

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	<b>KSCMP Executive Board Meeting</b>
<b>Date:</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> January 2020
<b>Time:</b>	2.30 – 4.30pm
<b>Location:</b>	Room 1.73, Sessions House
<b>Chaired by:</b>	Andrew Pritchard

### Members Attendance at Meeting

Name	Title	Representing	Attending	Apologies
Andrew Pritchard Chair	Chief Superintendent	Kent Police	✓	
Matt Dunkley	Corporate Director for Children, Young People and Education	KCC - CYPE	✓	
Paula Wilkins	Chief Nurse (CCGs)	Clinical Commissioning Groups	✓	
Sheridan Morrison	Designated Nurse	Clinical Commissioning Groups	Jennie Green	
Mark Janaway	Programme and Performance Manager	KSCMP	✓	
Chibuogu Nyananyo	Project Officer - Minutes	KSCMP	✓	

Also in attendance:

Name	Title	Representing	Attending	Apologies
Michael Thomas-Sam	Strategic Business Adviser - Social Care	KCC Strategic and Corporate Services	✓	
David Whittle	Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships and Corporate Assurance	KCC Strategic and Corporate Services	✓	
Sarah Hammond	Director, Integrated Children's Services (Social Work Lead)	KCC - CYPE	✓	

<p><b>1.</b></p>	<p><b>Welcome and Introductions</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed Partners to the Executive Board meeting and introductions were made.</p>
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes of Executive Board Meeting 30<sup>th</sup> October 2019</b></p> <p>The Minutes of the Executive Board meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> October 2019 were agreed as an accurate account of the meeting.</p> <p><b>Action Log:</b></p> <p><b>4.1 - Matt Dunkley to speak to Zena Cooke, KCC Corporate Director of Finance regarding the Independent Scrutineer post being within IR35. Matt Dunkley has sent in an update. Action closed.</b></p> <p><b>4.2 - Mark Janaway and Michael Thomas-Sam to advertise this vacancy after the Job Description has been amended. Mark Janaway has updated this. Action closed.</b></p> <p>6.1 – Chibuogu Nyananyo to scope available dates from Executive Board members’ PAs and arrange meetings in December and February 2020. <b>Updated by Chibuogu Nyananyo. Action closed.</b></p> <p>9.1 – Executive Board members to consider and put forward 4 or 5 key priority areas for discussion and consideration at the December Executive Board meeting. <b>Discussed at the Board Meeting as item 5 below. Action closed.</b></p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Partnership Team functions and resourcing – draft paper</b></p> <p>Presented by Michael Thomas-Sam and David Whittle.</p> <p>Mark Janaway and Chibuogu Nyananyo stepped away for this item.</p> <p>David Whittle (Director, SPRCA) and Michael Thomas-Sam (Strategic Business Adviser) were in attendance for this item.</p> <p>David Whittle introduced the report which set out the response to the direction given by Executive Board at the meeting on 30 October 2019, regarding the Partnership team functions and resourcing.</p> <p>David Whittle and Michael Thomas-Sam then responded to comments and questions from the Executive Board, including the following: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Executive Board expressed views on the proposed job titles for one of the positions. Assurance was given that final job titles including JD’s would be subject to the views expressed by the Executive Board and the consultation with staff.</li> <li>b) David Whittle confirmed to the Executive Board that the proposals would be delivered within the existing budget for staff.</li> <li>c) Andy Pritchard (Chair) enquired whether the proposals may result in staff having to undergo selection and recruitment process. David Whittle confirmed that KCC HR process will be</li> </ul>

	<p>followed.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the proposals regarding the structure for the Partnership Team be approved and consultation with staff should take place, subject to any final comments from the Executive Board within one week.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Independent Scrutineer – advertising and appointment</b></p> <p>Presented by Mark Janaway. Mark Janaway noted that Sarah Vaux is interviewing on behalf of Paula Wilkins, and asked if the Partners have decided on a format for the interviews, or if they would like him to re-circulate the CVs and Job descriptions.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard noted that when he and Paula Wilkins interviewed the candidates for a similar role in the Medway Children Safeguarding Partnership (MSCP), they asked questions of the interviewees.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested giving the candidates a topic, for example, a redacted Serious Case Review (SCR), and an hour’s notice to give a presentation on any lessons for the safeguarding partners.</p> <p>Paula Wilkins noted that this will not be feasible for the candidate coming in at 8.30am on a Monday morning. She suggested giving 24 hours notice.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond agreed with this idea, stating that the candidates can be informed to expect an email, and an automatic email is pre-set to go out 24hours before their interview (on a Sunday in this case). Sarah Hammond also added that the SCR used should have inter-agency issues, as a number of the recent SCRs are single-agency issues.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested giving the candidates an SCR and the Action Plan arising from it, and added that Sarah Hammond and Mark Janaway put forward an SCR. Sarah Hammond suggested Child D.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard asked if Sarah Hammond and Mark Janaway could also prepare proposed questions from the SCR.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley said an example of a question could be ‘how would you advise the Partnership?’ The presentation does not need to be PowerPoint, a ten-minute discussion would suffice.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard suggested 40 minutes for the interviews, and stated that he still has the questions from the MSCP interviews. Paula Wilkins reminded him that one of the candidates has already answered those questions as he interviewed at MSCP too.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested that the questions asked should be about things that are not in the candidates’ CV, like their experience, how they would add value to the Partnership, what they think is the main difference between this role and that of the Chair of the old Safeguarding Boards. Matt Dunkley also added that Partners could pick an issue, like risks to adolescents, and ask candidates to say what they think would be the challenges for Agencies to address that issue.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard suggested ‘what would you say our risks and opportunities are in Kent?’</p> <p>Paula Wilkins added, ‘what will your approach be?’ Andrew Pritchard suggested ‘give an example of when you managed a conflict situation’, ‘what would you consider to be success in this role in a year’s time?’</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <p><b>4.1 - Mark Janaway and Sarah Hammond are meeting next week and will come up with questions for the interviews, recommendations and Action Plan from an SCR.</b></p>

5.	<p><b>KSCMP Priorities – starting point for the Scrutiny and Assurance Framework (SAF)</b></p> <p>Andrew Pritchard noted that at the last meeting, Partners agreed to come back with suggestions on what the priorities should be for the Partnership. He passed round a document with the priorities agreed by MSCP, and asked Partners if they felt any of the points was relevant to Kent.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley stated that the agreed priorities need to be relatively few and genuine, to give the Partnership a chance to actually work on them.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard suggested 3 year priorities, but reviewed yearly.</p> <p>Based on the MSCP list of priorities,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Priority One: Contextual Safeguarding and trauma informed practice</li> </ol> <p>Andrew Pritchard felt that this topic influences a wide range of business for the partner agencies and other relevant agencies, and will be pertinent to their work.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested that the wording is changed, if it is to be adopted by KSCMP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Priority Two: Domestic Abuse</li> </ol> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested that Domestic Abuse (DA) should be narrowed down. The focus on DA should be on the response to the new DA Agenda and the impact of DA on children.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond felt that DA is a multi-agency issue - how do Agencies respond to these families other than making referrals to the Front Door? Paula Wilkins noted that the priority for Health is that Primary Care staff and GPs are not picking up DA. Jennie Green added that the assumption is that after a referral to the Front Door, practitioners have done their bit, and Integrated Children’s Service is holding the risk. She wondered where else other professionals can go with DA cases other than the Front Door.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond stated that the evidence from the Front Door is that all Agencies, including the Police, just send in referrals on anything that remotely resembles DA. Most of the referrals don’t meet the threshold, even for Early Help, so they are not accepted. Professionals need to recognise the degrees of risk in DA cases and not just making a referral for every DA incident. If, for example, a neighbour rings the Police because two members of a family are having a row, this results in a referral – as against when someone has been killed. These kinds of referrals are flooding the system to such an extent that cases that need real scrutiny are not being identified.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard stated that another focus could be identifying that DA is the most likely cause of trauma and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE), and putting in place a structure of early intervention. Mark Janaway stated that practitioners need to consider the history of the family and the cumulative impact this has. Recent SCRs reveal that DA has been bubbling for a long time in those families, but professionals looked at each incident as one-off incidents.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested that KSCMP develop a tiered system of responses and intervention to DA. For example, working with perpetrators should be focused on the risk to the child.</p> <p>Mark Janaway remarked that from the KSCMP Scrutiny and Assurance Framework (SAF), after a priority is identified, the first piece of research will be to find out good/bad practice, and what the difficulties are in addressing the issue. This will then be brought back to the Partners who will decide the next steps, and these will be used as the framework.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested rewording this priority to ‘Developing a better co-ordinated Inter-agency approach to our response to DA, and the impact on children’, and it should involve focus on the</p>

challenges faced by Agencies.

### 3. Priority Three: Neglect

Sarah Hammond stated that, in the last couple of years, the focus has been on adolescents and contextual safeguarding, and this seems to have been at the expense of younger children under 8 years. She suggested that Partners consider this cohort, especially children-in-need who do not meet the Social Work threshold, and their multi-agency response to Early Help.

Andrew Pritchard asked if this assertion is this backed up from SCRs, because the priorities need to be driven to some degree, by the themes identified in SCRs. Matt Dunkley replied that Child JD, which has just come in, involves a lot of these issues.

Paula Wilkins added that a recent theme from SCRs has been identifying the role of fathers, their background and history. Could this be a sub-theme of neglect? Mark Janaway stated that it also links in to DA.

### 4. Priority Four: Effective Early Help

Matt Dunkley remarked that Effective Early Help is pretty much a single-agency issue. Andrew Pritchard reminded Partners that Medway have just been given recommendations from a recent Inspection, and this is reflected in the agreed priorities. Paula Wilkins agreed, stating that the MSCP Executive Partners had to weave in the recommendations the authority was given, into the priorities for the Partnership.

Matt Dunkley stated that the test for KSCMP should be whether or not the priority is a fairly single-agency, or multi-agency issue.

### 5. Effective Partnerships

Matt Dunkley stated that he agreed with this as a priority for KSCMP, the Partners need to work out how to work together.

Matt Dunkley suggested that the Priorities need to be streamlined so that they can be broken down into DA stream, Neglect stream, and the Effectiveness of the Partnership.

Andrew Pritchard suggested including the Voice of the Child to the list of Priorities, Matt Dunkley replied that this can be included in Contextual Safeguarding.

Next Steps:

Andrew Pritchard suggested that Mark Janaway use the above points to draw up a Thematic Paper on the KSCMP Priorities. Matt Dunkley noted that as part of the process, Mark Janaway should speak to the key Agencies. Paula Wilkins suggested that this Paper is discussed at the Health Safeguarding Group (HSG) meeting. Mark Janaway added that the District Safeguarding Leads (DSL) meeting is coming up too, as well as the Education Safeguarding Forum and they will be given the opportunity to make some input.

**Action:**

**5.1 – Mark Janaway to draft a Priority Focus Paper for the next Executive Board meeting.**

6.	<p><b>Working Together 2018 (Chapter 4: Rapid Reviews, Local Safeguarding Practice Reviews, notifications to National Child Safeguarding Practice Panel)</b></p> <p>Presented by Matt Dunkley and Sarah Hammond.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley informed Partners that just before Christmas, he received a phone call from Mark Gurrey from the National Panel, who wanted to discuss Serious Incident notifications from KCC. Mark Gurrey gave him a heads-up to say that Kent was notifying the National Panel about things which they should not be notifying them of, and in some instances the Authority was not clearly evidencing how it was responding to the case.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley noted that he had not fully embedded the changes from the old KSCB to KSCMP, and that different members of the National Panel have said contradictory things, for example, Mark Gurrey was asking why certain cases are referred to the Panel, but another member of the Panel directed the Authority to notify the Panel.</p> <p>A lot of things have changed, Reviews are for learning between Agencies and not a public right to know. Matt Dunkley stated that the decision about whether or not to notify National Panel is solely his responsibility, and the threshold for that is death, or serious harm and that abuse and/or neglect are suspected.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond noted that some of the language used in Working Together 2018 (WT) itself is blurry, and directions from the National Panel are sometimes contradictory to WT. For a notification to be made, two things need to come together, firstly, a serious incident (meaning the child has died or has been seriously harmed, AND secondly, neglect or abuse is suspected or known. For example, Child KRH who is the transgender young person that attempted suicide, does not meet the threshold as abuse or neglect were not suspected. This is not to say that Partners should not consider a local review, but the National Panel should not have been notified about the case.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley remarked that he will not be notifying the National Panel of cases like this, in the future.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond stated that WT provides the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If a Looked after child (LAC) dies, regardless of whether there is abuse or neglect, the Local Authority should make an Ofsted notification.</li> <li>2. If a child who lives in Kent, or usually lives in Kent, is seriously harmed outside England AND there was abuse or neglect, Matt Dunkley should notify the Partnership, and Ofsted.</li> <li>3. The Local Authority has a duty to review where abuse or neglect has occurred, AND the child or young person has died or is seriously harmed, for local learning. For example, Child JD meets the criteria for a Review.</li> </ol> <p>The Partners can decide to hold a review even where there is no notification to the National Panel, but once a Rapid Review meeting is held, the National Panel has to be notified of its decision, and the outcome of the review. The minutes of the Rapid Review meeting also has to be sent to all the Partners.</p> <p>Mark Janaway noted that the KSCMP Business unit has not notified the National Panel of any cases that were not already sent in by Integrated Children’s Services (ICS). 10 of the notifications as outlined in the embedded document for the next item of the Agenda were sent in by ICS.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley stated that he was told by Mark Gurrey that these notifications are filed by the National Panel, and Ofsted requests these files before there is an inspection.</p>

Sarah Hammond added that some members of the KSCMP Rapid Review Group are not Safeguarding Partners, and proposed that they should not be there. The process can include collating information from relevant Agencies, but the Rapid Review decision should be that of Partners.

Sarah Hammond also stated that some cases have gone to the Rapid Review Group which should not have gone, and suggested that Partners agree on a decision-making mechanism to decide whether or not a case should go to the Rapid Review Group. She also proposed that the Rapid Review Group have a rotating Chair of the Partners, like it is with the Executive Board. She noted that WT allows Safeguarding Partners to make these arrangements.

Paula Wilkins wanted to know who the health representatives are on the Rapid Review Group. Mark Janaway replied that it is the Designated Nurses and Designated Doctors.

Matt Dunkley stated that the Rapid Review is to consider the information collated from relevant Agencies, and decide whether or not it meets the threshold for a review.

Mark Janaway remarked that this is what the Rapid Review Group, as presently constituted does, and suggested that those cases, which Matt Dunkley does not notify the National Panel about, are not called Rapid Reviews.

Matt Dunkley replied that they can still be called Rapid Reviews, but they need to come back to the Partners. He proposed a 24 hour turn-around.

Sarah Hammond remarked that if they are called Rapid Reviews then the Local Authority has to notify the National Panel as soon as the meeting is held. To this end, the Partners can decide to change the name.

Matt Dunkley stated that an example of a case which should not have gone to the Rapid Review Group is LP. It was a case of a concealed pregnancy, and father is an offender. LP is in care and has recovered, it was a single agency issue with liberi being down. There could have been a meeting to share information (by whatever name it is called), but the National Panel did not need to be notified.

Mark Janaway replied that this was the outcome of the Rapid Review meeting, and the decision will be sent to the National Panel on Monday.

Sarah Hammond noted that a notification should not have been sent to the National Panel in the LP case, and internally the process has been changed within ICS. But there were two cases which the National Panel found out about and rang the ICS Safeguarding Unit, insisting that they send in a notification. That practice needs to stop.

Andrew Pritchard stated that these meetings need to be distinct, because there is a statutory process for Rapid Reviews. He suggested that these types of meetings be called Information-sharing meetings, and it can be clarified from Mark Gurrey, how the National Panel found out about those two cases.

Paula Wilkins stated that this point needs to be clear, because the contract with the Designated Doctors is for Rapid Reviews. They might not attend Information-sharing meetings because they are not paid for it.

Michael Thomas-Sam suggested that there needs to be a review of the process, Sarah Hammond agreed with this view.

Matt Dunkley summarised these points as follows:

1. He makes the decisions on notifications
  2. Partners need to agree on what to do about those cases that the National Panel will not be notified about, he delegated his role in this decision-making process to Sarah Hammond.
- Andrew Pritchard proposed Coretta Hine, and Paula Wilkins will take this as an action to get

	<p>two Designates to be the Health representatives in this process.</p> <p>3. This process will be confirmed at the next Executive Board meeting.</p> <p>Mark Janaway stated that the only members of the Rapid Review Group that this new arrangement would affect are the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) and the National Probation Service (NPS).</p> <p>He added that Partners need to decide whether Education is represented by ICS or The Education People (TEP). There was direction from the National Panel that they want Education formally represented on the Rapid Review Group.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond stated that TEP can contribute to the rapid review, but not attend the decision-making meeting.</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <p>6.1- Mark Janaway to draft an outline/flowchart of the proposed notification, Rapid Review and Information Sharing process.</p> <p>6.2 - Paula Wilkins to propose two Designates to be the Health representatives in the decision-making for cases where there will be no notification to the National Panel.</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Practice Review Update</b></p> <p>Presented by Mark Janaway. This update is to keep Partners apprised of all the work that KSCMP is engaged in, and will therefore be on the Agenda for every Executive Board meeting.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley remarked that the feedback from Mark Gurrey was that notifications from Kent is very high, and that the National Panel received 21 cases from Kent in 18 months.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard suggested that Mark Gurrey inform the Partners how many of these cases should not have been put forward.</p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>KSCMP Budget – initial discussion</b></p> <p>Presented by Mark Janaway.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard noted that the broad staffing cost is static, and within considerations. Assuming the other elements of the expenditure stay the same (like training and SCR costs), the Partnership needs to raise £100,000 to cover the budget going forward.</p> <p>Paula Wilkins asked who the relevant Agencies are. Mark Janaway replied that it is Kent Fire and Rescue, CRC, NPS, and District Councils. Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CAFCASS) wrote to say they were stopping their contribution, but that is negligible.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard suggested that Partners push for the continuance of Relevant Agency contributions. Matt Dunkley remarked that the new arrangements mean some of these Agencies will not sit on the sub-groups, so they might not want to contribute.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard stated that assuming relevant Agency contributions raises £30,000, how does the</p>

	<p>Partnership raise the balance of £100,000? Mark Janaway replied that in other Partnerships across the country, the Local Authority carries the larger part of the Partnership costs. In Kent, this this will need to be discussed with David Coburn, KCC Head of Paid Service.</p> <p>Michael Thomas-Sam stated that David Whittle will be meeting with David Coburn about the non-staffing costs. The trade-off, however, is that contributions from Partners is to fund the staffing element.</p> <p>Paula Wilkins stated that the health contribution will remain the same for the next year.</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <p>8.1 – David Whittle to meet with David Coburn regarding the non-staffing costs, Matt Dunkley to give Partners an update during the Independent Scrutineer interviews.</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Presented by Mark Janaway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation, sign off and publication of Local Child Safeguarding Practice reviews</li> </ul> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested that Partners are involved in the sign off, but they should be briefed by their staff.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard summarised that there would be no presentation by the Independent Author to the Executive Board, Partners will take briefs by their staff, discuss the report at Board meetings and this can be fed back to the Independent Author.</p> <p>Mark Janaway suggested Coretta Hine reports to Andrew Pritchard, Kevin Kasaven to Matt Dunkley, and Sheridan Morrison to Paula Wilkins.</p> <p>Mark Janaway also stated that the Partners need to consider the proportionality of the reviews undertaken. In KRH for example, the Rapid Review Group decided that the issues identified in that case warranted a more detailed review. Sarah Hammond replied that to her knowledge, there was no abuse or neglect suspected, and that case should not even have gone to the Rapid Review Group because it is not a Safeguarding review. The Rapid Review Group, however, felt that due to the circumstances that had not been raised in any other case, (transgender, high level mental health concerns and the young person as a young carer), this still warranted a local review to identify local learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of Executive Board meetings</li> </ul> <p>Mark Janaway stated that the shadow Executive agreed that Minutes of Board meetings would be published.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Minutes would be published after being signed off at the next Board meeting, and in some cases redacted if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role of Lay Members</li> </ul> <p>Andrew Pritchard felt that they add value, Paula Wilkins agreed with this view. Andrew Pritchard suggested that Lay members continue to add value to the sub-groups.</p> <p>Agreed by Partners.</p>

- The Association of Safeguarding Partners (TASP)

Mark Janaway stated that this has been a useful forum in the past, and a more formal way to find out what other Safeguarding Partnerships are doing.

Matt Dunkley disagreed with KSCMP being members, stating that the point of the new arrangement is so that Safeguarding Partnerships can all be very different. If TASP is associated with the old groups, it might be a bit focused on the old Safeguarding Boards.

Partners agreed that KSCMP would not join TASP at the moment.

- Sub-Group Chairs' Attendance at Executive Board meetings

Agreed.

Sarah Hammond raised another point, stating that she was part of the Steering group, and the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the working group on Exploitation is not what was agreed to be their main function, which should be the identification of emerging themes. The TOR is simply a replication of the old Threats and Vulnerabilities Group, but it needs to be a horizon-scanning function. Herself and Mark Janaway will be meeting next week to review this.

Paula Wilkins asked if the TOR was agreed by Partners. Mark Janaway replied that it was, and they were was signed off at the last Executive Board meeting.

Mark Janaway asked who will orchestrate the work when issues have been identified? The Scrutiny and Challenge Group should be pulling these together and feeding up to the Partners.

Sarah Hammond replied that this group should be doing it, and suggested that the TOR for that group is revisited, in line with what was agreed at the Steering Group.

Mark Janaway remarked that the Exploitation group is comprised of Kent, Medway, children and adults. Sarah Hammond suggested that the Exploitation group can continue as it is, but KSCMP needs to create an additional sub-group to identify emerging themes.

**Actions:**

9.1 – Chibuogu Nyananyo to publish the Executive Board meeting minutes on the KSCMP website

9.2 - Mark Janaway and Sarah Hammond to meet to draft TOR for the Emerging Themes Sub Group.

**10.**

**Dates of future meetings**

- 21<sup>st</sup> February 2020 (2.30 – 4.30) Room 1.73, Sessions House
- 7<sup>th</sup> April 2020 (10.00 – 12.00) Room 1.73, Sessions House
- 9<sup>th</sup> July 2020 (10.00 – 12.00) Room 1.73, Sessions House
- 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 (10.00 – 12.00) Room 1.73, Sessions House



--	--