



**Senior Leadership Group Board Meeting
MEETING NOTES**

Date: 15 January 2020
Time: 2:00pm – 5.10pm
Venue: SLT Boardroom Guildhall 2 Kingston
Chaired by: Ian Thomas, Fergus Keegan

Attendees:		
Ian Thomas	IT	Chair, Chief Executive, Kingston Council
Chris Robson	CR	Independent Scrutineer Kingston and Richmond Safeguarding Children Partnership
Sophie Cavanagh	SC	Head Teacher, The Kingston Academy
Det Supt Owain Richards	OR	SW BCU Head of Safeguarding, Metropolitan Police
Dr Suzanne Luck	SL	Designated Doctor, Kingston CCG Paediatric Consultant, Kingston Hospital
Fergus Keegan	FK	Director of Quality, Kingston and Richmond CCGs
Elisabeth Major	EM	KRSCP Professional Adviser
Sophie McGeoch	SM	Head Teacher, Meadlands Primary School, Richmond
Sian Thomas	ST	Designated Nurse for Safeguarding Children, Richmond CCG
Ian Dodds	ID	Joint Director of Children's Services, Kingston and Richmond Councils
Carrie Mark	CM	AD for Quality Assurance & Review, Achieving for Children
Carol Clapperton	CC	Strategic Partnership Manager, Richmond & Wandsworth
Abby Lubbat	AL	Notetaker
Apologies:		
Alison Twynam		Director of Children's Social Care, Achieving for Children

Item	Notes
1.	Introductions
	Welcomes and introductions were made.
2.	Minutes of meeting 20 November 2019

	<p>No amendments were suggested. Matters arising were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EM & JT to organise an event designed to optimise the effective operation of the SLG: Done. This will take place on 2nd March 2. EM to manage the process for the approval and dissemination of the SLG’s meeting notes. Done 3. EM to go ahead with implementing one Task and Finish Group re alternatives for young people, who were vulnerable and Not in Education, Employment or Training: Item 3 on Agenda 4. EM to table a written proposal for fostering efficient links with other Partnership Boards at the next SLG meeting on 15 January 2020. This is on Agenda for presentation by CC. 5. EM to propose, taking account of input from SLG members, a cost-effective means of developing priorities for future Business Plans. Item on Agenda 6. EM to draft a detailed proposal for adopting a common approach to Signs of Safety across the Partnership. EM had not completed. FK asked how we know we have a common approach – we need a specific proposal. <p>Action 1: EM to draw up a specific proposal for a common approach to Signs of Safety by 15th February 2020.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. EM to issue timescales for the receipt of contributions to the newsletter. Contributions are chased up.
3.	Core Data & Quality Assurance Findings
	<p>ST said that the Learning Hub subgroup had not met as a subgroup since the last SLG meeting. The subject of neglect had been considered by the SLG for the summer Learning Hub, with a sample of 5 Richmond and 5 Kingston children, looking at those subject to Child Protection Plans for neglect, Child in Need Plan. These were of a broad range of age groups. Neglect of teenagers and neglect among affluence are both under-studied areas.</p> <p>CM suggested a sample from among the 10 children for study. There was a cycle identified of neglect →intervention→improvement→withdrawal→decline→intervention.</p> <p>ST and CM would identify a focus (neglect is a wide concept).</p> <p>ST stressed the need for a consistent tool which works for multiple agencies.</p> <p>FK felt that 10 was a good initial sample size, it might be good to go from this for a subset of repeat interventions, asking the question which interventions were successful.</p> <p>Action 2: CM & ST to consider sample size and boundaries and feed this back to the SLG following the February Subgroup meeting.</p> <p>The result will be a Learning Hub event not a full Conference.</p> <p>Data Report EM presented the proposed dataset report.</p> <p>There was considerable discussion regarding the need for a more full dataset of both partnership and single agency indicators.</p>

	<p>Action 3: EM to propose a further model and find exemplars from other partnerships with support from the CCG data analyst.</p> <p>Subgroup Updates The meeting received the written updates tabled by the Richmond & Kingston LSCB Learning Review Subgroup, the Vulnerable Child and Adolescent (“VCA”) Subgroup, and the Joint Workforce Development Subgroup.</p> <p>Vulnerable Child & Adolescent Subgroup This group had not met since October, to meet again in March. The Contextual Safeguarding Conference was coming up on 23rd January The MARVE Protocol is to be signed off in January; there is a pilot to integrate the IOM (Integrated Offender Management) Cohort.</p> <p>Learning Hub Subgroup The group were to meet in February. A name change was discussed for the Subgroup and it was agreed it would be called the Quality and Innovation Subgroup.</p> <p>Joint Workforce Development Subgroup A name change for this subgroup was discussed in order to differentiate better; it was decided to call it the Learning and Development Subgroup.</p> <p>Local Learning Review Subgroup The Serious Case Review report was published, and also the first draft of Young Person S report. The Emotional Health Review draft Report should be finished in a few weeks, for presentation to the SLG at the April meeting.</p> <p>Action 4: Strategic Leaders to consider attending a Subgroup.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Learning Hub Focus on Missing Children</p>
	<p>The group had received the draft written report, which CR presented. He commented on how well the focus groups worked together, thanks were expressed to all who attended and all agencies’ attitudes to working on this issue.</p> <p>It was good to convene separate groups for managers, practitioners and children – the importance was emphasised of having the right people engaging with the children, who are going missing (“trusted adults”). Managers were knowledgeable in their fields.</p> <p>There were about a dozen recommendations in the report to consider.</p> <p>Action 5: CR to highlight strategic recommendations to finalise the report by 20th March 2020.</p> <p>OR said that it was important for the police to gain and document more of the voice of the child.</p> <p>SL suggested looking at the work done in other boroughs.</p> <p>ID emphasised a focus on strategic recommendations and the need to take up the Signs of Safety approach in the report.</p> <p>CR said the final report should be sent out to all who had engaged with it, he was happy for it to go out anywhere; we still need to follow up on the practical as well as the strategic recommendations.</p>

	<p>FK said there was a need to have a final step to ensure that these policies and procedures are followed up. It needs to be concise.</p> <p>ST-the children had all experienced Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs); all experienced domestic abuse, neglect and most had only one parent.</p> <p>CM asked whether agencies were effective in taking up all these experiences as an advance warning, picking up the risk factors as a predictor. <u>All</u> these randomly selected children had multiple ACEs.</p> <p>SC emphasised the importance of schools being aware of the risk factors and being able to pre-empt incidents. Shared intelligence among schools was necessary.</p> <p>FK recommended one or two 7-minute learnings, one with education focus, aggregating recommendations into a concrete strategy, developing a multi-agency policy. For future reports, a Statement of Assurance covering the six areas of assurance was important, eg partial, substantial.</p> <p>Action 6: Angie Mitchell, AfC to lead on refreshing the Missing Handbook with a multi-agency group by 30th March 2020.</p> <p>Conference and Workshop 23 Jan This will be aimed at practitioners. Feedback on the event will be an agenda item at the next meeting.</p>
5.	Subgroups' Exception Reporting (paper)
	EM presented this item.
6.	Serious Case Reviews / Local Learning Review
	<p>SM expressed the general feeling that the independent school sector sits outside the general school community. They should be brought into that community. The culture in independent schools was sometimes very different from Local Authority schools. They should be represented at this forum.</p> <p>FK expressed concern that the SLG could become too big. Possibly they could be represented via the Subgroups.</p> <p>It was observed that one Head Teacher from a Kingston private school is on the Quality & Innovation Subgroup.</p> <p>FK suggested talking to the Charity Commission to ask how they ensure independent schools are represented – all were encouraged to look at the issue of engagement of private schools and come back with answers for the April meeting.</p> <p>CR said that in terms of strategy the SLG should review the process of commissioning case reviews tightening terms of reference and deadlines.</p>

	FK asked how we assure ourselves of the adequacy of our existing arrangements, how we decide Terms of Reference, how we manage the process. The Local Learning Review Subgroup chairs needed to feed back whether they can do this or whether they need some additional support from the SLG.
7.	Child Death Overview Panel
	FK the new arrangements had been put in place for SW London as a whole. We have good clinical arrangements; we only have a small number of cases. The SW London group will make an annual report. The local CCGs were able to create a new post of Family Liaison Nurse based at Kingston Hospital working across Kingston and Richmond.
8.	Top Fives and Stubborn Issues
	<p>EM reported. Strengths were: SPA was working well, there were few escalations and 'Signs of Safety' were adopted.</p> <p>Stubborn issues were much as outlined at the last meeting.</p> <p>Different approaches of Richmond and Kingston to contribution of GPs to Child Protection Conferences were discussed.</p> <p>These have produced different results: there has been a problem with the absence of clarity around escalation and a lack of consequences of failure. Notifications are sometimes arriving after the time-frame.</p> <p>Action 8: FK will follow up GP contributions to Child Protection Conferences and report back at the next meeting.</p> <p>EM noted Initial Health Assessment (IHA) data for Children Looked After for both boroughs were much as previously discussed and not stabilised.</p> <p>FK observed that better results have been achieved in Kingston with one person responsible, than in Richmond where there is a pool of people. It was observed that the Nurse sitting with the CLA (Children Looked After) team has also helped.</p> <p>FK – both teams have doubled appointment opportunities. Also paediatricians have extended their clinics, so that we have double what the guidelines ask for. The CCG has invested much in this area of work.</p> <p>IT commented that there were relatively small numbers of children looked after in our area.</p> <p>ID observed that the particular cohort of children coming into care at this time included many of whom refused IHAs, many adolescents and many asylum seekers.</p> <p>The new Named GP had led to an improvement in engagement with GP services, though the processes need to be managed better and communication and management needs improvement.</p> <p>Transitions to adulthood: EM reported that a Young Person aged over 18 was held by MARVE but there are still issues around exploitation. There was a particular issue with vulnerable adults.</p>

	<p>Early Help Assessments (EHAs) are mainly completed by AfC Family Support Workers. There is some worry about the lead professional role.</p> <p>SM said that a lot of the time the work was done in schools, but not recorded.</p> <p>SL said this was similar in Health, that Health Visitors were doing assessments but not recording them.</p> <p>FK observed that issues remain and they should be kept on the agenda, other people in the meeting were needed, eg the Named GP to feed back on this.</p> <p>IT commented that the person who knows the family best is the best person to be the lead professional. He asked what work is being done towards a single assessment process co-ordinating help.</p> <p>ID said that there is a network of partners looking at this, feeding through him – he will report on this at the next meeting.</p> <p>Action 9: ID to feed back on the progress towards the harmonisation of the process co-ordinating help at the April 2020 meeting.</p>
9.	Business Planning for 2020
	<p>ID said there was a need to develop a business plan, a process for agreeing priorities. These priorities were to last 2 years and offer the greatest opportunity for improvement. There was some discussion around what these priorities should be and the process of deciding on them. It was agreed that a short list will be decided on from a long list put to stakeholders.</p> <p>Action 10: ID will draft a long list of priorities and obtain input from stakeholders, for the Setting Priorities part of the 2nd March Development Session, in order to have a finalised business plan by April.</p>
10.	Links with other Partnership Boards
	<p>This was presented by CC, Strategic Partnership Manager across Richmond & Wandsworth. She was looking to set up a Chairs' Group, moving to develop cross-borough priorities.</p> <p>FK commented that a CCG Chair might be useful, as a lot of work had been done on Health & Care Plan. The Community Safety Partnership was working well.</p> <p>IT said that it was important to consider how such an exercise would add value.</p> <p>FK suggested that the 3 strategic partners could rotate the Chair between them. This would help Chairs to understand what is happening in each other's territory.</p>
11.	Any other Business
	<p>a) ID highlighted Kingston's ILACS outstanding inspection.</p> <p>c) OR reported MOPAC funding will enable an increased police contribution, though it is not yet known exactly how much.</p>

Action Table

	Action	Officer
1	EM to draw up a specific proposal for a common approach to Signs of Safety by 15 th February 2020.	EM
2	CM & ST to consider neglect audit sample size and boundaries and feed this back to the SLG following the February Subgroup meeting.	CM & ST
3	EM to propose a further dataset model and find exemplars from other partnerships with support from the CCG data analyst.	EM
4	Strategic Leaders to consider attending a Subgroup.	IT, ID, FK, OR
5	CR to highlight strategic recommendations to finalise the report by 20 th March 2020.	CR
6	Angie Mitchell, AfC to lead on refreshing the Missing Handbook with a multi-agency group by 30 th March 2020.	Angie Mitchell
8	FK will follow up GP contributions to Child Protection Conferences and report back at the next meeting.	FK
9	ID to feed back on the progress towards the harmonisation of the process co-ordinating early help at the April 2020 meeting.	ID
10	ID will draft a long list of priorities and obtain input from stakeholders, for the Setting Priorities part of the 2 nd March Development Session, in order to have a finalised business plan by April.	ID