

Derby City Partnership



City for Children and Young People

Joint Derby Safeguarding Children Board and City for Children and Young's People Executive meeting

11 March 2009

Carsington Suite, Riverside Centre, Derby

Present

Andrew Flack (Chair)	Corporate Director for Children and Young People, DCC
Liz Adamson	Designated Doctor (Adviser)
Cllr Les Allen	Cabinet Member for Children and Young People
Jane Appleby	Lead for Children, CAMHS and Safeguarding, SHA
Sue Richards	Head of Children's Quality Assurance, DCC
Verna Bayliss	Partnership Co-ordinator, Derby City Partnership
Rachel Dickinson	Assistant Director Locality Services, DCC
Rita Silvester	Assistant Director Performance and Commissioning, DCC
Rachel Gibson	Representing Gill Collinson, NHS Derby City
Stephen Edgeley	Deputy Chief Nurse – Mental Health Services Trust
David Elliott	Action for Children
Mary Gordon	Representing Hugh Hastie, Connexions Derbyshire
Clare Morgan	Headteacher, Meadow Farm Primary School
Jo Ward	Headteacher, Bemrose School
Debbie Platt	D/Supt Public Protection, Derbyshire Police
Philip Edwards	ViA Rep
Michael Perkins	ViA Rep
Maura Teager	(Vice Chair – LSCB) Deputy Director of Nursing, Foundation Hospital Trust
Gillian Sewell	Chief Executive, YMCA Derbyshire
Andy Wakeman	(Vice Chair – CYP Exec) NHS Derby City
Trish Thompson	Director of Provider Services, NHS Derby City
John Amos	Fire and Rescue Service

In Attendance

Keith Howkins	Head of Finance, CYP, DCC
Suanne Lim	Head of Youth Offending Service
Stephanie Cole	The Audit Commission
Rachel Walker	Derbyshire Constabulary
Adele Styles	Young People's Senior Consultation Officer, Corporate and Adult Services
Keith Woodthorpe	Assistant Director Specialist Services, DCC

Apologies

Jag Atwal	Derbyshire Constabulary
Keith Burn	Jobcentre Plus
Gill Collinson	Director of Engagement and Executive Nurse, NHS Derby City
Hugh Hastie	Chief Executive, Connexions Derbyshire

Janet Holland
Kevin McCann
Mark Menzies
Heather Sahman
Chris Wheyway
Keith Burn

Chair, Children and Young People's Network
Assistant Director, LSC Derbyshire
Assistant Director, Housing
Strategic Health Authority
Derbyshire Mental Health Trust
Jobcentre Plus

Item

Item

1. Introductions

AF welcomed members of both the Derby Safeguarding Children Board and the Children and Young People's Executive to this annual joint meeting. All attendees introduced themselves.

2. Overview of progress so far

AF gave a presentation on the progress on matters relating particularly to the safeguarding agenda and the outcome of the Laming Review. A copy of the presentation is attached to the minutes.

- AF had forwarded the Government's response to the Laming review to members of both boards

Comments/Questions

- The quality of communications and speed at which people react are vital to the safeguarding service
- How do you define co-location? This can happen in various venues and with different partners involved. We have had difficulty with access to level 2 training – who needs access to it?
There are different elements of co-location for different needs/areas. SR brought to the last LSCB meeting the expected increases in training and costs
- All agreed that the statement 'Nothing can be more important than keeping children and young people safe' is of enormous importance and implications
- Both Boards have had the Area 1 evaluation. All agencies involved in the pilot felt improvements had been made in terms of access to services and speed of response. Area 1 will continue with coordination in other areas and attention being paid to scoping co-location opportunities
- Historically the city has benefited from LAA underspend and agencies have collectively decided where to direct this funding. Agencies aligning/pooling funding to target identified priorities has not yet been effectively developed. There are significant cost implications to the partnership review, including the costs of the LSCB. These need to be addressed by all agencies as the basis of risk analysis

3. Governance

The group looked at where the CYP Executive sits as part of the Derby City Partnership planning function. The Children's Trust Arrangements May 2009 document was circulated by RS for information and to explain the relationship between the CYP Executive, the Local Safeguarding Children Board, the Outcome Groups and the Commissioning Board.

Comments/Questions

- This is an excellent document, how widely is it distributed? Could this be part of the induction package?

Item

Item

This will go to the Outcome Groups, Commissioning Board and DCC CYP Heads of Service. Agencies should share this with their own staff as appropriate. The weblink for this document is <http://www.derby.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7A736EA5-DB94-4AE8-AA50-703C1286853F/0/DerbyCityChildrensTrustArrangements.pdf>

4. Relationship between the CYP Executive and LSCB – is it working?

In 2006 it was agreed to work on the relationship between the LSCB and CYP Executive, looking at the structure and process. The question was asked as to how robustly the LSCB can challenge the CYP Executive. 'Challenge' will be an agenda item for the Stay Safe group and the LSCB. The Stay Safe group feeds into the Trust planning process and this has gone well for the last three years, but it could do better. There are questions nationally about independent challenge where the Chair for both the LSCB and CYP Executive is the same.

It was agreed that both the LSCB and CYP Executive need to work robustly to drive forward the Stay Safe agenda, but this will not just focus on the safeguarding element.

The LSCB is not sufficiently resourced to develop effective performance oversight – so this is a challenge back to the partners on the CYP Executive.

Comments/Questions

- What are people's own instinctive views about it working? Who challenges who? What is the split of doing, planning, delivery, challenging and carrying out?
- All agencies are committed but cannot afford to fund when it could move the whole agenda forward. Can the LSCB challenge when it has members that sit on both Boards? When in our arrangement does the LSCB challenge?
- It was expected that an independent Chair would be sought for the LSCB
- Multi-agency audits should happen, but in reality this becomes less of a priority given people's workloads. This was identified as an issue at the last joint development day.

5. Draft Stay Safe Action Plan

The draft action plan was circulated to the group. It has fewer actions than last year, as last year it was difficult to gather the performance data for each action. There are now two key actions underneath each of the priorities. The draft has been discussed at the Joint Commissioning Board.

Comments/Questions

- Concern was expressed about the SS3A target. Experience shows that levels of intervention services have been lowered. Is this target the reason for this?
This is a national indicator. Derby has always prioritised child welfare rather than numbers
- It was felt that SS8 uses passive language
It is set in the context of having only one LSCB officer
It is almost identical to Every Child Matters enjoy and achieve. Are we duplicating other plans? Can we do some analysis on this in light of the Laming review?

Item

Item

Rather than expanding, a clear link should be demonstrated to avoid duplication of work

The strategic priorities are the Trust priorities. The parts identified will be in the LSCB plan

Anything that underperformed in the Outcome Group plans last year has been carried forward. There are structures in place to address concerns

- Not much has been said regarding prevention and risk assessment of domestic violence
There is a link to the Community Safety Partnership, they now have a unit specifically for this
- The plan emphasises the importance of the engagement of partners.
- There is an overall resourcing issue and this needs to be taken forward

It was agreed to continue the current Charing arrangements of both Boards until the formal changes arising from the Laming review are implemented.

6. Feedback from ViA

The ViA Shadow Board members gave an update from the last ViA Shadow Board meeting

Questions/Comments

- Members of both Boards have previously made activities, discrimination and teenage pressure pledges. AS has emailed all those with outstanding pledges for updates and progress made
- AF spoke to the young people at the last Shadow Board meeting to gauge their reaction/perception on becoming a social worker and was encouraged by their mainly positive reaction
- Discussion took place around who young people would turn to with safeguarding issues. It was recognised that whilst the school nurse/family GP is a logical choice, most young people do go to their teachers in the first instance. Trust in the adult contacted plays a big part in this
- Displaying the name of the Child Protection Co-ordinator as well as other related contacts on notice boards around schools was thought to be a good idea to make young people aware of who to contact
- ViA shared copies of a new information sticker for young people.

SR

It was agreed that the Voices in Action Shadow Board will take forward:

- The publicity of who young people can contact
- The wider distribution of stickers outlining contact telephone numbers for young people
- That young people are aware of what the systems are to talk to the appropriate person/agency (to be age sensitive).