

Meeting Title:	KSCMP Executive Board Meeting
Date:	30 th October 2019
Time:	3.30 – 5pm
Location:	Room 2.62, 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	✓	
Paula Wilkins	Chief Nurse (CCG's)	Clinical Commissioning Groups	✓	
Sheridan Morrison	Designated Nurse	Clinical Commissioning Groups	✓	
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	✓	
Mark Janaway	Programme and Performance Manager	KSCMP	✓	
Chibuogu Nyananyo	Project Officer - Minutes	KSCMP	✓	

<p>1.</p>	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>The Chair welcomed Partners to the inaugural Executive Board meeting and introductions were made. Partners expressed agreement with the composition of the Executive Board.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Minutes of Steering Group meeting</p> <p>The Minutes of the Steering Group (Shadow Executive Board) meeting on 11th September were agreed as an accurate account of the meeting.</p> <p>Action Log:</p> <p>2.1 - Mark Janaway to update the Practice Improvement Framework to include how the Practice Review process will deal with cases that do not clearly fit the remit of cases outlined in the guidance. Mark Janaway has updated this. Action closed.</p> <p>2.2 - Mark Janaway to review the Terms of Reference for the Rapid Review Group. Mark Janaway has updated this. Action closed.</p> <p>3.1 - Michael Thomas-Sam and Amanda Hornsby to update the terms and conditions for the appointment of the Independent Scrutineer. Updated by Michael Thomas-Sam and presented as item 4 below. Action closed.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Partnership Team functions and resourcing – draft paper</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 and Michael Thomas-Sam were in attendance for this item. David started his presentation by reminding the Executive Board that the Shadow Executive had agreed the core list of functions that they considered necessary for the proposed Partnership Support Team and these were agreed on 24 July 2019. Subsequently, the project team had carried out detailed work on the functional responsibilities which would assist the Executive Board and the wider partnership.</p> <p>David explained that the agreed functions and the related job roles were profiled against a ‘Gold’, ‘Silver’ and ‘Bronze’ resourcing model. The ‘Gold’ option would have the full spectrum capacity and capabilities to deliver the vital and all new activities/products that the Executive Board will wish to be delivered. David also stated that the ‘Silver’ option would be expected to have enhanced capacity and capabilities to deliver the vital and some new activities/products that the Executive Board will wish to be undertaken, whilst the ‘Bronze’ option would utilise the existing capacity, capabilities and budget to deliver the key activities and some limited new activities/products that the Executive Board would wish to be carried out. The Executive Board was presented with information about the indicative costs associated with each of the options. The Board asked to be provided with any benchmarking information gathered as part of the fact finding research by the project team.</p>

	<p>Following its consideration and deliberation, The Executive Board expressed its view that it would be important to have analytical capability whether secured by way of a dedicated staff or as a function that could be bought on an ‘as and where needed basis’. Similarly, the Executive Board concluded that the policy role could be sourced on the same basis. The Board considered that some of the functions/responsibilities could be linked and made the duty of one person.</p> <p>The Executive Board summarised its position that, it prefers to live within the existing budget as far as the Partnership Support function was concerned, that is, to spend no more than the available budget. The Board also decided that it wanted the Partnership Support function to remain as a discrete and ringfenced unit at this stage.”</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Independent Scrutineer – advertising and appointment</p> <p>Presented by Michael Thomas-Sam. He stated that remuneration for the Independent Scrutineer was not finalised at the last meeting. From his research, the day rate benchmark for this region is between £680 - £900.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley noted that £650 per day would be more in line with offers around. Andrew Pritchard agreed with this view, stating that himself (Andrew Pritchard) and Paula Wilkins will be holding interviews for an Independent Scrutineer for the Medway Safeguarding Children’s Partnership (MSCP) and the remuneration is £650 a day.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard noted that the function of the MSCP Independent Scrutineer as advertised is similar as that of the KSCMP, and Medway received applications from very qualified candidates at the advertised day rate. Most of the candidates are retired Directors of Children’s Services, former Local Safeguarding Children’s Board (LSCB) Chairs, and one of them is an ex-Police officer. It is possible that some of the same candidates may also apply for this role with KSCMP.</p> <p>Paula Wilkins added that herself and Andrew Pritchard could mention this upcoming vacancy to the MSCP candidates during interview, in case they wanted to apply to KSCMP as well.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard remarked that he liked the Job Description as it is quite broad, but Matt Dunkley remarked that it read like the post-holder would be an employee of Kent County Council (KCC). Matt Dunkley asked if the role as advertised for MSCP, was within IR35 (therefore the post-holder is taxed as a KCC employee not as a contractor). Michael Thomas-Sam confirmed that this role is similar to that of the MSCP Independent Scrutineer, but noted that some local authorities he had researched into, like Gloucestershire, and Kingston and Richmond, define the role of Independent Scrutineer as within IR35. Matt Dunkley stated that he will discuss this issue with Zena Cooke, KCC Corporate Director of Finance.</p> <p>The Partners agreed that this role should be considered outside the scope of IR35, and should be advertised as a day rate contractor.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley queried why a degree level qualification was required for the role, partners agreed that this requirement should be removed from the Job Description.</p> <p>It was agreed that once Matt Dunkley has received clarification from Zena Cooke, Mark Janaway and Michael Thomas-Sam should amend the Job Description and advertise.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>4.1 – Matt Dunkley to speak to Zena Cooke, KCC Corporate Director of Finance regarding the Independent Scrutineer post being within IR35</p> <p>4.1 - Mark Janaway and Michael Thomas-Sam to advertise this vacancy after the Job Description has been amended.</p>

<p>5.</p>	<p>Partnership Sub Groups – Terms of Reference, membership and Chairs</p> <p>Presented by Mark Janaway. This item is on the Board’s Agenda as a reference for the Executive Board. He stated that only one Sub Group had met since the partnership’s implementation on the 17th September. The Terms of Reference will be reviewed and finalised by the Sub Groups at their first meetings.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Meeting Scheduling</p> <p>Presented by Mark Janaway. He noted that the Shadow Executive Board proposed bi-monthly meetings at first, then moving to quarterly meetings.</p> <p>Partners agreed that if they feel they need to meet more frequently after April when the meeting schedule moves to quarterly, this item can be brought back on the Agenda for discussion at the February meeting. Paula Wilkins stated that she will be away on the proposed date of 4th February and asked for this to be rescheduled.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley noted that Partners need to meet in December to sort out the budget.</p> <p>Chibuogu Nyananyo will liaise with the Executive Board members’ PAs to find a date in December and February 2020.</p> <p>The Sub- Groups and representative Fora meeting quarterly. It was agreed by Executive Board members that at each Executive meeting, one chair of the Sub-groups, (Policy and Procedure, Exploitation and Scrutiny and Challenge) should attend for an update on the work of that Sub-Group.</p> <p>Agreed that the Representative Fora report through the Scrutiny and Challenge Group. Should the Executive Board wish an exception report from one of the Fora, the Chair of that Fora will be invited to the Executive Group meeting. They will attend for their agenda item not the entire meeting.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>6.1 – Chibuogu Nyananyo to scope available dates from Executive Board members’ PAs and arrange meetings in December and February 2020.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Practice Review Update</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>Mark Janaway stated that KSCMP should be cleared of all Kent Safeguarding Children’s Board (KSCB) cases by September 2020. Paula Wilkins asked if there was any SCR being delayed due to waiting on input health professionals? Mark Janaway noted that this issue has been overcome now and Dr Lynne Wright (Named GP) has been very helpful.</p> <p>It was noted that sadly a lot of the learning themes from practice reviews are recurring. Mark Janaway stated that bruising to pre-mobile babies has been flagged up with the National Panel, and they feel that this is a learning theme on a national scale.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley wondered why disguised compliance was not picked up as a key theme. Mark Janaway pointed out that it was picked up under the theme Inquisitive Practice.</p>

	<p>Mark Janaway noted that KSCMP is working with Independent Reviewers so that rather than just repeating recommendations, there is a more intensive analysis to find out why these themes are recurring.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley stated that Agencies should also consider moving away from just measuring risk, to working with families to reduce risk. This is contextual safeguarding and involves developing relationships, especially with adolescents. Paula Wilkins remarked that a recent SCR in Medway had similar themes around disguised compliance and engaging with fathers. The challenge for professionals will be maintaining that high level of challenge and awareness of risk even when you have a positive relationship with the family.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley noted that challenge between Agencies in a Strategy meeting, for example, would provide that oversight. Paula Wilkins agreed, stating that other Agencies who are not so involved with the family can retain objectivity and can therefore, challenge if necessary.</p> <p>Mark Janaway remarked that some KSCMP multi-Agency training is focused on professional curiosity, so that professionals can learn about what other Agencies are doing and how they are doing it.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley remarked that the nature of the Health Visiting service means that some bruising in pre-mobile babies are not being picked up. Agencies need to work together more. Integrated Children's Services (ICS) are working together with other Agencies providing adolescent services, and this working together should be implemented between Agencies providing services to younger children.</p> <p>Sheridan Morrison noted that a lot of the parents under review are young parents or care leavers, and the harm occurs within the baby's first 8 weeks of life, which is when they cry more. Matt Dunkley stated that as an example, ICS have a target group of young women who have had their first child removed. They also need to do some parenting work with care leavers. Paula Wilkins agreed with this view, stating that some care leavers might not have had positive parenting role models.</p> <p>Mark Janaway noted that KSCMP will pick up some of these issues, and integrate them in to its training programme. Matt Dunkley added that this should also be fed into the multi-agency audit programmes.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>KSCMP Budget – initial discussion</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard stated that this item was discussed while Mark Janaway and Chibuogu Nyananyo were out of the room. David Whittle has agreed to make a contingency payment to cover the outstanding amount in the budget for this year, David Whittle will brief Mark Janaway about this.</p> <p>Paula Wilkins remarked that MSCP include South London and Maudsley (SLAM) as one of the Health Partners for contributions to their Budget, but KSCMP does not, and asked that this be considered.</p> <p>Mark Janaway stated that KSCMP and MSCP are looking to train Reviewers so that both Partnerships can exchange Reviewers to carry out local practice reviews and save the cost of appointment an Independent Reviewer. It should be noted though, that this is not a financial contribution, but a time contribution from partners. Andrew Pritchard advised to proceed with caution, stating that conducting these reviews is very time-consuming for the member of staff undertaking it.</p> <p>Sheridan Morrison pointed out that the different methodologies used by the different Independent Reviewers make the process more difficult, having an agreed KSCMP model and training Reviewers in that model would make the process more efficient.</p> <p>Mark Janaway remarked that this will be the first year KSCMP have an overspend, this is a result of reduced contributions over time.</p>

	<p>Sheridan Morrison pointed out that the income for 2019-20 included a £47,500 rollover and this will not be available next year. This will need to be taken in to consideration in future budget discussions.</p> <p>Partners agreed that the KSCMP budget and the contributions from partners should be on the Agenda for the next meeting.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>KSCMP Priorities- starting point for the Scrutiny and Assurance Framework (SAF)</p> <p>Mark Janaway asked if there is a particular area of priority that Partners would like the Partnership to focus on, this can be taken up and when the actions on the first priority are being implemented, work can begin on a second priority to keep the cycle rolling.</p> <p>Sheridan Morrison suggested the vulnerability of babies, or multi- agency work with young parents who don't naturally go to services for various reasons. This would involve working with young parents to produce messages on safe sleeping, the risk of shaking, crying babies, etc. to make the message easier to receive.</p> <p>Paula Wilkins queried if this should be our number one priority as a Partnership.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley stated that this issue is about managing the risk from the parents, because they knew what they were doing but couldn't stop themselves. Matt Dunkley agreed that managing the risk of harm to infants is an issue, but suggested that a bigger issue is managing risk around teenagers which includes serious injury, suicide, exploitation, gang violence, knife crime, missing episodes, children's homes, trafficking, CSE.</p> <p>Andrew Pritchard remarked that it is a big chunk of work, and suggested that, as outlined in the SAF, Partners define the task. The idea is then to determine what Partners want to scrutinise, sign it off, get a report at their next meeting which would be in three months, and then decide at that meeting what the next steps should be.</p> <p>Paula Wilkins suggested focusing on the increase in suicide and mental health issues. Matt Dunkley remarked that this is within the remit of the child death overview panel (CDOP), and partners agreed.</p> <p>Matt Dunkley suggested as an area of focus, how Partners assure themselves on their multi-agency response to domestic abuse and how this impacts on the children.</p> <p>After discussion it was agreed by Partners that this item should be priority on the Agenda for the next meeting. Ahead of the meeting each member should consider and put forward 4 or 5 suggested areas for priority focus by the Partnership.</p> <p>Action:</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.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Mark Janaway stated that he will be circulating the Learning and Development Framework to Partners for comments and feedback.</p>



200191029 - KSCMP
LIF - V2.docx

Update : Draft Learning and Development Framework attached. **Action closed.**

Future Meetings

December 2019 TBC February 2020 TBC		
7 th April 2020	10am – 12noon	Room 1.73, Sessions House, Maidstone
9 th July 2020	10am – 12noon	Room 1.73, Sessions House, Maidstone
8 th October 2020	10am – 12noon	Room 1.73, Sessions House, Maidstone