearly the objectives, an evaluation of what had been achieved plus clarity around funding streams. There was a need to know the life span of some of the grant funding, other options for funding and when the Children's Trust Board would be faced with some decisions in the long term.

#### **ACTION:**

**The terms of reference of the domestic violence sub-group to be considered by the next LSCB Meeting.**

## **2. PARENTING PROVISION TO PREVENT ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

Chris Dimmelow advised that a grant of £50,000 had been made to Exeter which would go into the Community Safety Partnership.

Martin Spragg commented that the Respect agenda was politically driven - the Respect task force headed by Louise Casey was created around three years ago. Their initial agenda was full of language around punishment, but when the Respect Action Plan came out, it was more balance in tone. The way forward had to be as much about intervention and support as about threats. The

Respect Team funded 6 pilot projects around the country to offer very intensive parenting support to a couple of families who were taken out of their home and housed in a special unit. The evaluation of this project showed a great improvement in anti-social behaviour and in other areas such as school attendance. Despite their expense, it was recognised that the initiative was cost effective over all. The next phase was for 77 authorities to get up to £50,000 available to do some intensive family work with families at the more serious end of the spectrum of concerns. Exeter was the only area in Devon to get this funding. There had been a number of discussions with the PCT and Exeter City Council. The difficulty was in knowing who was in charge of developing parenting support. Part of the overall Respect Action Plan was to establish a parenting academy. Parenting UK were currently tendering with the Respect Task Force for this contract. They had many years of experience in the field. There was a need to ensure that individual good practices were not lost but fitted into a more coherent strategy, to ensure that families got the inputs they needed from the most appropriate service, with minimal to no overlap.

With regard to domestic violence, Roy Tomlinson observed that if the issue of misuse of power within a family setting was not tackled, and the family dynamic changed, other interventions worked less well.

Anne Whiteley suggested that a paper on parenting strategy should be prepared for consideration by the Children's Trust.

Kathryn Kershaw stated that the Children's Centres would be keen to link in with both projects.

Derek Moore stated that power was a significant issue within families. There was a need to be sure that efforts were to try to empower families to make better choices and be better parents rather than follow a particular parenting model.

Deborah Booth made the point that some families would need a different type of parenting support, for example where there were toddlers and teenagers in the same family. There was an increased emphasis on parenting contracts and Parenting Orders through the Courts. Teachers had a role with regard to parenting in the broader sense of the word, and so needed to have some knowledge of the more specialist services available to parents as often it was their child's teacher whom a parent would first disclose to that they were having difficulties with that child. Penalty Notices to parents did not help foster good parental relationships with their child's school.

Cathy Ellingford asked what role CAMHS and primary mental health care workers had. Martin Spragg responded that all of the six pilots had mental health professionals on the multi-agency teams doing the interventions. He understood Exeter was trying to secure some Community Psychiatric Nurse time.

Peter Jeffs stated that each of the District Council areas in Devon had their own crime and disorder group plus an anti-social behaviour co-ordinator. The ASB Co-ordinator for East Devon was trying to pull together multi-agency groupings and certain professionals were refusing to attend meetings to discuss how to take a holistic view rather than simply attacking a child for their behaviour. Roy Tomlinson observed that the Safer Communities Group was in the process of commissioning some work to find out more about the nature of anti-social behaviour.

Martin Spragg advised that, to date, there had been a total of 23 ASBOs made on young people. A great many young people were referred into an escalation process, a number of agencies did engage, others did not. The number of young people who went in and the number who ended up with ASBOs were vastly different. What was being sought was a reduction in anti-social behaviour without recourse to ASBOs. They were a useful tool in a small number of circumstances and for some people they had worked when nothing else had.

**ACTION:**

**MARTIN SPRAGG TO ENSURE THAT THESE ISSUES ARE CONSIDERED IN THE FORMULATION OF THE DEVON PARENTING STRATEGY.  
A COPY OF THE CONSULTATION DOCUMENT TO BE PROVIDED TO LSCB MEMBERS FOR ANY COMMENTS.**

### **3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

#### **Matters Arising**

Page 2 – Chris Dimmelow advised that the Hidden Harm Co-ordinator had been appointed. This was a very experienced applicant who hoped to start next month. Chris Dimmelow would arrange for them to attend a Board meeting in order to introduce themselves and to explain how they envisaged their role developing.

Page 2 – With regard to the Devon LSBC budget, Chris Dimmelow advised that the Funding Agreement was almost ready to sign. Wayne Davies yesterday had advised that the issue of PCT contributions was near to resolution.

Chris Dimmelow reported receipt of a letter from CAFCASS nationally regarding their funding contributions into individual LSCBs across the country. Martin Gladwin added that he had made it clear there were ongoing concerns from LSCBs about the fairly small contribution CAFCASS was making. It was agreed that CAFCASS's corporate director would write to all Chairs of LSCBs and this letter had been sent out during the past week.

Referring to the national CAFCASS letter, Martin Gladwin stated that the amount CAFCASS were likely to be able to contribute in the year 2007/8 was likely to remain the same and there was no potential for local flexibility in cash terms. Making a contribution to 150 LSCBs was a challenge. CAFCASS remained keen to contribute in other ways such as through the use of training venues.

Anne Whiteley responded that she appreciated the point CAFCASS were making about providing funding to all LSCBs in the country, but the Local Authority areas having to cover LSCBs varied enormously in size. Devon was one of the largest Local Authorities in the country. There was no escape from the fact that if the responsibilities of LSCBs were to be taken seriously, and expanded, there was a cost implication to this. Nonetheless the fact that CAFCASS had sent a letter to all LSCBs to explain their position was appreciated.

Page 2 – Child Witness Support Project – Alison Kearnes wished to make clear that the NSPCC was seeking charitable funding for video links and was asking for government funding for the Child Witness Support scheme.

Ann Morecraft noted that John Clements had made a presentation on the Missing Persons Project to the youth panel which was welcomed. Magistrates would like to be involved if that was possible. Maria Kasprzyk noted that the first steering group was well attended. There was a view that a peninsula-wide protocol should be aimed for.

Page 4 – Maria Kasprzyk advised that work had been started on being able to place Devon LSCB minutes and tabled reports onto the CYPS website (password protected) and was likely to take a couple of months to resolve.

Page 5 – Anne Whiteley stated that she had not heard from Peter Hancock regarding his thoughts on recommendation 18 of the JAR Action Plan with regard to housing. Chris Dimmelow responded that the first JAR Action Plan Implementation Meeting took place a couple of days ago and housing was a major issue of concern. This was the most vulnerable part of the JAR Action Plan. Peter Jeffs advised that there was a Devon-wide Chief Officers' Group and he could help the LSCB place a specific item on their agenda if that would help.

Page 5 – Martin Gladwin advised that he and Chris Dimmelow had updated the LSCB Business Plan and this would be going on the website as soon as possible.

Page 6 - Chris Dimmelow advised that Georgie MacIntosh had confirmed that she would be pleased to be part of an LSCB Development Day.

Page 7 – Any Other Business – Chris Dimmelow advised that he had attended a demonstration of the new South West Child Protection Procedures yesterday, which was very promising. It would

provide a much more comprehensive a web-based information system which would be far more complex than what was currently available. It would have a download plus research and information facilities. It was hoped this would go live on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2007.

Page 7 – Any Other Business - Alison Kearnes asked that the sentence forming paragraph 3 be changed to read “Alison Kearnes advised that Cornwall LSCB were considering signing up to the Project.”

#### **4. REPORT OF THE TRAINING SUB-GROUP**

The Meeting considered Piers Tetley’s report.

##### **ACTION:**

##### **CHRIS DIMMELOW TO ASK MICHELE THORBERRY, AS CHAIR OF THE TRAINING SUB-GROUP, TO ATTEND LSCB MEETINGS.**

Ann Morecraft reported that Michelle Thornberry had asked that item 5 (CP content in induction, mandatory and awareness training across Devon) form part of the agenda for the Health Sub-Group which was due to meet soon.

With regard to item 4, Charles Holme reported with concern that 5 potential Health attendees had been barred from attending by their managers. The new training programme around the training of hospital doctors was now being trialled at the RD&E, in Torbay and in Plymouth. The aim was to train every foundation Year 2 doctor.

#### **5. REPORT OF THE HEALTH SUB-GROUP**

Helen Hyland’s report was considered by the Meeting.

Liz Smith explained that the Devon Primary Care Trust had been formed out of the six previous Primary Care Trusts in Devon. Devon PCT was unusual in that the provider part of the organisation was quite large. At some time over the next 2-3 years decisions would be made about its future. PCTs were formed to become commissioning organisations.

Including Liz Smith, Devon PCT has seven Directors, as follows:

- (1) Virginia Pearson – Director of Public Health – will link closely with the LSCB
- (2) Sally Slade – Director of Provider Services (interim post holder) – likely to take between 6-9 months to appoint to this post, allowing for length of notice likely to have to be given to previous employer
- (3) Rebecca Harriet – Director of Provider Development
- (4) Jane Carroll – Director of Commissioning (starts 01/02/2007)
- (5) Vanessa James – Director of Governance
- (6) Director of HR not yet appointed, but post is held on interim basis

Anne Whiteley commented that DCC was working with the Chief Executive of the PCT and with the Director of Public Health, in a desire to link health and social care. In terms of children’s services, Anne Whiteley had shared a lot of detail with Virginia Pearson, and she would be taking a paper to the PCT Board next week on Anne Whiteley’s behalf regarding some of these services. PCT representation for the Children’s Trust Board had now been agreed.

A meeting between Anne Whiteley, Sally Slade and Miles Hapgood had been convened, the aim of which would be to try to come to some understanding and view as to how best to delivery statutory services.

Liz Smith commented that she felt there was a definite will for joint working between Health and Social Care. Areas of key interest yet to be discussed included district council boundaries and the fact that the future of commissioning in health services would be practice-based. Anne Whiteley added that the model of budget-holding key professionals was also being looked at.

Peter Jeffs observed that another area for consideration ought to be whether Exeter would become a unitary authority. Anne Whiteley responded that whether or not this happened, there was a far greater collaboration and working together across the family of local government. There were discussions happening between Plymouth, Devon and Torbay regarding closer working arrangements.

Martin Spragg commented that YOT were actively looking at a single BCU model for Devon. The Police preference was to work towards there being a single BCU in Devon, probably incorporating Torbay.

In terms of joint commissioning for the Children's Trust, the point was made that many older children did not receive universal services such as health visiting. Many parents would take issues, e.g. around their child's mental health, straight to the family's GP, because of perceived stigma.

In terms of the merger of the 6 PCTs into one for Devon, John Rom cautioned the need for there to be a clear and auditable trail between new and old systems, as it was at such times that systems broke down, performance management did not work and staff did not know what was expected of them.

With regard to child death screenings, Charles Holme stated that Chapter 7 of "Working Together" needed to work. A paper had been circulated to Chris Dimmelow, Anne Whiteley, and Dr Kevin Snee, Chairman of Devon PCT. At local level, there was a need for rapid response times, particularly to look into unexpected deaths of 0-18 year olds. An "unexpected death" was one which would not have been expected within the preceding 24 hours.

#### **ACTION:**

#### **CHILD DEATH SCREENING TO BE DISCUSSED AT THE NEXT LSCB MEETING.**

Chris Dimmelow advised that there was to be a regional meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2007, involving CEHMAC and the DfES. It was thought a Cornwall, Plymouth, Torbay split could be a possibility. Chris Dimmelow thanked Charles Holme and Bob Brown for their work. In his opinion, implications would be greater than for serious case reviews and would add to the increasing operational child protection responsibilities of this LSCB.

John Rom advised that appointments within the SHA would be picked up by Amanda Cocks. There were 14 LSCBs in the South West which would need supporting.

#### **6. REPORT OF THE EDUCATION SUB-GROUP**

Juliet Hammacott presented this report. Points arising were made as follows:

(1) requests for CRB checks had grave implications for resources in terms of being able to complete them in good time. The longest delay aware of was 37 weeks.

(2) regarding the comments about free training, Juliet Hammacott remarked that it was her understanding that child protection foundation training used to be free, but monies were then devolved into schools for training. Anne Whiteley responded to confirm that the LSCB had now established a pooled budget for training which removed the need for cross-charging on a per capita basis. Individual schools did not contribute to this budget and so they would have to purchase places at the agreed rate. Chris Dimmelow added that 47% of the cost of the training budget came from CYPS. Schools received training on an "at cost basis", and for that received two days worth of very high quality child protection training. Juliet Hammacott said she would ensure that this information was clarified to the Education Sub-Group.

(3) with regard to Internet safety, Chris Dimmelow confirmed he had had a conversation with the Head Teacher concerned and informally talked to the Police, so it was hoped this matter could be resolved informally. It did however raise concerns around access to the Internet and Equal Opportunities issues. Martin Spragg suggested that the matter could have been dealt with through the Youth Intervention Officer.

(4) with regard to CEOPS (Child Exploitation On-Line Protection Service) it was clarified that this body responds to concerns around abuse through the Internet. They had developed a training pack in respect of which there had been a local presentation. They were looking into how their pack might be promoted. Beverley Dubash was looking to see how this could be worked into the training provided for schools. SCOMIS had expressed an interest also. It was hoped to cover as many schools in Devon as possible. Anne Whiteley added that across the South West, all the Directors of Children's Services were part of the South West Grid for Child Learning. Chris Dimmelow added that there was a SCOMIS sub-group to look at the issue of Internet technology in general. This group was formed in response to an issue arising in a foster home rather than a school. CYPS provided computers to help young people in care learn, whilst the South West Grid provided the Internet access for this. Every school in Devon only got their Internet through the South West Grid for Learning.

(5) Derek Moore made the point that four of the NCH Children's Centres had invested in video conferencing facilities, and standards for this needed to be agreed.

(6) Kathryn Kershaw suggested that Internet access via Job Centre Plus outlets needed, if not already, to come under the auspices of the South West Grid.

(7) Claire Mitchell queried whether the education provided to children who were patients on Bramble Ward, RD&E and to the children's ward at North Devon District Hospital received their Internet service through the South West Grid. It was felt this needed to be checked out.

## **7. JOINT AREA REVIEW ACTION PLAN**

Chris Dimmelow presented this document in respect of the Post-JAR Action Plan Group Meeting held on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> January. Points arising were made as follows:

Page 2 – this outlines what Help Desks do. The overall aim here is county-wide consistency of practice.

Page 3 – Thresholds are to be widely publicised and then reviewed by Maria Kasprzyk, who had already prepared an initial document which described the County's Child In Need policy. There was a desire to engage key agencies with regard to the business process which would be undertaken to assess and make clear decisions with regard to children in need. Maria and Dave Simpkins had sent out invitations to all agencies, seeking representation from different parts of the county. They had a 35 day grid they were trying to develop and at the start of the process would call a multi-agency meeting then agree a plan, with the aim of implementation being by late Spring 2007.

Cathy Ellingford commented that her organisation did not have a Joint Agency Team. Maria Kasprzyk responded that whether an organisation had a JAT or not, they had to bring people together to do the assessment. She did not think not having a JAT posed a risk. Liz Smith felt that Claire Mitchell should be part of the multi-agency meeting, to which Maria Kasprzyk confirmed she had been invited.

Anne Whiteley observed that from the JAR, professionals did not know what the thresholds were – they had not been published at that stage. Then they did not understand why decisions were made or not made. All professionals had to work the same and to have the same understanding of what the thresholds were. Duplication could not be afforded.

Maria Kasprzyk advised that she and Chris Dimmelow were working on a multi-agency referral form.

John Rom remarked that he appreciated the document was an internal document only, and that the Joint Area Review and Action Plan was a multi-agency exercise, but he wondered how that process was being performance managed. Anne Whiteley responded that overall performance management was being undertaken by the Joint Performance Management Team, whose membership had been extended so that there was an overarching group who were performance managing the whole JAR Plan. Social Care had many things to put right. Many things had had to be put in place which had not previously existed. Work around thresholds had to come to the LSCB, and Anne Whiteley wanted exception reporting to go to the sub-groups who had a key interest. A diagrammatical explanation of the above would be useful.

**ACTION:**

**CHRIS DIMMELOW TO PRODUCE A DIAGRAM CLEARLY SHOWING THE ABOVE AND NAMING THOSE PERSONNEL INVOLVED.**

Chris Dimmelow explained that within CYPS a reporting sheet had been developed which showed each recommendation of the JAR and gave an account of the progress made. These entries were colour coded green (if completed) amber (if almost completed) and red (no progress). It was agreed this would be amended slightly to form a reporting tool. It would incorporate other Action Plan points which did not have CYPS responsibility for completion. Implementation of the JAR Action Plan was important across the board. The DfES consultants would be coming in next week.

Anne Whiteley was mindful that Devon was due an annual performance assessment, notification of which was likely to come through in April 2007. The annual performance assessment would not be like the JAR in terms of intensity but the implications for Devon could be close in significance to a JAR. Devon would need to be able to demonstrate improvements in terms of fieldwork, not so much in terms of resources used but in the way professionals worked.

Page 5 – Martin Gladwin suggested the need for a separate heading for Section 120 notifications. CAF/CASS was tasked with notifying of any Court generated documents where domestic violence was a prevalent factor. For this area, CAF/CASS sent such information to Chris Dimmelow who sent them on to the appropriate offices where they were logged and assessed. Anne Whiteley suggested that when the multi-agency group was convened, there would be a need to identify what the indicators of success were going to be so that the Board could measure performance against this. Chris Dimmelow responded that on the advice of the consultants, the Post-JAR Action Plan Group had been asked to put in outcome indicators to the JAR Action Plan.

Ann Morecraft suggested that the A3 reporting sheet which Chris Dimmelow had been speaking to be made into a more user-friendly format, given that it was to be considered by subsequent LSCB Meetings.

**ACTION:**

**LSCB MEMBERS WITH ANY OTHER COMMENTS TO E-MAIL THESE TO CHRIS DIMMELOW OR MARIA KASPRZYK IN TIME FOR THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING WITH THE CONSULTANTS ON 31<sup>ST</sup> JANUARY 2007.**

**8. SERIOUS CASES REVIEW SUB-GROUP**

Chris Dimmelow spoke to his report of the last meeting, held on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2007. Additional information was reported as follows:

**Case KB**

The JACAT report was awaited. This was a complex overview report because the concerns covered two other Local Authorities plus the family structure was itself complex. Jane Richards and John Ingham were progressing the overview report. Corinne Hayes commented that she and Claire Mitchell had done the best they could with regard to the JACAT report, and Chris Dimmelow remarked that the process had had the positive outcome of clearly showing that the management of JACAT rested with the Primary Care Trust rather than with CYPS.

### **Case AC**

Chris Dimmelow would provide final reports to all relevant parties and submit to CSCI.

### **Case SL**

Ann Morecraft was doing the overview report for this case.

### **Case KW**

Work on this case was commenced but suspended in November 2006 at the request of the Police so that the Police could interview key personnel. Chris Dimmelow would be writing to relevant parties next week to instruct them to now resume this review.

### **Case RB**

The post-mortem examination of this child plus the ongoing Police interviews confirmed that RB's injuries were directly attributable to child abuse. RB's father was arrested for murder and was in custody. Terms of reference were being drafted, and Chris Dimmelow thanked Charles Holme for his help in that respect. The child was not previously known to social care, nor was RB's name previously on the Child Protection Register, but there had been significant Health involvement with RB's parents.

### **Case TB (new case)**

This child, with Downs Syndrome, Hershprung's Disease and a heat condition, had recently died aged just over one year. TB was being fed by his father on the sofa in the early hours of the morning. Father fell asleep but later woke up to find his son dead. There was to be a meeting today which would consider whether the child died from natural causes or in suspicious circumstances.

There are four other siblings in this household.

### **Child Minder DH**

Chris Dimmelow reminded the Board that an independent report had been commissioned into the handling of this case, from which an Executive Summary was produced which was to be used to provide feedback to the three sets of parents involved. OFSTED felt this report produced grounds on which to deregister DH and had produced a draft letter to her which drew heavily on the report. Outstanding at the present time was:

- (1) the need to agree content of the OFSTED draft letter
- (2) the fact that the parents were still pushing for some explanation as to what had gone wrong in the investigation, hence the content of the Executive Summary needed to be agreed so the parents could have some feedback
- (3) the need to have the agreement of all involved agencies with the content of the report.

Charles Holme had been doing some work with hospital staff in terms of their views.

Corinne Hayes remarked that she had found this case quite stressful. The investigation had created enormous and unnecessary conflict. She had been unable to reach agreement with Charles Holme. Conflict had been between the RD&E as an organisation and the LSCB. Corinne Hayes apologised for the delay in getting the report back but it had taken longer than envisaged. There had been a good deal of conflict created within Health, which was a pity as the aim surely had to be to learn from mistakes within a "no blame" culture. Corinne Hayes was strongly of the opinion that a lot of blame was being directed towards Health, yet Paediatricians were only trying to look after children. The person identified within the report a "Paediatrician 2" felt that the executive summary put the blame on him and delay in presentation of Child A to Social Services (CYPS) to

the point that he felt he should involve his Medical Defence Union. Corinne Hayes hoped that her colleague would receive an apology in due course.

Charles Holme observed that there was a broad measure of agreement to the overview report, but urged caution as it was not the LSCBs document to alter wholesale. He agreed the need to concentrate on the injuries themselves and the likely causation, and he had tried to do this to the OFSTED document. It was important that the OFSTED letter was sent out to the child minder as soon as possible.

Charles Holme observed that the original executive summary was the draft from case records and agency contributions. Corinne Hayes had completed the individual management report which included interviews with key people and this had been very helpful. In terms of interagency working, those writing the overview report were very dependant on what had been documented and the perception by one agency of the information given to them by another agency. The way it was put and interpreted was important to try and gain some understanding of interagency working. Hence there may have been the best of intentions but people did not actually commit themselves to a statement to other agencies. Charles Holme agreed Health had some of the best documentation. No CYPS file was open on Child A until around 2003, and so for a long time there was nothing from CYPS.

Corinne Hayes wanted the parents to have as much information as possible but at the same time wanted to see a more balanced report going to the parents, hence she wanted some wording changed. Anne Whiteley commented that this needed to be worked through in a smaller group than this LSCB.

Chris Dimmelow stated that he was very sorry if there was anything which the serious case review committee had done to make Corinne Hayes feel as she had outlined.

Ann Morecraft wondered whether it would be helpful if in the executive summary the point was made that the focus was on Health and what they did and did not do, given that it was Health who had the bulk of the available documentation – no SSD (CYPS) file being in existence for some time. Corinne Hayes responded that she thought this a helpful suggestion, and added that some of the recommendations coming out in their report needed to be part of the executive summary. For example, no matter how long the delay, if new evidence came to light this had to be looked into.

Cathy Ellingford suggested some assessment of the report take place within a smaller forum. Chris Dimmelow responded that he was happy to take suggestions around how to resolve difficulties around the substantive report written, but OFSTED did want to deregister DH. Alison Bailey had telephoned him this week enquiring on progress and saying they wanted to get the letter off to DH as soon as possible. Bob Brown was under considerable pressure from the parents who wanted some formal feedback, and it was hoped to be able to do this from the executive summary.

Charles Holme had issue with the extent to which the content of the overview report had been lifted to go into the proposed OFSTED letter to DH. Claire Mitchell suggested a way forward of Charles Holme and Corinne Hayes meeting with Cathy Ellingford and another Board member to try to come to some agreement. Cathy Ellingford recommended that another LSCB serious case review take on this case – she did not think she would be the best person to be involved. Bob Brown cautioned that it would take several months for someone without prior knowledge to be able to get to grips with the case. He did not think a final agreed version was too far away now and that there was more than enough evidence to satisfy any Tribunal DH might appeal to. He felt the executive summary could be amended to take out that information which the parents did not need to have.

#### **ACTIONS:**

**CORINNE HAYES, CHARLES HOLME AND JANE RICHARDS TO GIVE A VIEW AS TO WHAT NEEDS TO COME OUT OF OFSTED'S PROPOSED LETTER TO DH.**

**BOB BROWN TO REDRAFT THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOLLOWING FURTHER COMMENT FROM CORINNE HAYES AND CHARLES HOLME.**

**9. ADVICE LEAFLET REGARDING CHILD PROTECTION IN SCHOOLS**

Beverley Dubash presented this draft leaflet to the Board and invited comments. The Education Welfare Service had been encouraging schools to put in a safeguarding statement into their school prospectus, and felt this leaflet could be given to parents of new pupils. The intention was that a supply of these leaflets would be distributed to schools giving them the option to have more printed if they wished. Printing costs would come out of the Education Welfare Services' budget.

Comments were offered as follows:

- (1) Martin Gladwin stated that references to Social Services needed to be changed to CYPS
- (2) Deborah Booth pointed out that there were 150 children in Devon receiving link education, so these young people should not be forgotten
- (3) The leaflet had been designed for parents, but given the proposal for a supply to be available in secondary schools, it was highly likely older children would pick up copies as opposed to just parents.
- (4) John Rom suggested the need to put in another contact as well as Child line, for someone whom children and young people could contact. He also suggested rewording the front of the leaflet so that it just says "Information for parents" so that any young person picking it up would know the leaflet was just for parents. Martin Gladwin suggested re-wording to say "Information for parents and carers."
- (5) Anne Whiteley wondered whether consideration should be given to the need to produce something more geared to children and young people.

**ACTION:**

**MARIA KASPRZYK AND BEVERLEY DUBASH TO DISCUSS.**

At this point, Dr Richard Tomlinson introduced himself. He was a Consultant Paediatrician who had been working in Exeter since 2004, working at both the RD&E and in the community. He was also the Named Doctor for Mid-Devon and the Named Doctor for the RD&E Trust.

**10. EQUAL PROTECTION FOR CHILDREN**

Alison Kearnes provided Board members with a copy of the Summer 2006 briefing of The Children Are Unbeatable! Alliance which is campaigning for the UK to join the movement to abolish all corporal punishment of children, plus a sheet entitled "What are LSCBs being asked to consider doing?"

**11. CRIMINAL RECORDS BUREAU CHECKS**

Liz Smith stated that there was variation within the new Devon PCT with regard to the frequency of re-checks for staff with the CRB. One of the organisations forming part of Devon PCT checked all staff who had a working involvement with children on a three yearly basis. Corinne Hayes advised that the RD&E did this on a targeted case basis because of resource implications in terms of time and money.

**ACTION:**

**LIZ SMITH TO ENSURE THAT DEVON PCT ROUTINELY DOES THREE YEARLY CRB CHECKS OF STAFF WORKING WITH CHILDREN.**

## **12. LSCB DEVELOPMENT DAY**

Anne Whiteley reminded the Board that at their last Meeting, the possibility had been discussed of Christa Wiggin doing some development work with the Board. There had been a recent survey of LSCBs around the country looking at where they were in their formation and ongoing work programmes. This piece of work locally was led by Georgie MacIntosh in the government Office South West. Discussions had taken place with her about how Devon was doing in comparison with others. Christa Wiggin was to be invited to attend an LSCB meeting at one point when this information was to hand, and she would be pleased to do some work with the Board.

The Board felt that this work could not be slotted into one of the development days already planned for 2007, so that meant a separate further date needed to be agreed.

Anne Whiteley suggested Friday 5<sup>th</sup> October 2007, and this was agreed by the Board.

### **Action:**

**ALL PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS DATE IS NOW CONFIRMED AND FACILITATORS FOR THE DAY HAVE BEEN AGREED. A VENUE WILL BE NOTIFIED IN DUE COURSE.**

## **13. GMC CONSULTATION RE GUIDANCE FOR DOCTORS WITH REGARD TO CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

Jane Richards reported that the GMC were looking again at its guidance in good medical practice in terms of how doctors dealt with children and young people. The GMC felt this guidance needed to be re-written and had drawn up a replacement draft. The consultation period ended on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2007.

### **ACTION:**

**JANE RICHARDS TO DRAFT A RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF THE LSCB AND REPORT BACK TO THE MARCH 2007 MEETING.**

## **14. PROTOCOL FOR THE USE OF MEDICINE BOXES**

Chris Dimmelow reported that Devon DAAT had introduced a system of providing medicine boxes for Methadone and other prescribed medications for drug users. Boxes were given out with advice as to their proper use. The aim of this initiative was to enable drug users to keep such medications safely away from children.

## **15. RCPCH RESEARCH PROJECT**

Charles Holme reported this study was a continuation of complaints against Paediatricians in cases where child abuse was suspected. The project aimed to explore p[arents' experiences around this – whether there were issues which parents wanted to understand or discuss. The project wanted to interview a group of up to 50 parents. Charles Holme was aware that Devon was current participating in work around substance misuse and was aware of the difficulties that project had had in recruiting suitable parents. With regard to the RCPH research project, there would be no implications for the RD&E as they would simply identify suitable families who met the project's criteria.

Chris Dimmelow commented that with the substance misuse project, there were concerns around data protection – permission had to be sought from families before child protection information relating to their child could be released. Parents were reluctant to open themselves up to highly sensitive material.

After some further discussion, it was agreed that Charles Holme would decline this area's involvement in this research project.

## **16. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

The Board received information regarding the forthcoming BASPCAN Conference to take place on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2007 in Taunton, and the Safe and Sound Conference, to take place on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2007 in London.

## **17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

(1) John Rom stated that there was currently a themed review of dual diagnosis services and Mental Health Leads were preparing papers likely to lead on to action plans for the substance misuse service. John Rom had encouraged Leads to ensure that within their own responses with the implications for children in substance misuse were brought out. Therefore in due course local services would be developing action plans for this. The deadline for feedback was Monday 29<sup>th</sup> January 2007. There was a moderation exercise, but feedback from this exercise was not expected until mid 2007.

(2) John Rom asked whether LSCB expected member agencies to automatically provide their business reports each year, or did agencies receive written reminders. Chris Dimmelow responded that he sent out written reminders to agencies to do this.

(3) Charles Holme urged LSCB members to encourage anyone they knew who would benefit from attendance to attend the BASPCAN Conference.

(4) Laura Spittles stated that research showed many patients and clients using the Devon NHS Partnership Trust had experienced sexual abuse. There were multi-agency implications arising, and she suggested it would be useful for the Sexual Abuse Forum to come to an LSCB meeting and talk about their work.

(5) Helen Hyland made a request for reports to the LSCB to spell out acronyms in full.

(6) Ann Morecraft stated that when there was a MAPPAs panel meeting about an individual offender deemed to pose a medium to high risk, the Minutes when written up and debate needed to focus on implications for children. A training package was being put together with a DVD entitled "Protecting Jayne" to give agencies an idea of MAPPAs function and what it did. It was hoped this package would be ready by April 2007. There was concern about young offenders moving on to offend in a similar way when adults.

Chris Dimmelow responded that MAPPAs had been provided with a copy of the LSCB Business Plan. In addition, LSCB had put issues on their agenda including that their process should recognise the LSCB's responsibility around adults who pose a risk to children.

### **ACTION:**

**BOB BROWN TO PROVIDE CHRIS DIMMELOW WITH AN UPDATE ON PROGRESS.  
CONSIDERATION TO BE GIVING TO THIS FORMING AN AGENDA ITEM AT A FUTURE LSCB MEETING.**

(7) Martin Gladwin stated that as he was retiring with effect from March 2007, today was his last LSCB Meeting. He had enjoyed working together and meeting new people.

Anne Whiteley on behalf of the LSCB thanked Martin Gladwin for his loyal commitment to the Board and offered the Board's very best wishes for him for the future.

(8) Martin Spragg advised the Board that there was a new duty on Local Authorities to provide positive activities for young people. Within this, there was bound to be some safeguarding issues arising.

Martin Spragg further advised that the Youth Offending Service was putting together policies and procedures around the use of appropriate adults in interview situations which had a range of safeguarding issues. He hoped to be able to bring this to the next LSCB Meeting for signing off.

**18. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING AND CONFIRMED VENUES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE BOARD**

The next Board Meeting will take place on Friday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2007 at 9.30 a.m. at Buckfast Abbey.

Venues for future Meetings were confirmed as follows:

Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2007 9.30 a.m. The Committee Room, East Devon District Council Offices, The Knowle, Sidmouth.

Friday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2007 9.30 a.m. Buckfast Abbey.

Friday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2007 9.30 a.m. The Committee Room, East Devon District Council Offices, The Knowle, Sidmouth.

Signed ..... Dated .....  
Anne Whiteley  
Director of Children & Young People's Services

P:\JULIE\LSCB190107