

Minutes of the Herefordshire Safeguarding Partner's Board
Wednesday 18 December 2019 1.00pm – 2.30pm
Mordiford Room, Plough Lane, Hereford

Present:

Liz Murphy Sue Thomas	Independent Chair Superintendent, Local Policing Commander for Herefordshire, West Mercia Police
Chris Baird Ellen Footman	Director for Children & Families, Herefordshire Council Head of Safeguarding, Designated Nurse for Safeguarding Children and Adults, NHS Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group

In attendance:

Ed Hughes (minutes) Philippa Granthier Karen Wright	Business Support Co-ordinator, Safeguarding Business Unit Interim Business Manager, Safeguarding Business Unit Director of Public Health, Herefordshire Council (attended for item)
---	---

Item		Action
	Welcome	
	<p>The Chair welcomed all to the December Herefordshire Safeguarding Partner's Board meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed to change the agenda order to move Item 3 (Business Unit proposal and budget 20-21) to the end of the meeting.</p>	
1.	Minutes of the previous meeting, action log and matters arising	
	<p><u>Minutes</u> The minutes of the previous meeting on 23 October were approved as an accurate record, CB requesting the following amendment on Page 2:</p> <p>LM sought clarity around governance; the partners advised that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The children and young people's partnership has specific groups and activity that address both children with disabilities and early help. <p>Should be changed to:</p> <p>LM sought clarity around governance; the partners advised that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The children and young people's partnership has specific groups and activity that address both children with disabilities and early help. The early help group is an operational group, not a strategic group, although a more strategic group is being established. <p><u>Action log</u> Members considered the following outstanding actions from the action log: (updates in bold)</p> <p>Action No 15 (23.10.19 ref 4.1) <i>Finance / Funding - PG to draft letter, and pass to Chief Executive for signature, before circulating to partners.</i></p>	

	<p>Draft letters agreed with Alistair Neill, Chief Executive, but PG has chased as there appeared to be hold up in getting letters out. PG to let EH know once letters have been sent.</p> <p>Action No 19 (23.10.19 ref 7.2) <i>Development & Practice Group - Key members of the Development and Practice Group to update the neglect strategy and accompanying action plan virtually, thus avoiding the need for an additional meeting.</i> Lindsay MacHardy will be the lead for neglect, and will work on this with key members of the Development and Practice Group.</p> <p>Action No 22 (18.11.19 ref 2.2) <i>Business Plan - It was agreed that PG will lead on the production of the new plan.</i> The deadline for this to be revised to March 2020.</p> <p>Action No 23 (18.11.19 ref 2.3) Neglect strategy - CB to identify a lead for neglect. Completed – Lindsay MacHardy will be the lead for neglect.</p> <p>Action No 24 (18.11.19 ref 2.4) Engagement - Development & Practice Group to create a framework on ‘engagement of children & young people’ to include what is already in existence (existing groups and mechanisms) and further recommendations as to what else should be in place that is purposeful. Ongoing – The final version needs to go to the next Q&E meeting on 16 March for approval.</p> <p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>None</p>	
2a.	<p>Performance & Scrutiny - Feedback from Quality & Effectiveness Group</p>	
	<p>LM presented feedback from the last Quality & Effectiveness Group, which she chaired for the first time, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance • Effectiveness of the safeguarding system • Collaborative working • Learning system • What needs to happen <p>Late papers – It was agreed that in future any papers received after the seven day deadline set by the Safeguarding Business Unit would not be included on the agenda.</p> <p>This will apply to all meetings which come under the Safeguarding Partners Board. Any instances of late papers from Local Authority, Police or Health staff shall be escalated in advance to CB, ST or EF so they can take action to secure the outstanding papers</p>	

<p>2.1</p>	<p>LADO – The Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) service is working well. LM asked whether health staff about which there are concerns are routinely referred to the LADO service and this was not known.</p> <p>Action - EF agreed to follow this up (see action 3.6)</p> <p>Priority areas –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thresholds e.g. only 24% of contacts progressed to referral in Quarter 2. What happened to other 76%?, 51% of S47s NFA'd? • Is there an EH pathway - and if not how does this impact on volume of Police referrals which account for 50% of referrals • Why is EA the biggest category of CPPs? • Outcome focused plans/core group functioning <p>It was pointed out that the MASH referral form (MARF) has a box for 'Level 3' as well as a box for 'Level 4'. Not clear whether any MARF should be classed as a 'contact' if Level 3 is indicated here.</p> <p>It was proposed and agreed at the last Q&E meeting that members would participate in a 'walk the floor' session once a year.</p> <p>Shared understanding of Levels of Need and risk is a challenge. Where cases 'sit' is a key issue.</p> <p>MASH Governance group - The MASH Governance group has potential issues with governance and reporting which need to be addressed, as well as possible gaps in staffing / representation, including at the MASH itself.</p> <p>Issues were raised about the level of health staffing at the MASH. It has now been addressed, although there are differing opinions about whether sufficient operational cover was in place at all times. The staffing issue was raised at MASH Governance Group by the MASH manager. In addition, education resource in the MASH had not been operating at the agreed level.</p> <p>The MASH Governance group should resolve any operational difficulties and escalate effectively if required.</p> <p>Members agreed that the MASH Governance Group needed a more robust governance and reporting mechanism. In future it will report to the Quality & Effectiveness Group and also will be included on future agendas of this meeting under 'messages to/from partnership groups' alongside the other groups.</p> <p>Representation from Voluntary & Education sectors - Voluntary / Community Sector representation is something that needs further consideration. Are they meant to be at the meeting to represent the whole sector, or just to act as a voluntary sector 'voice'?</p> <p>It may be more effective to try and engage effectively with existing voluntary sector forums.</p>	<p>EF</p>
------------	--	-----------

<p>2.2</p>	<p>Educational Representation is another challenge. They do attend meetings but cannot “speak” on behalf of the whole sector. One comment was that they feel that they are only contacted when they do something wrong.</p> <p>As with voluntary sector, the education sector have established groups and networks including Designated Safeguarding Leads meetings and Secondary Heads Association meetings.</p> <p>Multi-agency audit programme –</p> <p>It was suggested that the current audit tool is too process focussed; feedback had been given by LM to address this however this did not result in the required changes. Will now need to be looked at after the Jan/Feb 2020 audit.</p> <p>MASH referrals –</p> <p>Are partner agencies routinely reviewing the outcomes of referrals? This is not clear. They need to look what they are submitting, especially those that did not progress, to close the learning loop. It was suggested that the MASH governance group could consider auditing some unsuccessful referrals on a multi-agency basis.</p> <p>Partners could consider a pathway across level 3 and level 4, for all support not just MASH. LM pointed out that there seems to be no training specifically on thresholds, though it is covered in the Working Together training course.</p> <p>It was pointed out that MASH is to be reconfigured.</p> <p>Early Help Referrals –</p> <p>ST outlined the process for referrals in the Police. All relevant Police information goes into the Police Harm Assessment Unit (HAU). The HAU then pass everything to the MASH. MASH then pass anything at Level 3 through to Early Help.</p> <p>There should be a pathway directly from the HAU to Early Help.</p> <p>Dataset / Risk Register.-</p> <p>LM will be facilitating a multi-agency workshop in January that will produce a multi-agency dataset as well as updating the risk register.</p> <p>Signs of Safety –</p> <p>Signs of Safety, which is an innovative strengths-based, safety-organised approach to child protection casework is being adopted by Herefordshire Council. It will be referenced at the multi-agency partnership summit taking place in February before further multi-agency events start from March 2020.</p> <p>The following actions were agreed:</p> <p>Action – Early Help Strategic Group to lead on reworking the pathways, arrangements and thresholds, in conjunction with the Development & Practice Group (CB to pass to Chair of Strategic Group).</p>	<p>CB</p>
------------	---	-----------

2.3	Action - MASH Governance group to report in to the Quality & Effectiveness Group (CB to pass to Chair of MASH Governance Group).	CB
2.4	Action – Q&E Group Terms of Reference to be updated accordingly	PG
2.5	Action - Review how the Safeguarding Partnership engages with the education sector and voluntary / community sector	PG
2b.	Performance & Scrutiny – Report on CDOP Process	
2.6	<p>EF presented the report on the new CDOP process, which has aligned the process across Herefordshire and Worcestershire. Confirmation was provided that the new arrangements had been signed off within the 2 statutory child death partners’ governance arrangements. Operational aspects of the process such as notification have not changed.</p> <p>Currently all work is going through the Safeguarding Business Unit, and it was assumed by Public Health and CCG that this would continue. PG reported that the expectations on the SBU have not been made clear, despite requesting clarity, and it appears that agreement about continued involvement of the SBU by Public Health staff was assumed, rather than explicitly requested and agreed.</p> <p>It was pointed out that future plans for the SBU do not include capacity for CDOP activity. This is because CDOP no longer is a statutory requirement of the partnership, but of the CCG and LA. It was agreed that future pathways and resources for CDOP need to be joined up with the agreed future plans for the SBU.</p> <p>ACTION – EF/KW/PG to follow up outside the meeting</p> <p>The Chair queried the involvement of Herefordshire child death partners as the TOR circulated only had Worcestershire logos.</p> <p>In future, themes/leads from CDOP/CDR would come back to the partners via the Joint case Review group (including if related to child safeguarding practice reviews).</p>	EF/KW/ PG
3.	SCR Report Formal Sign Off	
4.	Approval	
	<p><u>Partnership Summit Agenda</u></p> <p>It was agreed that PG would circulate the amended Partnership Summit Agenda to members for comment.</p>	

	<p><u>Proposal for Logo</u></p> <p>Members discussed the draft 'new safeguarding arrangements' logo which had been produced by the Council design team and asked for further work to be undertaken.</p>	
5.	Messages to / from partnership groups	
	<p>Quality and Effectiveness Group – Feedback was discussed earlier in the meeting.</p> <p>Development & Practice Group - Lindsay MacHardy will be the lead for neglect, and will work on this with key members of the Development and Practice Group. The group will also need to look again at the MARF, the threshold document and the levels of need</p> <p>Safeguarding in Education Group – Partners will be reviewing how the Safeguarding Partnership engages with the education sector more effectively.</p> <p>Safeguarding in Early Years Group – Partners wish to explore how assurance from the early years sector on safeguarding arrangements can be provided.</p> <p>Joint Case Review Group – Partners requested a thematic analysis of learning from SCRs to inform business planning.</p> <p>The MASH Governance Group will be added to this section from the next meeting onwards.</p>	
6.	Any Other Business	
7.	<p><u>Business Unit proposal and 2020-21 Budget</u></p> <p>Business Unit resources were discussed alongside the functions of the Partnership. Further discussion is needed with Adult and CSP stakeholders -PG will take this forward.</p> <p>In the interim, PG will circulate no later than 23/12/19, the cash contribution required from the three partners to fund the arrangement that partners expressed their support for in the meeting.</p> <p>Partners will confirm by 10/1/20 when they will present a paper to their organisation on securing the necessary contribution to the budget for 2020-21.</p>	

Date of next meeting – 31 January 2020.