

**BRIGHTON & HOVE LOCAL SAFEGUARDING  
CHILDREN BOARD**  
**Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> June 2016. 1pm-4pm**  
**The Great Hall, Moulsecoomb North Hub**



**Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
Anna Gianfrancesco	Service Manager, YOS
Claire-Louise Mackay	LSCB Senior Administrator (Minutes)
Daryl Perilli	Data Analyst, Brighton & Hove City Council
David Feakes	Head of Safeguarding, Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust
Deb Austin	Head of Safeguarding, Brighton & Hove City Council
Debbie Piggott	Head of Service for Assessment, Rehabilitation and IOM, Kent Surrey & Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company
Debi Fillery	Named Nurse, BSUH, NHS Trust
Eddie Hick	Child Protection and Safeguarding Manager, Sussex Police
Emma Wadey	Director of Nursing Standards & Quality, SPFT
Elizabeth Cody	Brighton College
Graham Bartlett	LSCB Independent Chair (Chair)
Helen Gulvin	Assistant Director Children's Services: Safeguarding & Care
Kerry Clarke	Strategic Commissioner Children's Services, Children 5-19 Public Health Programmes
Jamie Carter (Dr)	Designated Doctor for Child Protection, Brighton & Hove CCG
Jane Mitchell	Safeguarding Lead, SE Ambulance Service
Jason Tingley	Sussex Police Lead
Jo Lyons	Assistant Director Children's Services: Education & Inclusion
Lorna Miller-Cooper	LSCB Lay Member
Mark Burden	Senior Probation Officer, National Probation Service
Mat Thomas	Early Help Hub Co-Ordinator, Brighton & Hove City Council
Mia Brown	LSCB Business Manager
Nigel Nash	Service Manager, CAFCASS
Peter Castleton	Head of Community Safety, Brighton & Hove City Council
Pinaki Ghoshal	Executive Director of Children's Services, Brighton & Hove City Council
Richard Chamberlin	Roedean School
Stephen Terry,	LSCB Lay Member
Sue Kelly	Named Nurse, SPFT
Terri Fletcher	Director, Safety Net. Community & Voluntary Sector Representative
Tom Bewick (Cllr)	Lead Member, Children's Services, Brighton & Hove City Council
Tracy John	Head of Housing, Brighton & Hove City Council
Yvette Queffurus	Named Nurse, Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust

## Apologies Received

Andrea Saunders	Director of Public Protection, National Probation Service
Andy Reynolds	Director of Prevention and Protection, ESFRS,
Gail Gray	Chair, Violence against Women & Girls Forum
Mary Flynn (Dr)	Named Doctor, Brighton & Hove CCG
Sherree Fagge	Chief Nurse, Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals
Soline Jerram	Director of Clinical Quality & Primary Care, Brighton & Hove CCG

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1 Graham Bartlett welcomed the group, and introductions were made. David Feakes was welcomed as the new Head of Safeguarding for SCFT, and reminded the group that Sussex Community is now a Foundation trust. Mark Burden explained that he was present to represent the National Probation Service on behalf of Andrea Saunders

1.2 Graham Bartlett reminded all members to declare any conflicts of interest should they arise.

### 2. Minutes of Last Meeting

2.1 The Minutes of the last LSCB meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2016 were agreed for accuracy.

### 3. Matters Arising

3.1 The LSCB considered the circulated update on matters arising from the March 2016 LSCB meeting.

3.2 (Item 3.2 – Baby Liam Publication) There were no further comments on the written response to this action, so this will now be incorporated to the action plan.

3.3 (Item 5.8 – MAPPA Annual Report) More information has been provided following our request, and the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee are going to discuss this further at their July 2016 meeting. **Action: Feedback at September's Board**

3.4 (CSE Promise) The work on the CSE Promise is being progressed by the CSA/CSE Prevent, Protect and Early Identification Subcommittee. It was hoped that there would be a draft to present today but this will be forward planned until our September meeting.

3.5 Healthwatch were invited to this meeting, but were not able to attend, so we will welcome them in September 2016 to introduce their role to the Board.

### 4. Update from Leadership

4.1 The Leadership Group, which includes the chairs of all LSCB Subcommittees, last met on the 4<sup>th</sup> May 2016.

4.2 The Case Review Subcommittee updated on their ongoing work

4.6 Following June Hopkins' retirement, a new Designated Nurse has been appointed by the CCG. Joanna Tomlinson-Howe will start post in July, and she has previously worked in Kent.

4.7 The Vulnerable Children & CSE Strategy Group have invited Erica Thornton from Missing People to their next meeting to discuss the service they are providing for missing children across Sussex. The group are also working on how to make sure that the See Me Hear Me framework is robustly embedded in partners' work.

4.8 Graham Bartlett asked the Leadership Group to consider whether we should spend £1500 to become a partner member of the Association of Independent LSCB Chairs. After some discussion they decided this would not be a justified expense.

## **5. Monitoring & Evaluation 2016-17 Annual Report**

5.1 Deb Austin presented the annual report of the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee on behalf of their chair, Helen Davies. The Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee continue to oversee a programme of multi-agency audits, disseminate the findings from audits and track action plans, and scrutinise aspects of practice highlighted by the Management Information Report. Membership of the group has remained constant, and the agency representatives are committed to the work of the group. For 2016-17 the frequency of the Monitoring & Evaluation meetings has changed from bi-monthly to quarterly, which is a reflection on how this work has become embedded in partner's work streams.

5.2 During 2015-16 the group completed three multi-agency audits, rather than the customary four, as capacity was reduced during the Ofsted inspection, which was a large scale piece of quality assurance activity in itself.

5.3 The Multi-Agency Audit on Network Meetings & Core Groups looked at 18 cases and found that there was good practice although 36% did need some improvement. This audit incorporated feedback from parents who said that they felt that they can engage with these meetings and that the practitioners involved work well with together.

5.4 Key recommendations included:

- frequency of meetings should be specified in the plan
- all actions should have a specific timeframe documented
- if practitioners are unable to attend a meeting, they should always be required to submit a report
- where appropriate, young people should be invited to attend the meeting
- minutes of the meeting should be kept simple with the focus on the child's plan
- a record of the meeting should be circulated to members within 2 weeks

5.5 The second multi-agency audit addressed parental substance misuse and its impact on children. This revealed good practice in midwifery, good multi-agency assessments, work that was child focused and positive partnership work. There was one recommendation about GP records and one about pre-birth assessments.

5.6 The third audit is the Early Help audit that we will consider today. This was a large piece of work completed in three parts:

- analysis of early help data set
- a shallow dive of cases referred to the Early Help engagement team in May 2015
- multi-agency audit of 10 of the above cases, involving ten agencies

5.7 The shallow dive looked at 144 cases, and found that 60% could have been referred straight to the Early Help Hub. The in-depth audit then found strong multi-agency work with very child focused practice, and evidence that the voice of the young person has informed the work undertaken. In the majority of cases, there is regular case supervision and management oversight of the case. The recommendations include addressing confusion reported by parents about who is doing what and which service is involved, and ensuring that the nominated lead professional is fulfilling their role.

5.8 The Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee also consider selected single agency audits. Throughout 2015/16, Children's Services has shared many of their audits, which has enabled the subcommittee to get assurance on key matters and allowed them to avoid duplication of work.

5.9 The LSCB Quality Assurance Framework underpins the multi-agency audit programme. In 2015/16, efforts were made to improve feedback from service users and from practitioners, with a stronger focus on outcomes. This year the subcommittee will continue to develop how they best hear the voice of the child, and their parents & carers, in this work.

5.10 The Management Information Report is now produced on a 6-monthly basis rather than quarterly, to allow patterns and trends to be analysed more effectively.

5.11 In the Ofsted inspection of the LSCB they were positive about our quality assurance work.

5.12 Graham Bartlett thanked Deb Austin for presenting this report, and the members of the Monitoring & Evaluation subcommittee for all of their work. He said that the Board must not underestimate the level of work that goes into these audits, and thanked Tina James in particular for her support on this work.

5.14 Graham Bartlett said that there are still individual agencies that have not shared their single agency audits, but they had been written to and encouraged to contribute. He said that the Board needs to understand the level of audit activity that takes place in partner agencies, and that we should work with East & West Sussex to develop what we want partners to provide assurances on.

5.13 Graham Bartlett said that whilst he was pleased that the Police have presented their Child Protection Review to the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee, he still wants to encourage them to conduct more case file audits. Jason Tingley said that it would be useful to have an advance plan across Sussex to build into their work streams. Graham Bartlett agreed and said that he will discuss this with the other two LSCB chairs so that they can avoid duplication and increase efficiency.

## **6. LSCB Communication Strategy and Participation & Engagement Action Plan**

6.1 Mia Brown presented the proposed LSCB Communication Strategy for 2016-19 on behalf of Andy Reynolds, chair of the Participation & Engagement Subcommittee. She reminded the Board that regulation 5 of the Local Safeguarding Children Boards Regulations 2006 states that LSCBs are responsible for “communicating to persons and bodies in the area of the authority the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children, raising their awareness of how this can best be done and encouraging them to do so”.

6.2 This strategy will be driven forward by the Participation & Engagement Subcommittee. It is very similar to the previous year’s strategy, but has expanded upon how we will seek to engage with children and young people, and how we will ensure that their voice is heard in our communications. We began this with the brief consultation on our business plan that the Designated Teacher’s forum took forward, and we want to develop more robust and inclusive principals for consulting children & young people throughout our work. Lorna Miller Cooper said that this was discussed at the Lay Member Development Day, and it is vital that we are clear whenever we undertake any consultation about why we are doing this, how we will do it, what we want to achieve and what the children will get back from this. This will be discussed in depth at the next Participation & Engagement Subcommittee in July 2016.

6.3 Anna Gianfrancesco said that Alex Cooter, Manager of RUOK? is working with Kerry Clarke to develop a leaflet for parents around adolescents staying safe at Pride and throughout the summer. She will link in with Terri Fletcher over this for the Safety Rocks newsletter.

6.4 Graham Bartlett said that the Participation & Engagement group is one of our strengths. Although we could always do more we must remember that we are one of the better Boards in terms of our communications.

6.5 Terri Fletcher said that we need to think about how we can measure if our communications are effective, and that it is difficult to quantify if this makes a difference. Jason Tingley said that the Pan Sussex CSE Campaign has just closed and he can arrange for how this was evaluated to be presented at a future LSCB meeting. The methods involved looking at the analytics of the website and media, including millions of viewings for some of the videos, as well as surveys of parents and children across the county. **Action: Forward Plan Vulnerable Children Strategy Group agenda.**

6.6 The Board signed off the LSCB Communication Strategy for 2016-19.

## 7. Lay Member Presentation & Feedback from Conference

7.1 Lorna Miller-Cooper presented on the Lay Member Conference which took place at Brighton Town Hall on the 26<sup>th</sup> May 2016. Our Lay Members chose to hold this event after last year's session in Portsmouth which they found a good opportunity to talk about the role and the experiences in different Boards.

7.2 There were 20 attendees from 10 Board across the South East region. The agenda followed on from last years and included:

- Learning more about the different aspects of the role
- Feeling and being effective
- Understanding more about the work of a Safeguarding Board
- Ideas about how to engage the wider public in safeguarding issues

7.3 The group found that there is no consistent approach to lay membership across the ten LSCBs represented. Each LSCB has a varied length of service, different numbers of lay members, with more lay members considered very beneficial. Some LSCBs have several Lay Members spread across a large geographic area, and some only have one. We are unique in having four for an authority of this size.

7.4 Lay members participate in a wide variety of sub-committees/groups including the Child Death Overview Panel, Case Review, Quality Assurance and Learning & Development. A Lay member in one LSCB also chairs a specific subcommittee, and another leads on public engagement. Some Lay Members contributed to the Annual Report, and some had been involved in the recruitment of the Independent Chair.

7.5 Lay members were not sure that they had influence on the board, or that there is any consideration given to what difference it actually makes having a Lay Membership. Some LSCBs document all their challenges and are improving how the responses to and action from these, are evidenced. Lay members understood their role to be not only one of challenge, but one that brings individual skills and experience, as well as bringing a public voice and different perspective to discussions. The independence of the lay member gives the freedom to ask questions that often other people might be thinking but not saying because of constraints of their role. They agreed that we are a voice from the community - not the voice of the community.

7.6 Terri Fletcher did a presentation on consulting with Children & Young People, and the work that Safety Net do. This was well received and the Lay Members were interested to consider how to communicate have meaningful consultation that has an impact and influence.

7.7 Andy Reynolds also did a presentation on the Participation & Engagement Subcommittee. He outlined the good work that we do to communicate with professionals, as we are often approached by other Boards asking to reuse our information or briefings. He described the tensions between communicating what the Board is and key safety messages, and there was a consensus that it is more important for the public to be told about safeguarding rather than the LSCB. However some Boards did say that young people had expressed a view that it was important to know that there is an overarching Board that scrutinises these things.

7.8 The Lay Members then discussed in small groups how they could improve their effectiveness, and had the following suggestions:

- Fostering a culture in which *all* board members challenge each other, so that the expectation is always there that the lay members will do so and that all partners are used to responding effectively.
- That the board and subcommittees agree ground rules for how they work together in meetings, to promote openness and professional behaviours.
- Improved chairing to proactively support constructive challenge and discussion
- The Lay Member Buddy role is really helpful, especially where this offers support before during and after meetings and when asking challenging questions in meetings.
- Improving the understanding of all LSCB members and committees of the role of lay member and its dual purpose as an equal member and as external advisor/scrutineer.
- Clarity for board members that Lay Member are bound by an LSCB confidentiality agreement and as such may participate an all aspects of the board's work.

7.9 To help increase the understanding of the role and function of Lay Membership, Lorna Miller Cooper reminded the Board that:

- Lay members are recruited through a formal application and interview process, including DBS clearance and sign a confidentiality agreement on beginning their role.
- Is required for the LSCB to have a Lay Membership as per The Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 amended sections 13 and 14 of the Children Act 2004, which states that the local authority must take reasonable steps to ensure that the LSCB includes two lay members representing the local community.
- Working Together 2015 states that: Lay members will operate as full members of the LSCB, participating as appropriate on the Board itself and on relevant committees. Lay members should help to make links between the LSCB and community groups, support stronger public engagement in local child safety issues and an improved public understanding of the LSCB's child protection work.
- As a voluntary role, the contribution of individual Lay Members varies according to individual experience and availability alongside other commitments.
- Lay membership provides a public voice on the board, bringing diverse perspectives and local concerns to discussions.
- Equal membership – in some LSCBs lay members chair committees and sit as equal contributors on Child Death Overview Panel, also have presence on the Corporate Parenting Panel.

7.10 The feedback from the conference attendees was very positive, and Mia Brown said that one member said it was the best of the five conferences they had been to. Our Lay Members are going to take forward an action to set up a virtual network for further discussion and support.

7.11 Graham Bartlett thanked Lorna Miller Cooper for this presentation, and all our Lay Members for organising this event. He said that it is very useful to understand where different Boards are at, and that we all struggle with the same issues regarding challenge. He said that it is right to remember that our Lay Members are voices from the public, and we must bare this in mind when responding to their questions. The Public, and Lay Members, and even some partner agency representatives, are not familiar with all the jargon and acronyms that are used in our discussions, so all members should speak in plain English and make sure that these concepts are explained at our meetings. He hopes that there will be future Lay Member events as this feedback was very useful.

7.12 Terri Fletcher<sup>1</sup> asked how far the role and remit of the Lay Members is understood by our Board? She suggested that it may be beneficial to circulate something to all of our subcommittees to raise awareness of this. Helen Gulvin agreed, and said that the Case Review Subcommittee had a discussion around this and their learning should be shared. **Action: A message to be circulated to all Subcommittee Members to give clarity on the Lay Member role, including what to expect and what not to expect.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Challenge – does the Board understand the Lay Member role and why we have them?

## **8. Wood Report**

8.1 Graham Bartlett discussed the Wood Review which has major implications for both the role of the LSCB and the Child Death Overview Panel, as well as recommending a centralisation of all SCRs. This review was commissioned by the government to look at whether LSCBs are still relevant or if there is a better model that could be used.

8.2 The report, which was released in May 2016, recommends that LSCBs should no longer be a statutory requirement, and that the leadership for child protection, safeguarding and wellbeing should be shared between the local authority, police and health for each area, with some form of independent overview. It will be for these agencies to best decide how to discharge this function, and they may decide to continue with the Board set up. At the moment what is meant by the "local area" is not clearly defined.

8.3 This will be a journey of change, and Graham Bartlett reminded all partners that they must continue to work with the LSCB until things alter. He said that there is a risk that there will be voids left when the legislation is passed, and we must continue to work together until new arrangements are in place.

8.4 Graham Bartlett has spoken to the Chief Executive of the Council, and Pinaki Ghoshal, and there will be a paper to the City Management Board on Thursday. Pinaki Ghoshal and Geoff Raw will work with the police and health partners to make a decision. It is worth remembering that the recommendations from the Wood report concentrate on the 75% of LSCBs that were graded "requires improvement" by Ofsted, and that we are part of the minority that were rated as Good.

## **9. Early Help Update**

9.1 Mat Thomas was welcomed to the group, and explained that he would be presenting the Early Help Update on behalf of Sarah Colombo. There is a proposal that the governance of Early Help comes under the LSCB rather than the Early Help Partnership Board, which was led by Children's Services. This should support the development of a strategic outcomes framework, and provide scrutiny of Early Help pathways, processes and thresholds. Early Help is difficult to measure, and although Ofsted said that the offer in Brighton & Hove sounded good we still do not know how to best test its effectiveness, and it is felt that a greater degree of multi-agency oversight is needed.

9.2 Distinct elements of Early Help:

- Universal to enhanced interventions
- Universal health visiting offer
- Volunteer Support Development Coordinators in Children's Centres
- Targeted interventions
- Integrated Team for Families family coach works with a family for 3-6 months
- Universal Partnership Plus health visiting interventions

9.3 The targeted interventions link most closely to social work, and Mat Thomas reports quarterly to children's services and the LSCB on the Early Help Assessments and Plans. This does not capture any of the work that is going on in the universal services, and so does not give the complete picture of Early Help in the city, and they will be working with the Stronger Families team to look at this.

9.4 The Troubled Families national programme had six indicators against which to monitor progress, which are linked to early help:

- ASB and crime
- Mental and physical health
- Progress to work and sustained employment
- Children and young people in need of help
- Attendance and behaviour at school
- Domestic violence and abuse

9.5 This provides a large set of KPIs that can be monitored, and they would like assistance to decide which to report on regularly. In the autumn there will be a new IT system launched for Early Help, which will be used for both referrals and case management, and there is a huge capacity for data to be reported on through this.

9.6 Mat Thomas asked the Board to consider whether the balance is right between the quarterly reporting that focuses on core targeted Early Help services in relation to intensive services, and the annual report that looks across the wider range of Early Help indicators.

9.7 Pinaki Ghoshal told the Board that the Early Help Partnership has been dissolved to reduce the duplication of meetings and work, and reminded us that Early Help is a priority on the LSCB Business Plan. The measures that are reported should let us know if and how Early Help is making a difference. He also warned that the KPIs from the Troubled Family Project do not tell the whole story, for example we have seen a significant improvement with school attendance but not enough to be counted on the national level.

9.8 Graham Bartlett said that, regardless of the changes that may occur to the Board following the Wood Review, it is clear in Working Together that the LSCB should assure the quality of local early help arrangements. Although we cannot commission services we are expected to seek assurances.

9.9 Terri Fletcher asked if we would need another subcommittee to look at this, or if it would be integrated into the existing structures?

9.10 Yvette Queffurus said that she welcomes the definition of Early Help that is expanded to cover the work that in universal services that is not currently captured, but said that it will be a huge agenda and asked if we would be able to catch it all. Lorna Miller –Cooper agreed that our definition of Early Help should be all the manifestations, and Graham Bartlett said that this is a good opportunity to broaden the city's understanding and to look at the effectiveness of our system as a whole. He did concede that this will be much more complex.

9.11 Jane Mitchell said that the data must be put into context, and that it will be really important to know this from a health perspective. Mat Thomas said that the Stronger families team have to do produce the quantitate data anyway.

9.12 Kerry Clarke said that Public Health have a performance outcome framework which they can look at, which is used in their commissioning. Mat Thomas said that all new contracts should ask what Early Help looks like.

9.13 Helen Gulvin said that the potential remit is very large and we must agree what the LSCB wants to look at. She said that the connectivity is important, and suggested that we ask for key headlines. Graham Bartlett said that we first need to understand the indicators available and what our points of accountability are to these, before identifying 8-10 that help us understand how well the system is working. It was agreed that a task and finish group should look at this.

9.14 Jason Tingley suggested that we contact the 25% of LSCBs that have been rated good by OFSTED and ask if any of them have already done this work.

9.15 Anna Gianfrancesco reminded us that the LSCB's focus must be safeguarding, and that early help usually takes place before these thresholds are met. She suggested that we should do an audit of services, similar to an S11, and ask them to evidence what they do in terms of early help. We could also monitor those cases that have progressed from early help to social work to look at the reasons why. Graham Bartlett said that it is important to also look at those cases who do not escalate. Pinaki Ghoshal agreed that this would be beneficial across the partnership, and suggested that the task and finish group look at what this audit should contain over the summer.

9.16 **Action: A task and finish group will be formed and will report back to the Board to help the LSCB:**

- **Understand the Early Help Offer**
- **Understand Early Help Pathways**
- **Understand how effective early help is**
- **Recommend what the LSCB should measure in terms of indicators, and how we can support this, including best use of existing measures and qualitative information.**

9.17 Helen Gulvin said that it is key that the board understand the universal + point, and that we are aware of the capacity at all access points.

9.18 In conclusion, the Board agreed to take up the role of assurance on Early Help. The Board needs to understand what the Early Help offer is, and how it is connected to other services, as well as awareness of the different access points and their capacity. They will look at which indicators will give the best picture of how well early help is doing, and will look at how to locate this within current Board business.

9.19 Graham Bartlett said that this is a key element for the Board to look at. Although we can be confident that our thresholds are sound, following the OFSTED inspection, we need to look at how we work with families before these crisis points and understand how to stop situations from escalating. He will consider who to involve in the task and finish group, and ask for a report back in September as there needs to be an arrangement in place so that there is not a void left by the Early Help Partnership Board.

## **10. Unaccompanied Asylum Seekers**

10.1 Pinaki Ghoshal joined the meeting after a meeting in London to discuss Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children. The Home Office are starting a national dispersal scheme in July 2016, as some parts of the country, for example Kent, are looking after an over-proportion of children. The Government has agreed to share this responsibility fairly across the country, as well as agreeing to take in those in Europe who have a link to the UK.

10.3 There is a national team who will be working with regions on the methodology for reallocation. Many of the children who are looked after by Kent are housed in other local authorities so it is expected that the area in which they live will take responsibility rather than moving the child.

10.11 Helen Gulvin said that she attended a conference in Brussels last week where there was an interesting session on this subject. She said that most of the child migrants are from Afghanistan, followed by Ethiopia and then Syria. However, the issues these children face are all the same and we need to understand their experiences, and how they will have tried to keep safe on their journeys.

## **11. Discussion Groups**

11.1 The Board divided into three tables to discuss different papers for 40 minutes and then fed back on their considerations.

## **12. Joint Targeted Area Inspection**

12.1 Joint Targeted Area Inspections are being undertaken by Ofsted, Care Quality Commission (CQC), Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) to look at front door, assessments and a theme. This round of inspections involves a deep-dive audit of CSE and missing, and the inspections from September onwards will look at Domestic Violence & Abuse, although the criteria for these has not yet been published.

12.2 Graham Bartlett explained that we have a self-assessment that relevant partners have been asked to complete to help us understand our story and any questions that might arise from this. The LSCB has met with the key agencies and discussed how to refine this so that we are able to articulate the situation in Brighton & Hove and explain what we are doing to improve any areas where there are identified gaps. This was a strength in the LSCB's Ofsted inspection last year.

12.3 Graham Bartlett explained that we had planned to agree a mock judgment letter today, but the person who is leading this has been involved with the SEND inspection

12.4 Graham Bartlett explained that we have a lot of narrative, although we are still waiting for health's input. The narrative concentrates on the processes rather than the impact, and we must remember that this is not an end in itself. At the link officers meeting it was highlighted that there are already different interpretations of what the criteria mean, for example are they referring to single agency thresholds of those of the front door? The LSCB will need to take a helicopter view of the whole system, focusing on whether there are the right outcomes for children, and how do we know that we are making a difference?

12.5 The self-assessment will be refreshed every six months, or whenever there are significant changes and a lot of this information can come from the S11 reports.

### **13. Referrals & Thresholds, Multi Agency Audit**

13.1 Mat Thomas fed back on the table discussion of the Early Help audit. He said that they began with a provocative, but key question of should be a single front door system? At the moment the two door system relies on individual professionals to make a decision on where to place their referral, and currently there are a number of cases that go to the MASH but are redirected straight to Early Help.

13.2 Mat Thomas said that we need to learn about the early identification of domestic violence, as the police are involved much further down the line.

13.3 There are not many referrals to Early Help regarding substance misuse, presumably as these go straight to MASH due to the risk to the child.

13.4 Sussex Police, responding to calls of domestic incidents, accounted for the majority of police enquiries to the MASH which were passed to Early Help. The referrals from the police tended to sit at a lower threshold than referrals from other professionals. This shows the importance of the police as part of the early identification of families in distress, not just in terms of safeguarding but at the lower levels of risk. At times the EHH Engagement Team is 'triangulating' the reports from the police of incidents at home, with reports from schools of poor behaviour by children

13.5 Mat Thomas asked about accountability, and to what degree should the Early Help Hub to be held responsible if another service can't meet a family's need once they have accepted the case? The recommendation from the audit, that the Early Help Hub monitor the progress of families is not feasible, and this should be built into the Service Level Agreements. Sue Kelly asked where the EHH can escalate to if there is not a service to take their referrals? Kerry Clarke said that in the mind of the referrer the EHH is responsible. Graham Bartlett said that the Local Authority may need to look at structure issues around access and responsibility.

13.8 Mat Thomas said that strictly speaking this is not a two door system as there is also CAHMS and Educational Psychology routes into Early Help, so our understanding still needs further refinement.

### **14. Management Information Report – Part B themed data set on Early Help**

14.1 Daryl Perilli fed back from the table discussion of the Early Help Data Set. He said that the indicator of most concern was on page three, where the largest area of need for

children is Emotional Wellbeing. Emotional Wellbeing is a very broad category, and the table would like to see this further broken down. They would also like to look at the infrastructure of support available and how effective this is.

14.2 The table also felt that they would like to know more about the work with adults to ensure that the needs of the whole family are addressed.

14.3 Peter Castleton asked whether we can evidence that Early Help is reducing the strain on the safeguarding system further down the line, as well as seeing what the outcomes for children are.

14.4 Jo Lyons said that this data looks at the numbers, but not at whether the interventions work, for example do we know whether the work in schools on emotional wellbeing is effecting referrals? Graham Bartlett asked if the Task and Finish Group should look at the evidence base. Jo Lyons said that at the start of Early Help they did a lot to map the many services out there, and tried to judge which made a difference so they could promote this work. Mat Thomas said that he has a map of children's services contracts, and feet on the ground knowledge of what systems work.

14.5 Terri Fletcher said that they are getting more and more referrals for children that they know they are not the best service for, but there seems to be nowhere else to send them. Jo Lyons said that we must look at the evidence on what would work for these families and request more funding for the services that would meet these needs if there is a gap.

14.6 Daryl Perilli said that the second indicator of concerns is the numbers of families whose last review takes place on time. He asked if we look at best practice elsewhere, or if there is comparative data? There is a local group of data analysts looking at this but it is not straight forward with the varying definitions of Early Help. Their radical solution to this would be to look at the outcomes, and whether this reduces demand. What are the key measures of success and effectiveness?

14.7 Jo Lyons questioned why there were no cases forwarded to Early Help from any Social Work Teams other than the MASH? Mat Thomas said that there is a process for step down from the pods, and whilst this isn't an issue it is not used as well as it could be. Yvette Queffurus explained that when the social worker is removed the Core Group of people working with a family normally remain in place to provide ongoing support.

## **15. Any Other Business**

### **Weekly allocation meeting**

15.1 Mat Thomas said that all professionals are welcome to join the Early Help Hub's Weekly Allocation Meeting on a Monday morning at 9.30am, to get a better understanding of the process and considerations. For more information, or if you would like to attend, please contact Mat at [mat.thomas@brighton-hove.gcsx.gov.uk](mailto:mat.thomas@brighton-hove.gcsx.gov.uk)

### **Communications around Pride**

15.2 Kerry Clarke said that with our communications around safeguarding and Pride we must remember that it is not just children from Brighton & Hove but across the county and asked how we join up with East & West Sussex? Anna Gianfrancesco said that she does through Alice Skinner, and Deb Austin said that she would through her counterparts in East & West and their LSCBs. Jane Mitchell said that we should also reach further to Surrey and Kent.

15.3 Anna Gianfrancesco said that they are doing a consultation with parents who do not traditionally engage through schools to talk about how their children may be at risk before the school holidays begin. Kerry Clarke is targeting the parents of children either at the PRU or those under ruok?, YOS or the adolescent pod, and the police are also involved with this work.

### **Ann Coffey's Missing Children Report**

15.4 Helen Gulvin said that Children's Services are working with the Police to look at the recommendations from report by the [All-Party Parliamentary Group for Runaway and Missing Children and Adults](#), chaired by Ann Coffey MP. Key recommendations include: the 'absent' category for missing children should be abandoned and replaced with a new risk assessment response that assesses the level of risk to all missing children as either 'low', 'medium' or 'high'. Jason Tingley said that this will have an impact on capacity as well as on our contract for the Missing Children Service and Return Home Interviews across Sussex. **Action: This will be forward planned to the September Agenda**

### **Training at the Hospital**

15.5 Debi Fillery said that she is holding a Awareness Raising Session at the Audrey Emmerton Building in the Royal Sussex County Hospital next Wednesday, 15th July from 12.30-4pm. They will discuss Burns, head injuries, mental health and self-harm and trafficked children, and professionals from all agencies are welcome. If you would like to attend please email [debi.fillery@nhs.net](mailto:debi.fillery@nhs.net)

### **BSUH Safeguarding Review**

15.6 The Hospital's safeguarding review has been completed, and will be discussed at a future meeting. Debi Fillery said that there was a question about repeat Disclosure and Barring Service checks for staff and asked how frequently these are done in partner agencies. Deb Austin said that she believes it is every three years.

### **Annual report submissions form agencies**

15.7 Mia Brown said that we will be writing to agencies soon to ask for submissions for the LSCB Annual Report for 2015-16.

### **LSCB Presence at Community Event**

15.8 Mia Brown said that Dave Hunt will be manning a stall at the Community Event at the level on the 8<sup>th</sup> July, to raise the profile of the LSCB and safeguarding with the wider public. She advised that if any agencies would like to join in, or had any promotional materials for us to use to contact Dave at [david.hunt@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:david.hunt@brighton-hove.gov.uk)