

Meeting Title:	KSCMP Executive Board Meeting
Date:	21 st February 2020
Time:	14:30 – 16.30
Location:	Room 1.73, Sessions House
Chaired by:	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	Sarah Hammond	✓
Paula Wilkins	Chief Nurse (CCGs)	Clinical Commissioning Groups	✓	
Sheridan Morrison	Designated Nurse	Clinical Commissioning Groups		✓
Rory Patterson	Independent Scrutineer	KSCMP	✓	
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		✓
Neil Mitchell		(Innovation Unit - CYPE)	✓	

No.	Agenda Item
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting and introductions were made.</p> <p>Apologies were noted from Matt Dunkley, Sheridan Morrison and David Whittle.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed Rory Patterson to KSCMP, and noted that his occupying a similar Independent Scrutineer role at Medway Safeguarding Children Partnership (MSCP) will be helpful because some Agencies work across both Medway and Kent.</p>
2.	<p>Minutes of Executive Board Meeting 10th January 2020</p> <p>The Minutes of the Executive Board Meeting on 10th January were agreed as an accurate account of the meeting.</p> <p>Action Log:</p> <p>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. Completed. Action closed.</p> <p>5.1 – Mark Janaway to draft a Priority Focus Paper for the next Executive Board meeting. To be discussed as item 4 below. Action closed.</p> <p>6.1- Mark Janaway to draft an outline/flowchart of the proposed notification, Rapid Review and Information Sharing process. To be discussed as item 5 below. Action closed.</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. Completed. Action closed.</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. Completed. Action closed.</p> <p>9.1 – Chibuogu Nyananyo to publish the Executive Board meeting Minutes on the KSCMP website. Completed. Action closed.</p> <p>9.2 - Mark Janaway and Sarah Hammond to meet to draft TOR for the Emerging Themes Sub Group. Discharged – left to Mark and Sarah to finalise. Action closed.</p>
3.	<p>Transforming Child Protection Project</p> <p>This item was a late addition to the Agenda following a request from Sarah Hammond, after approval from the Chair. It was presented by Neil Mitchell (Innovation Unit - CYPE).</p> <p>Sarah Hammond explained that it is important for partners attending Child Protection (CP) Conferences to know and understand the proposed changes.</p> <p>She explained that this project will change the way CP Conferences work and how reports, minutes and plans would be accessed by staff and parents through a 'Portal'. Sarah Hammond requested that partners publicise the new project within their respective agencies. The overwhelming feedback from parents and young people to Integrated Children's Services (ICS) is that they would like to be able to see</p>

their CP Plan and engage with it. Therefore, the aim of this project is to have better engaged families and a more effective CP Plan.

Paula Wilkins agreed, noting that this should be rolled out to cover other meetings, , because having records of the meetings is so much better than paper copies.

Sarah Hammond replied that the ambition of the Directorate of Children’s Services is to replicate this across several meetings, but CP Conferences are their biggest cohort.

Rory Patterson asked if ICS intend to use the Business Support differently. He also wanted to know how the records from CP Conferences would be used in the case records.

Sarah Hammond replied that the Business Support would be used in other ways. There will be a bridge between Liberi, (the ICS case recording system), and this CP portal. The advice from the IT department is to have this portal tested alongside Liberi for some months, but ultimately, Liberi will be the source of information for every child. A new portal for referrals is also about to be introduced, so that when partners send in referrals, it automatically populates the first part of Liberi.

Neil Mitchell added that data will only be held in both the CP portal and Liberi temporarily, all information will be permanently held in Liberi.

Andrew Pritchard remarked that there are a lot of other partnerships, like the Child Death Overview Partnership (CDOP), Community Safety Partnerships, Child Protection Units, which use different portals and systems. Agencies could end up being involved with multiple portals using different platforms and providers, who then owns the information?

Paula Wilkins added that a major issue for Health staff is that they cannot access Kent County Council (KCC) systems.

Neil Mitchell replied that feedback from the test users was that they do not mind using different portals, but they felt that they needed a single platform that showed all their open CP cases. The CP portal also provides access for professionals that are outside of KCC.

Sarah Hammond stated that a major reason why the change started with CP Conferences is that this area is one of the safest places where there is no argument about information-sharing. All parties agree that information-sharing at that point is critical, and there will be no issues with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

In summary, Sarah Hammond stated that this presentation is an opportunity to show partners what plans are in place to replace written minutes, and secure an agreement in principle that ICS can go ahead to implement this new system.

Andrew Pritchard replied that Kent Police will support the new portal, but reiterated the need to be cautious about information being held on many platforms. He noted that Kent Police use different platforms in working with the Home Office and Social Care for example, besides their own Police systems.

Sarah Hammond stated that she would like to have contact details of key staff from partner agencies, so that ICS can collaborate with them and review the feasibility of this portal from a practice perspective.

Action:

3.1 – Partners to send names of key staff who will take part in feasibility reviews, both IT and operation wise, to Sarah Hammond.

4. Partnership Team functions and resourcing – update

	<p><i>Michael Thomas-Sam (Strategic Business Adviser) was in attendance for this item. Apology from David Whittle was noted.</i></p> <p>Michael Thomas-Sam informed the Executive Board that formal consultation about the proposed Partnership Team commenced on 27 January 2020 and a staff briefing meeting was held on 28 January 2020. This gave staff the opportunity to seek clarification on issues relating to the consultation. The staff impacted by the proposed restructure had requested an additional time to respond to the consultation because of prior commitments. In line with the HR advise, the consultation period was extended and would now close on 27 February 2020 instead of the original date of 17 February 2020. The expectation is that this will have provided staff with a reasonable opportunity to respond to the consultation.</p> <p>Michael Thomas-Sam responded to questions and comments from the Executive Board, including the following: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Andrew Pritchard enquired whether staff had raised several points for clarification. Michael confirmed that there had not been any more than the expected queries at this stage, although the full extent of this will not be known until the consultation closes. b) Paula Wilkins and Andrew Pritchard queried whether an assessment had been made about potential disruption to the business support to the Executive Board as a result of the consultation. Michael assured that the Executive Board that David Whittle had a contingency plan in place which will ensure continuity of business support to the Executive Board should it be necessary. c) Andy Pritchard sought confirmation that the Executive Board will be informed about outcome of the consultation. Michael confirmed that David Whittle will inform the Executive Board of the outcome of the consultation in early March. <p>The Executive Board noted the update on the ongoing consultation about the proposed Partnership Team.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>KSCMP Priorities - starting point for the SAF</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard noted that the Partnership's Priorities were agreed at the last meeting.</p> <p>Mark Janaway explained that this paper is a more detailed explanation of what was agreed, to aid Partners in determining the order in which the priorities should be addressed.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard wanted clarity on whether it was agreed that Trauma Informed Practice and Contextual Safeguarding should be deemed to be cross-cutting, as stated in the embedded paper.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond suggested that the Lived experience/Voice of the child can be a cross-cutting priority, but there is a risk that work with the most-at-risk adolescents will be limited if Trauma Informed Practice and Contextual Safeguarding is deemed to be a cross-cutting theme.</p> <p>This was agreed by the Partners.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard suggested that the Voice of the Child can be subsumed into Partnership Working, so partners can hold each other to account on that issue. This can then be a cross-cutting theme.</p> <p>Rory Patterson noted that one of the issues raised in the Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI) report on intra-familial sexual abuse was that this area was not prioritised by Agencies.</p> <p>Mark Janaway stated that there is some overlap between the findings in JTAI report and the</p>

recommendations from Child I SCR. The KSCMP Business Unit will review the overlap between the two, and this can be picked up by the Scrutiny and Challenge function. Mark Janaway added that although Intra-familial sexual abuse is not a Priority, this review is an acknowledgment by the Partnership that work is being done on the findings from the JTAI report. If gaps are discovered during the review, then this might need to be put forward.

Sarah Hammond added that circumstances such as this should be included in the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the Emerging Themes sub-group.

Paula Wilkins suggested that Partnership Working should be a cross-cutting theme alongside whatever priority is agreed, and suggested Domestic Abuse(DA) as the first priority.

Sarah Hammond agreed with DA, stating that ICS need to start working with the adults in the family – they are trying to embed ‘the adult facing workforce’ into their practice. She suggested that the Partnership focus on the early signs of DA, and how Agencies respond to the ‘fallings out’ between partners that could potentially become serious DA incidents.

Andrew Pritchard replied that, from a Kent Police perspective, there has been a lot of awareness raised about the subject of DA, but not enough in developing Contextual Safeguarding.

Sarah Hammond agreed, noting that there has been a significant reduction in the number of children who have been arrested following domestic incidents, and ICS interprets this to mean that police officers now have a better understanding that these are not bad children, even though the situation needs to be diffused.

Andrew Pritchard stated that Contextual Safeguarding also includes vulnerability around Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), and although DA has the biggest impact on Kent Police in terms of demand, there is a lot of work going on in that area.

Michael Thomas-Sam wanted to know what priority the partners would prefer, from a risk-based approach.

Sarah Hammond replied that, based on risk to the system, ICS would probably prefer DA, but based on risk to the children, it would be Contextual Safeguarding.

Paula Wilkins reminded partners that considering one theme as first priority over another does not mean that it is a greater priority, the sequencing is only because of capacity issues.

Andrew Pritchard advised that DA be put back for a few months because a lot of work already going on in that space, but he is unsure of how co-ordinated partners are in Contextual Safeguarding. The level of intelligence within the Police around CSE, for example, has reduced. There is no information from education settings or health agencies, and very little from ICS. This is probably because focus shifted to other issues like county lines.

Mark Janaway stated that the Partnership is in the process of relaunching the Exploitation Champions and is considering making this more district based, as opposed to county based. This would translate into more frequent local meetings, and maybe an annual county-wide meeting.

It was agreed that Trauma Informed Practice/Contextual Safeguarding should be considered as the first priority, Neglect as second, and Domestic Abuse as third.

Mark Janaway remarked that the Partnership will need commitment from staff for focus groups and other work on these issues.

Action:

5.1 – KSCMP Business Unit to review the findings from the JTAI report against the key learning and recommendations from Child I SCR

6. Practice Review Update (including the proposed Practice Improvement Framework)

Mark Janaway presented this item, stating that it is an update on where things stand with the Practice Reviews. A number of outstanding cases are still on hold due to criminal investigations, but the dissemination of the learning is ongoing.

Sarah Hammond stated that historically, partners could bring notifications to the multi-agency case review group, but with the new rapid review process, the function of the Practice Review Group needs to be clear. She suggested that this should be an Agenda item for the next Executive Board meeting, so that partners can discuss the differences between the activities and outcome of a rapid review, and the criteria for bringing cases to the Practice Review Group, which is where agencies come together to determine if a case warrants undertaking a Local Child Safeguarding Practice Review (LSCPR).

Mark Janaway replied that this difference is outlined in the amended Practice Improvement Framework embedded in the Agenda.

Sarah Hammond stated that all the work to be done in case JD for example, will be overseen by the Rapid Review Group.

Mark Janaway explained that if the remit of the Rapid Review Group was to oversee reviews undertaken following a Rapid Review, the Rapid Review Group would have to meet more regularly.

Sarah Hammond remarked that what needs clarity are the cases that partners bring, which do not result in notifications to the National Panel.

Mark Janaway replied that, following an extra-ordinary Rapid Review Group meeting, chaired by Sarah Hammond, it was agreed that the process would be for those cases to go to a Practice Review Group for discussion. This is included in the updated Practice Improvement Framework. These cases can then be reported either to the Rapid Review Group or the Executive Board.

Rory Patterson queried why a review will be undertaken if the Partnership is not required to report it to the National Panel. He suggested that the focus should be on doing what is required right, and if any issues arise with partners then this can be addressed. If the Practice Review Group is being set up to fix a problem, then that problem should be addressed directly.

Sarah Hammond stated that in a current LCSPR case, she has sight of the ICS' Individual Management Report (IMR) and she does not know what value this has added. The Partnership did not need a finger-pointing investigating and review meeting to acknowledge the learning from that case.

Michael Thomas-Sam noted that, although the partnership has moved from one system to another, the mindset seems to still be of the old system. Perhaps practice has not changed because Partners have not informed staff about what is expected of them.

Sarah Hammond remarked that the requirements of the new arrangements are tricky enough as it is. If there is to be a Practice Review Group, they must have agreed TOR.

Rory Patterson read from the Guidance to Working Together (WT) 2018. He then asked what, if any arrangements Safeguarding Partners have made to identify Serious Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews. He noted that the risk with having a Practice Review Group is that it will be a parallel process.

Paula Wilkins noted that cases that do not meet the criteria for a Rapid Review need to be triaged in some way.

It was agreed that this should be discussed at the first Practice Review Group meeting on 19 March, after which it will be discussed as an agenda item at the next Executive Board meeting.

	<p>Action:</p> <p>6.1 – The TOR for the Practice Review Group to be discussed at its first meeting, and at the next Executive Board meeting.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>- Elective Home School Education safeguarding / data sharing</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard stated that he requested for this issue to be discussed, because officers have been unable to do any work outside of education settings as no information is shared , either intelligence or safeguarding.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond replied that the Elective Home Education (EHE) regulations are loose. Legal advice to ICS is that if parents are complying with the legal requirements, such as being on the register of home education, are in contact with the local authority once a year, and allow their child to be seen once a year, ICS cannot share their information with the police. In the case of the child with the eating disorder, her parents allowed ICS to see her even beyond her 16th birthday as required by law. Therefore, they could not share any information with the police.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard asked if this could be looked at in a different way, for example, by way of making enquiries.</p> <p>Sarah Hammond replied that the EHE staff can raise safeguarding concerns if they are concerned, but the law itself is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Mark Janaway remarked that in response to a case that was sent up to them, the National Panel agreed that EHE is an area they would like explored.</p> <p>Other AOB</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard noted that he will not attend the next meeting, and Coretta Hine will represent him. Matt Dunkley will chair the meeting.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Dates of future meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th April 2020 (10.00 – 12.00) Room 1.73, Sessions House • 9th July 2020 (10.00 – 12.00) Room 1.73, Sessions House • 8th October 2020 (10.00 – 12.00) Room 1.73, Sessions House