



CHSCB Board Minutes

Date of Meeting	20th March 2018
Venue	Tomlinson Centre, Hackney
Chair	Jim Gamble (JG), Independent Chair of the CHSCB
Minutes	Sarah Seymour (SS), Board Co-ordinator

Agency	Membership	Attendance
CAFCASS	Melinda Cassel (MC), Service Manager – Public Law	Attended
Children and Family Services (City of London)	Andrew Carter (ACar), Chief Officer/ Dir. Community & Children’s Services	Attended
	Chris Pelham (CP), Assistant Director People, City of London Corporation	Attended
	David MackIntosh (DMac), Team Manager Community Safety	Apologies
Children and Family Services (LB Hackney)	Anne Canning (AC), Group Director, Children, Adults & Community Health	Attended
	Sarah Wright (SWr), Director of Children & Families	Apologies
	Lisa Aldridge (LA), Interim Head of Service, Safeguarding & Learning	Attended
	Pauline Adams (PA), Head of Service, Young Hackney	Attended
Hackney Learning Trust	Maurice Mason (MM), Head of Service Safer Communities	Apologies
	Sian Davies (SD), Interim Head of Hackney Learning Trust	Apologies
Police	Andrew Lee (AL), Assistant Director, Hackney Learning Trust	Attended
	Sue Williams (SW), Borough Commander, MPS Hackney	Apologies
	Charmaine Laurencin (CL) Detective Chief Inspector (DCI), MPS Hackney	Attended
	Keith Paterson (KP), DCI, East Region CAIT Team, MPS Hackney	Apologies (Rep)
Probation	Paul Barnard (PBa), Detective Chief Superintendent, CoL Police	Apologies
	Susanne Jolly (SJ) Area Manager – North London, London CRC	Apologies
	Stuart Webber (SWe), Assistant Chief Officer/ Head of Service, NPS	Apologies
Health	Clare Highton (CH), Chair of City & Hackney CCG (CHCCG)	Apologies
	Mary Lee (ML), Designated Nurse, CHCCG	Attended
	Pauline Frost (PF), Int. Prog. Director Children & Maternity Services, CHCCG	Attended
	Dr Nick Lessof (NL), Designated Doctor, City & Hackney CCG	Attended
	Sheila Adam (SA), Chief Nurse and Director of Governance, HUHFT	Apologies
	Marcia Smikle (MS), Head of Safeguarding Children, HUH	Attended
ELFT	Karen Miller (KM), Head of Safeguarding, Whittington Health	Attended
	Lorraine Sunduza (LSu), Director of Nursing	Apologies
Public Health	Dermot Ryll (DR), Associate Director CAMHS	Attended
	Penny Bevan (PB), Director of Public Health	Attended
Housing	David Padfield (DP), Director of Housing Services, Hackney Housing	Apologies (Rep)
HCVS	Kristine Wellington (KW), Head of Safeguarding, Children & Families	Attended
Tower Hamlets	(Claire Belgard), Tower Hamlets (City Youth Provision)	Apologies
Lay member	Sally Glen (SG), Lay Member	Attended
	Shirley Green (SGr), Lay Member	Attended
	Belinda Blank (BB), Lay Member	Attended
Lead Member	Cllr. Anntoinette Bramble (ABr), Lead Member for Hackney	Apologies
	Dhruv Patel (DP), Common Councilman	Apologies
Schools	Janice Thomas (JT), Executive Headteacher, Sebright School	Attended
	Annie Gammon (AG) Headteacher, Stoke Newington School	Attended
CHSCB Team	Rory McCallum (RMc), Senior Professional Advisor to the CHSCB	Attended
	Angela Bent (AB), Board Manager	Attended

(- Denotes no response)

Also in attendance

Evonne Hudson (EH), Interim Divisional Head of Housing, LB Hackney	Attended
Phil McElhone (PM), Child Protection Team, Met Police	Attended

Agenda Item 1: Introductions & matters arising from the previous meetings (12th December 2017)

Presenting: Jim Gamble

Discussion/ Challenge

Introductions were given and apologies noted. The minutes of the previous meeting on 12th December 2017 were **APPROVED** as an accurate reflection of the meeting. The Chair addressed the action log from December 2017. Outcomes and updates are recorded below.

Action Log – December 2017

Previous Actions		Lead	Update
Item 4: Partner Updates	09/17-11: ML to share the Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy, (referenced in the ELFT update paper) with the Vulnerable Adolescents sub-groups in City of London & Hackney.	ML	Carried forward SS to request a copy from ELFT directly.
Item 6: Prevent	09/17:15 TT/ RMc to update prevent guidance on the CHSCB website and to contact NSPCC to see if they can help provide some additional data.	TT/ RMc	Carried forward In hand, Website being updated. NSPCC to be contacted
December Actions		Lead	Update
Item 3: Safeguarding & Performance Trends	12/17-01 QA Sub group to look at capturing schools data.	QA Sub Group	Complete – QA Sub Group taking this forward.
	12/17-02 Board to map additional fiscal levels of vulnerability and policy around child poverty	RMc	Carried forward
	12/17-03 Board to consider further action needed in the area of Early Help	RMc	Complete
Item 5: Vulnerable Adolescents (Hackney)	12/17-04 SWr to liaise with project manager to solidify agreed complementary terminology for contextual safeguarding to share with members	SWr	Complete
	12/17-05 Further discussion on evaluation and quality assurance of contextual safeguarding project	ALL	Complete – added to the Board Forward planner.
Item 6: Partnership Updates	12/17-06 CHSCB to seek guidance on sharing of images of circumcision practice.	CHSCB	Carried forward
	12/17-07 CHSCB to consider Bromley guidance on GDPR	CHSCB	Complete
	12/17-08 RMc to add GDPR to the CHSCB Risk Register	RMc	Complete
Item 8: Working Together	12/17-09 RMc to draft a statement from partners committing to retain existing safeguarding arrangements.	RMc	Complete

Agenda Item 2: Risk Registers

Presenting: Rory McCallum

Discussion/ Challenge

CHSCB Risk Register:

JG commented that after debate at the Hackney Executive group meeting earlier in the month they have agreed to lower the RAG rating for risk 6 *Staff, providers/ stakeholders and/or the public are not consistently aware of the role and work of the CHSCB and important safeguarding advice/ information* from Red to Amber. He added that it was previously rated Red primarily owing to difficulties in engaging the Orthodox Jewish community. It has been lowered in recognition that there is sufficient level of awareness of the role and work of the CHSCB, and to keep it red solely on the basis of one community group would be disproportionate.

JG noted that an additional Amber risk has been added relating to GDPR as follows: *Risk 11: From the 25th May 2018 the new General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) comes into effect and will affect the way the organisations are currently processing and storing data.* Further work is required to fully populate the risk template. There is a lot of work being taken forward by agencies in response to the changes and we need to make sure that as a partnership we are fully compliant. AC remarked that this had been discussed at the London Directors of Children's Services meeting the day before. We do not want the changes to get in the way of safeguarding work. She suggested that as a partnership we should take a robust line that if safeguarding children is the reason for sharing information then this should continue. JG stated it was agreed at the Executive Groups that CHSCB would write to all Board partners to find out what each agency is doing to become GDPR compliant and to determine whether there are any potential issues for the safeguarding partnership. This will be added to the agenda's for the May Executive Group meetings.

JG concluded by advising that at the Hackney Executive they had also agreed to add an additional risk as follows: *Risk 12: Implementation of IR35 Policy with significantly inhibit the Board's ability to employ Independent Serious Case Reviewers of choice.* He added that LB Hackney's implementation of the new IR35 policy has resulted in independent reviewers being required to be paid through payroll, which some reviewers are understandably unwilling to do. AC queried whether this had been escalated to Tim Shields. JG asked AC to do this on behalf of the Board.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-01: AC to escalate the issue regarding Hackney's implementation of the IR35 policy, and the impact this could have on the Board being able to employ independent reviewers of choice.	AC	Next Meeting

Operational Risk Register:

JG thanked members for providing their updated risk registers. He asked members if anyone had any comments or questions they wished to raise. None were forthcoming. JG queried Hackney Learning Trust's red risk regarding unregistered school settings, and asked whether, in light of the work that Scrutiny have been doing in this area, we could sensibly lower this risk to Amber. AC acknowledged JG's point and the work that Scrutiny have been doing, however she advised she lacks confidence that the required legislation will happen in the near future. She therefore felt the risk should remain Red. JG and members present agreed.

Agenda Item 3: Safeguarding & Performance Trends
Presenting: Rory McCallum
Discussion/ Challenge

RMc presented an overview of safeguarding and performance trends across Hackney (City data was not available for this meeting owing to changes in the City of London IT system). The trajectory of increased activity continues and referrals to CAMHS have also increased. RMc remarked that the data presented is very similar to the previous reports and as such proposed not to go into any great depth unless members had comments they wished to raise?

SG asked whether we have any sense how City & Hackney are faring against other local authorities. RMc advised that for the next meeting the report would include comparative information for City & Hackney's Statistical Neighbours. It was also agreed that a short narrative would be provided to help put the slides in context.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-02: SR to include a short narrative and statistical neighbour comparators in future Safeguarding & Performance Trend reports.	SR	Next Meeting

Agenda Item 4: Family Justice Board
Presenting: Lisa Aldridge/ Chris Pelham/ Melinda Cassel
Discussion/ Challenge

LA outlined that at the end of December 2017 there were 369 children looked after by Hackney. Whilst overall there has been an increase in the number of looked after children since March 2017 there has been a 50% increase in the number of children subject to a care order and a 25% decrease in the number of children looked after by virtue of a Section 20 Agreement. This is in line with both national and regional trends and is partly a consequence of judgements made in courts on the use of Section 20 where children are looked after for more than a few months and closer scrutiny of the efficacy of parental agreement to Section 20 arrangements as well as a general increase in the use of care proceedings.

Although the number of children subject to care proceedings has increased, the number of children who actually become subject to a Placement Order has fallen slightly. This is primarily as a result of the Court's principle that it should only be used as a last resort which has resulted in an increase in the resolution of care proceedings through Care Orders, Child Arrangement Orders and Special Guardianship Orders. Hackney's timeliness and duration of care proceedings has improved and compares well across England and Wales, (an average of 28 weeks in the year ending March 2017 and 26 weeks across the first three quarters of 2017/18). However, this is expected to significantly increase in the last quarter of 2017/18 owing to the expected conclusion of a number of outstanding complex cases. LA added that Hackney are looking at cases to see if there is anything else they can do differently before looking to go for proceedings.

Since April 2017, 12 children have been made subject to Placement Orders. Of these 5 have already been placed with adoptive families; 4 are linked with potential adoptive families (in various stages of preparation) and the service are actively finding families for the 3 remaining children. Since April 2017 12 Adoption orders have been granted and a further 3 children have applications for adoption orders. Historically the majority of Adoption Order applications have proceeded through family courts uncontested. In the last 18 months there has been an increase in the number of birth parents accessing legal advice to actively contest legal proceedings. This has led to children waiting much longer in their adoptive placements before being legally adopted, despite adoptive parents making their applications soon as they are legally able to.

JG thanked LA for her report commenting that he found it really helpful. He asked CP if there was anything he wished to add from the City's perspective. CP noted that he had included a brief update in his partner update which stated that in the last 12 months the City has engaged in one Public Law case and one Private Law case, there were no concerns regarding timescales for these cases.

MS queried how likely it would be for parents to be successful at that late stage? MC commented that she did not have the figures to hand but she could find out for her next update. JG noted that he had recently met with some of Hackney's Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) who have some concerns regarding what information Judges are taking into account before making their judgements. He queried whether Cafcass Guardians hold any sway with the judges. He added that a good example of our concerns relate to Child M. This case concerned a 13 month year old boy found to have transverse fractures to both femurs. Both parents were deemed to have been involved. They were taken to court for grievous bodily harm but this was reduced to a charge of cruelty against the father. The mother subsequently has the child back in her care. He remarked that he is considering making representations to the Family Justice Board about the concerns we have about this position. AC noted that she would support this action as SWr, SLi and herself are extremely concerned about this case.

MC replied that she can certainly look into the role and impact of Cafcass guardians. She noted that the strength of the social work evidence submitted to courts, and whether there appear to be any gaps in the reports provided, will largely influence whether further reports are requested. She added that Cafcass are going to be looking at the number of short notice applications being received. Hackney comparatively submit a high number of short notice applications which will also have an impact on the number of additional assessments being requested. She suggested this might be something the Board/ Local Authority should also look at.

JG thanked colleagues for the helpful discussion. It was agreed the SCR Sub group would further review the Court's decision making in respect of Child M and to clarify whether any issues arose in respect of the timeliness of application or the quality of the social work report. Following this, CHSCB Chair to consider raising with FJB given the concerns identified in respect of mother's parenting capacity and recent criminal conviction.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-03: SCR Sub group to further review the Court's decision making in respect of Child M. CHSCB Chair to consider raising with FJB given the concerns identified in respect of mother's parenting capacity and recent criminal conviction.	SCR/ JG	Next meeting

Agenda Item 5: Early Help
Presenting: Pauline Adams/ Chris Pelham
Discussion/ Challenge

CP presented his paper and outlined that they have excellent multi-agency engagement and good partnership working across Early Help services. He explained that in the City of London the Early Help offer is part of Children and Families Services Hub. It sits within the same management structure which helps them to identify needs and reduce hand offs. Current areas of priority include:

- Capturing Distance Travelled – looking at ways through which to evidence the impact Early Help Services have on children, young people and their families’ lives.
- Short Break Service Improvement – the process and pathway for accessing the City’s Short Breaks was redeveloped in 2016 to both simplify and standardise the offer to make it easier for families to self refer. This has significantly improved families satisfaction with the service. Prior to this, the approach to Short Breaks had been ad hoc and as a result take up had been limited.
- Service User Engagement – reviewing the ways in which they engage with/ solicit feedback from children, young people and their families to inform service development activities across the partnership. (They are liaising with the CHSCB Community Engagement group to ensure any developments are in line with the Boards wider engagement approach).

CP concluded by advising that the Early Help Coordinator also chairs a helpful Multi-Agency Practitioners Forum to strengthen and improve joint working across and between all partners delivering Tier 1 and 2 services to children & young people and their families across the City of London. JG invited questions from members. None were raised. JG remarked that he had particularly welcomed CP’s report, particularly the recognition that the approach to Short Breaks needed to be improved. JG thanked CP for his report and invited PA to present her report.

PA explained that the Early Help offer in Hackney is delivered by both the Children & Families Service and the Hackney Learning Trust in partnership with a plethora of partners including schools, children’s centres, GP’s and health colleagues as well as service providers in the voluntary and community sector. The report provided focuses on the services delivered by Children & Families Service and Children’s Centres. The Hackney early help offer continues to develop and strengthen in response to the needs of the local community. They have seen a marked increase in demand for services. In 2016/17 5,635 named individuals attended 52,871 Young Hackney Universal Service sessions. This year to date (2017/18 Q1-3) has seen further increases with 8,912 named individuals attending 107,523 sessions.

PA added that the addition of the Young People’s Substance Misuse Service (which provides confidential support to young people aged 6-25 years old and undertakes preventative and educational work around drug and alcohol misuse) and the Health and Wellbeing service (established to provide a holistic child-centre service) have really enhanced the Early Help service offer. They are continuing to develop ways through which they can support young people. Detached Outreach and Youth Justice Prevention and Diversion services are really making an impact in terms of reducing the number of children involved in Criminal Justice.

User engagement is also a big feature of the service. Following every case closure they talk to families about their experience of the service they received. They also seek feedback through a series of youth forums, as well as the Youth Parliament. They also conduct annual surveys and seek to engage young people in the development of new service developments. RMc commented that for the 2017/18 CHSCB Annual Report it would be really helpful to understand which neighbourhoods the detached outreach teams have been going into. PA confirmed she would be able to provide this.

SGr noted on page 67 of the meeting paper pack it recognises that there are children who are hard to reach. She asked for greater clarity regarding what is done to identify these young people. PA responded that they are very aware that there are vulnerable young people who do not access universal provision. These are often the young people found hanging about on estates. They are located/ identified through the partnership. They offer outreach to those estates as a way of engaging these individuals. In addition they commission a range of VCS organisations to deliver services across the board spectrum of communities.

JT queried if the young people they are working with have younger siblings, whether the siblings can also be offered prevention/ intervention services. PA advised that this is possible. JT queried whether there is any way to alert schools of their engagement as this would be useful information for the schools to be aware of. PA confirmed that in relation to younger siblings they take a whole family approach. PA advised that she could do some mapping of the types of offers that are being taken up, and she could share this via the Head Teachers forum. AG agreed this would be very helpful.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-04: PA to map the types of offers that are being taken up by young people, and share this information via the Head Teachers forum.	PA	Next meeting

JG concluded by saying that we are having conversations at Board level to see what information is available from schools. He added that in his view Young Hackney is the jewel in the crown in of Hackney Services and they are continuing to do a great job despite the increasing demand.

Agenda Item 6: Partnership Updates
Presenting: All
Discussion/ Challenge

JG thanked members for providing their partner updates. He noted that in some reports the second question asking partners to provide reassurances that *they have effective contingency/ emergency planning arrangements in place for times of staff shortages and/or increases in demand & detail how they maintain focus on ensuring a healthy well-supported workforce*, has not been answered. He commented that we had asked for this update because we are seeking reassurances from partners. He asked that in future partners complete all aspects of the update as appropriate. JG took each update in turn and asked partners if they had any questions they wished to raise regarding the updates.

Cafcass

CP commented that going forward he would welcome a discussion about private law cases, their volume and the impact they have on children. He added that he would also be interested to know what percentage of Private Law cases become Public Law cases. MC replied that in the last year the City have had one Private Law case and Hackney have had 114. She added that the number of Private Law cases that become Public Law cases are quite low, but would need to check the actual numbers. She noted that it may be indicative of a Section 37 that meets the threshold for proceedings. It was agreed MC would be invited to attend the next City of London Executive Group meeting on 24th May for further discussion.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-05: SS to invite MC to attend the next City of London & Hackney Executive group meetings to discuss Public/ Private Law Cases.	SS	April 2018

City & Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group

SG queried whether the City & Hackney CCG take an overview of recruitment across the NHS Trusts, noting that a couple of Trust risk registers cite staff shortages and recruitment issues. ML replied they have a statutory responsibility to retain oversight. She added that staffing and recruitment had also previously been on the City & Hackney CCG risk register, but had just been removed owing to some of the vacant posts being filled.

City of London Corporation

No comments or questions were raised. ACar drew members attention to the London Children in Care Council (CiCC), facilitated by the Partnership for Young London and the City of London Corporation. He suggested, and it was agreed, that the chair of this group should be invited to attend a future Board meeting. JG noted for the minutes that the Quality Assurance 2017 Annual Audit outcome had been very positive.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-06: SS to invite the chair of the London Children in Care Council (CiCC) to attend a future Board meeting.	SS	May 2018

City of London Police

No comments or questions were raised.

East London Foundation Trust

SGr queried whether there was any way to record some of the Service User Participation events noted in the Partner update, so they can be shared with other groups? DR advised that they share what they can via the [ELFT CAMHS website](#).

With the growing ELFT geographical footprint JG sought reassurances from DR that ELFT have the capacity to deliver in City & Hackney. DR replied that he thought they did. He added that Jan Pearson has been replaced by Agnes Addington and that each borough have named professionals in place. ML commented that DR is correct that they are now in a better position and that their previous staffing/ capacity issue has been largely resolved. JG noted the reassurances given and commented he was aware that Jan was retiring and formally put on record his deep appreciation for her hard work and dedication. He added that he planned to write to Jan to put his thanks on record.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-07: JG to write to Jan Pearson to thank her for her hard work and dedication	JG	May 2018

Hackney Children & Families Services

JT queried whether LA could share any further information regarding the North London Social Work Teaching Partnership and how it is going. LA commented that it has been going for a year now and that it has been working well. The Local Authority support the University in the training of student social workers, in return they get access to the best people coming through.

In relation to the Staff Health Check Survey SGr queried what the percentage response rate they had received. LA advised that she did not know off the top of her head but that it is usually quite high as they advertise the survey quite widely. She agreed to check and bring details back.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-08: LA to include the percentage response rate to the Staff Health Check Survey on submission of the findings to SR (collating the CHSCB staff survey).	LA	Next meeting

JG commented that Section 2 of their update re contingency arrangements was really good and comprehensive. He added that the Managing Demand Group and their supervision and appraisal arrangements were particularly welcomed and reassuring as they demonstrate a real commitment to the Health & Wellbeing of staff.

Hackney Learning Trust

No comments or questions were raised.

Homerton University Hospital

It was noted that Red Thread's Youth Violence Intervention Programme will be coming to the Homerton, MS was asked to provide a little bit more information about this. She explained they are planning an internal launch on 29th April. The Red Thread teams work in major trauma units with young people aged 11-24 that come into trauma units as victims of assault and exploitation. Once the victims have been medically stabilised Red Thread youth workers (who are embedded in the Hospital's emergency department) engage the young victims/ and offer support in the aftermath of the incident. They can provide brief interventions and encourage them to stop think and reflect, and to make healthier choices/ develop positive plans to disrupt the cycle of violence.

JG also acknowledged the Homerton's excellent Voice of the Child work adding that it is providing very positive feedback.

London Ambulance Service

No comments or questions were raised.

London Criminal Rehabilitation Company

JG advised that he plans to write to London CRC regarding their lack of engagement. He added that he had attended a recent Scrutiny meeting. At that meeting London CRC came under some criticism for their lack of engagement.

MET Police

JG formally put on record his thanks and appreciation to Simon Laurence who recently left to head up the Grenfell Inquiry. He commented that it was disappointing to see that section 2 regarding contingency arrangements has not been answered. The Police are going through a lot of organisational changes, particularly in terms of the new BCU structure, and his opinion this represents a real risk.

CL stated that while Section 2 had not been completed the potential risk to safeguarding children had been acknowledged in Section 4 of the self-audit form. In response to JG she offered to provide commentary in Section 2 to provide greater clarity.

Action	Lead	Timescale
AP 03/18-09: JG to write to Simon Laurence to thank him for his hard work and dedication	JG	May 2018
AP 03/18-10: CL to update Section 2 to share with attendees for next meeting.	CL	Next meeting

National Probation Service

No comments or questions were raised.

Public Health

No comments or questions were raised.

[Whittington Health](#)

No comments or questions were raised.

JG commented that there have been some issues regarding the level of Board representation/ engagement from Housing and other areas that fall under the licensing portfolio. He added that he has raised this before and written to Kim Chaplain. EH apologised on behalf of the service for this and explained that she had been appointed the Interim Divisional Head of Housing. She explained they are restructuring housing services and developing the new training plan which will include safeguarding training for all levels of housing personnel. She added that going forward the newly appointed Divisional Head will be attending CHSCB Board meetings.

Agenda Item 7: Healthy Workforce **Presenting: Rory McCallum** **Discussion/ Challenge**

RMc briefly presented the attached presentation sharing headline findings from the CHSCB Staff Survey 2017/18 findings. He advised this will be considered at the Executives in more depth in May. This report will



20180320 Item 7 - CHSCB Staff Survey.pdf

This is the fourth staff survey run by the CHSCB. It closed on 16th March 2018 by which point we had received 555 responses. 161 responses came from the City of London, 343 from London Borough of Hackney and 51 from cross-borough agencies. This is the highest level of engagement achieved to date (313 responses were received in 2014/15, 495 in 2015/16 and 396 in 2016/17). Although technically closed RMc advised that if there are any final responses these should be sent through as soon as possible so they can be included in the final report.

The high level picture is very positive. Access to supervision, and quality of the supervision received is high. Access to and the visibility of Line Managers is good, and this is something that is clearly valued by staff. On the whole caseloads and workloads are manageable. The final slide draws out some comments respondents made in response to the question what makes you come to work? Responses include references to feeling valued and supported in their work and workplaces; and passion for the roles they undertake and the difference it can have in people's lives when undertaken properly.

The high level emerging findings suggest there is much for us to be optimistic about, however the reports to come to the Executive groups in May will provide a more detailed breakdown of responses including by whether or not respondents work with children and young people; and by agency. RMc added that we plan to disaggregate the data and take a closer look at responses particularly those who have responded to say they have not received any Safeguarding training; or state they have no access to supervision or support, to determine which agencies they work in what roles they undertake. Given the increased demand and subsequent workloads, and greater austerity measures, the health and wellbeing of staff will be key.

Agenda Item 8: Serious Case Reviews/ Local Learning Reviews **Presenting: Rory McCallum** **Discussion/ Challenge**

RMc presented the SCR update circulated with the meeting papers. He drew member's attention specifically to the following three cases:

Child M:

RMc outlined that last week the Board had published the Child M Serious Case Review report. This case relates to a 13 month year old boy found to have transverse fractures to both femurs. Themes coming out of the review are all too familiar including disguised compliance and lack of professional curiosity. He added that the report is well written and he asked members to share it with their staff.

Chadrack:

RMc also commented on the Multi Agency Case Review regarding Chadrack. This is the case of the five year old boy who was found to have starved to death following the death of his mother. Although the case did not meet the criteria for full Serious Case Review it was agreed that a local Multi Agency Case Review should be undertaken. This report has been completed and will be published on Thursday (22nd March). RMc added that this case has been in

the press over the last couple of months so he is expecting further coverage once the report is published. He advised that the report concluded a simple but critical lesson; we must all think safeguarding first. This simple yet powerful approach needs to be adopted as best practice, and must equally apply to school attendance issues. Current guidance on school attendance is unsurprisingly more focused on children not falling behind in their education. RMc has suggested this needs to change to put safeguarding first at its heart.

Child N & Child O

RMc concluded his update by commenting that the Serious Case Review regarding Child N and Child O is also to be published soon. This case related to two 18 month old twins who has been seriously assaulted by their father. Child N died from his injuries and Child O sustained serious injuries. The father has subsequently been charged with murder and attempted murder of his children. The SCR report has been completed and sent to the SCR Sub Group for review. It will be sent it to Board members before publication.

Agenda Item 9: CHSCB Annual Report 2016/17

Presenting: Rory McCallum

Discussion/ Challenge

Annual Report

JG confirmed that the [CHSCB Annual Report 2016/17](#) was published online last month and remarked that it is best viewed online as it has been published in an interactive/ easily accessible way this year. He added that the CHSCB Team are planning to complete the 2017/18 Annual Report earlier this year, and forewarned partners we will be contacting them shortly for their input.

Agenda Item 10: GDPR

Presenting: Angela Bent

Discussion/ Challenge

It was agreed that this item had already been covered earlier in the meeting.

Agenda Item 11: Chairs Feedback

Presenting: Jim Gamble

Discussion/ Challenge

JG advised that he had recently had a useful meeting with Lord Agnew regarding unregistered settings in the Orthodox Jewish community. In the meeting Lord Agnew acknowledged that his comments that Ofsted/Local Authorities had sufficient powers to deal with unregistered settings had been unhelpful. Lord Agnew also advised that the Government's [Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper](#) was due to be published for consultation in March. The Green Paper asks for feedback on their proposals to support parents with their choice of out-of-school education settings.

JG added that he and RMc had also recently met with Mr Myer Rothfeld, who has been nominated by the Rabbinate of the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations in Hackney to work with us regarding our concerns around unregistered settings. He added that he feels that they are making some progress. They had a positive, frank and honest conversation and are looking to work together to put in place appropriate safeguarding arrangements whilst continuing to press for appropriate legislative measures.

JG briefly commented that he is continuing to pursue the Home Office in relation to an outstanding recommendation from Case FC SCR to review Home Office Policy relating to sharing of soft intelligence. This issues has been going on for two and a half years and despite some recent progress with the Home Office (including a meeting with Sarah Newton MP), a further meeting (with her replacement following the reshuffle) has recently been cancelled at short notice. If this meeting is not rescheduled very shortly, then JG is considering publishing an open letter outlining his concerns as he feels it can no longer carry on. JG added that the recommendation in question proposed a simple review of current Home Office policy, how it is applied and how practice might be improved particularly when soft intelligence regarding potential criminal activity is held relating to those involved in formal safeguarding roles. The offender in this case, a foster carer, escaped scrutiny, in simple terms, because although police knew an allegation had been made against the foster carer, in each of the occasions when he was subject to the regular vetting checks that carers are required to undergo, a decision was made not to share that information. This led to over thirty children being placed in the home of the foster carer.

JG concluded by saying that SG had emailed him a couple of days before the meeting to highlight a growing concern regarding homelessness and the impact this is having on children. JG confirmed that CHSCB will do some scoping work on this to develop an understanding on the depth of the problem in Hackney.

Agenda Item 12: Any Other Business
Presenting: All
Discussion/ Challenge

JG advised that five sub group bi-annual reports have been circulated to members for their scrutiny and review. He added that these reports were considered at the most recent Executive group meetings. JG concluded by saying that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday 3rd July 2018.

Action Log – March 2018

Previous Actions		Lead	Update
Item 4: Partner Updates	09/17-11: ML to share the Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy, (referenced in the ELFT update paper) with the Vulnerable Adolescents sub-groups in City of London & Hackney.	ML	Carried forward SS to request a copy from ELFT directly.
Item 6: Prevent	09/17:15 TT/ RMc to update prevent guidance on the CHSCB website and to contact NSPCC to see if they can help provide some additional data.	TT/ RMc	Carried forward In hand, Website being updated. NSPCC to be contacted
Item 3: Safeguarding & Performance Trends	12/17: 02 Board to map additional fiscal levels of vulnerability and policy around child poverty	RMc	Carried forward
Item 6: Partnership Updates	12/17: 06 CHSCB to seek guidance on sharing of images of circumcision practice.	CHSCB	Carried forward
March Actions			
Item	Action	Lead	Deadline
Item 2. Risk Registers	AP 03/18-01: AC to escalate the issue regarding Hackney's implementation of the IR35 policy, and the impact this could have on the Board being able to employ independent reviewers of choice.	AC	Next meeting
Item 3: Safeguarding & Performance Trends	AP 03/18-02: SR to include a short narrative and statistical neighbour comparators in future Safeguarding & Performance Trend reports.	SR	Next meeting
Item 4: Family Justice Board	AP 03/18-03: SCR Sub group to further review the Court's decision making in respect of Child M. CHSCB Chair to consider raising with FJB given the concerns identified in respect of mother's parenting capacity and recent criminal conviction.	SCR/ JG	Next meeting
Item 5: Early Help	AP 03/18-04: PA to map the types of offers that are being taken up by young people, and share this information via the Head Teachers forum.	PA	Next meeting
Item 6: Partner Updates	AP 03/18-05: SS to invite MC to attend the next City of London & Hackney Executive group meetings to discuss Public/ Private Law Cases.	SS	April 2018
	AP 03/18-06: SS to invite the chair of the London Children in Care Council (CiCC) to attend a future Board meeting.	SS	May 2018
	AP 03/18-07: JG to write to Jan Pearson to thank her for her hard work and dedication	JG	May 2018
	AP 03/18-08: LA to include the percentage response rate to the Staff Health Check Survey on submission of the findings to SR (collating the CHSCB staff survey).	LA	Next meeting
	AP 03/18-09: JG to write to Simon Laurence to thank him for his hard work and dedication	JG	May 2018
	AP 03/18-10: CL to update Section 2 to share with attendees for next meeting.	CL	Next meeting

