

**BRIGHTON & HOVE LOCAL SAFEGUARDING
CHILDREN BOARD**

**Wednesday 7 June 2017. 1.30pm-4pm
The Great Hall, Moulsecomb North Hub**

Attendees

Graham Bartlett	LSCB Independent Chair (Chair)
Andrea Saunders	Director of Public Protection, National Probation Service
Claire-Louise Mackay	LSCB Senior Administrator (Minutes)
Dan Chapman (Cllr)	Lead Member, Children's Services, Brighton & Hove City Council
David Kemp	Head of Community Safety, ESFRS
Deb Austin	Head of Safeguarding, Brighton & Hove City Council
Debi Fillery	Named Nurse, BSUH
Debbie Piggott	Head of Service for Assessment, Rehabilitation and IOM, KSS CRC
Domenica Basini	NHS England
Elizabeth Cody	Brighton College
Emma Cockerell	Head of Service, Front Door for Families & Social Work Pods 1-5
Gail Gray	Chair, Violence against Women & Girls Forum
Jayne Bruce	Deputy Director of Nursing Standards and Safety, SPFT
Jo Lyons	Assistant Director Children's Services: Education & Inclusion
Jo Tomlinson	Designated Nurse, Brighton & Hove CCG
June Hopkins	South East Coast Ambulance Service
Kerry Clarke	Public Health Strategic Commissioner Children's Services, BHCC
Mary Flynn (Dr)	Named Doctor, Brighton & Hove CCG
Mia Brown	LSCB Business Manager
Nahida Shaikh	Prevent Coordinator, Brighton & Hove City Council
Peter Wilkinson (Dr)	Acting Director of Public Health
Pinaki Ghoshal	Executive Director of Children's Services, Brighton & Hove City Council
Rich Bates	Detective Chief Inspector, Sussex Police
Ruth King	Blatchington Mill School
Soline Jerram	Director of Clinical Quality & Primary Care, Brighton & Hove CCG
Terri Fletcher	Director, Safety Net. Community & Voluntary Sector Representative
Yvette Queffurus	Named Nurse, Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust
Vera Jakimovska	LSCB Lay Member
Zac Warren	Business Manager, Sussex Partnership Foundation NHS Trust

Apologies Received

Anna Gianfrancesco	Service Manager, YOS
David Feakes	Head of Safeguarding, Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust
Diane Hull	Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
Helen Gulvin	Assistant Director Children's Services: Safeguarding & Care
Helen O'Dell	Interim Chief Nurse, BSUH
Jamie Carter (Dr)	Designated Doctor for Child Protection, Brighton & Hove CCG

Jason Tingley	Sussex Police Lead
Natasha Watson	Managing Principal Lawyer, Brighton & Hove City Council
Nigel Nash	Service Manager, CAFCASS
Peter Castleton	Head of Community Safety, Brighton & Hove City Council
Richard Chamberlin	Roedean School
Tracy Bowers	Hertford Infant School
Tracy John	Head of Housing, Brighton & Hove City Council

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 Graham Bartlett welcomed the group, and introductions were made. Zac Warren was welcomed from Sussex Partnership, he is newly appointed as a Business Manager following their review of safeguarding.
- 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 16 March 2017 were agreed for accuracy.

3. Matters Arising

- 3.1 The LSCB considered the circulated update on matters arising from the last LSCB meeting on 16 March 2017.
- 3.2 (Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals Safeguarding Report) Jayne Bruce is yet to meet with Helen O'Dell to look at the crossover between the SPFT & BSUH safeguarding reports. SPFT have instigated a new model of integrated services, and have released additional resources to focus on safeguarding. Jayne Bruce asked Board to discuss any recommendations arising as there may be areas that additional support and challenge would be welcomed. **Action: The Sussex Partnership Safeguarding Report to be tabled at the September LSCB.**
- 3.3 (Item 9.3 – CSE Data) Richard Bates understands Jason Tingley has shared the first quarterly CSE report with Daryl Perilli. This will be circulated with the Board minutes and also discussed by the Vulnerable Children & CSE Strategic Group at their next meeting.
- 3.4 (Item 9.15 – Management Information Report: Self Harm) Kerry Clarke and Debi Fillery have met to look at a solution to improve information sharing with schools after a young person presented at the hospital with self-harm. They need to test if this works in practice: the Front Door for Families will be told when a young person presents at the hospital with self-harm this can be shared within the MASH, and the Education Safeguarding Officer can then share this with schools as it will be between Education colleagues.
- 3.5 (Item 12.2 – CISVA) An explanation was provided on the rationale for the cessation of the funding for this post. A small number of children were referred in the past year, and there are other services in place to provide appropriate support. Jamie Carter was not present to confirm if this was a satisfactory answer to his challenge, but Deb Austin said that she has met with Jamie Carter and Helen Gulvin outside of this meeting and is assured that there is resilience in the system.
- 3.6 (Safeguarding in Sport) Attached to the matters arising document was a letter from Active Sussex sharing the resources they provide for local sports organisations and clubs.

4. Update from Leadership

- 4.1 The Leadership Group¹ last met on 17 May 2017 and the minutes have been circulated to the Board.

¹ This group consists of the chairs of the LSCB Subcommittees and helps us co-ordinate the ongoing work to meet Business Plan objectives.

- 4.2 They discussed the Monitoring & Evaluation Annual Report, and concerns over the lack of single agency audits conducted by Sussex Police last year. Graham Bartlett, along with the East & West Sussex LSCB chairs have met with Detective Superintendent, Public Protection, and have been assured that Sussex Police will be undertaking quality assurance work across the region this year.
- 4.3 Monitoring & Evaluation have considered the scope of a multi-agency audit on children with disabilities that will take place next quarter, and agreed that this will focus on safeguarding concerns as highlighted by Ofsted. Initially we wanted to undertake this work with the SAB, but their preferred area of focus is on transition so this will need to be a separate piece of work.
- 4.4 The Leadership Group asked for an update on the work around peer on peer abuse, and were given a full briefing by Deb Austin on the range of work being undertaken by the Adolescent Pod and Sussex Police. Contextual Safeguarding is at the heart of this approach, and there is more information about this at <https://contextualsafeguarding.org.uk/>
- 4.5 The Leadership Group discussed the LSCB Budget and agreed not to ask for any increase in contributions this year, in recognition of financial pressures all partners are experiencing. The highest outgoing for the LSCB remains to be Serious Case Reviews.
- 4.6 Pinaki Ghoshal said that he has met with Soline Jerram and Jason Tingley about succession planning for a new chair as Graham Bartlett steps down in September 2017. They have agreed that they will be recruiting for a broadly similar role, and the advert will be circulated soon and asked all members to share this widely with their networks. They will have a panel of key members from the statutory agencies of the new Safeguarding Partnership (Local Authority, Police & CCG) for the interview process, but will also be inviting members of the wider Board. The intention is to recruit quickly and to get someone in post by August so that they can have a handover with Graham Bartlett.

5. Early Help Group Update

- 5.1 Peter Wilkinson updated on the first meeting of the new LSCB Early Help Group. There were a lot of attendees, with a great deal of enthusiasm. The group agreed the Terms of Reference and that they will use the definition of Early Help from Working Together 2015.
- 5.2 The Early Help Group reviewed the NSPCC report "Its Time" as requested by the Leadership Group, but the group agreed that Early Help stops before the support this report concentrates on for children who have been abused.
- 5.3 The group have identified topics to focus on for each meeting, and schools are very enthused as a lot of Early Help activity takes place in their settings. There is a large membership of this group so ensuring that the meetings are focused will be a challenge, and Graham Bartlett said that they can prioritise the themes and narrow the remit if necessary.
- 5.4 Elizabeth Cody said that it would be good to have attendance from more secondary schools at this meeting, other than Brighton College and Blatchington Mill. **Action: Jo Lyon's will extend the invitation to other schools, and ensure that the messages from these meetings are disseminated**

7. Front Door for Families

- 7.1 Emma Cockerell was welcomed to the meeting to discuss the implementation of the Front Door for Families as a single point of access in Brighton & Hove. A briefing was circulated to partners to explain the new model, following on from two emails about the Early Help consultation and changes circulated to the Board in February & April 2017.
- 7.2 The Front Door for Families brings together the Early Help Hub, Family Information Service and MASH with an aim of reducing any confusion about thresholds and access to services. Each part still has their own functions but are all accessed through the one front door. This provides families and communities with information, advice and guidance, provides support and advice to professionals already working with children and families and manages referrals into Social Care and targeted Early Help. This approach should help provide a more rapid response to enquiries.
- 7.3 There is a need to revise and update the Threshold Document following these changes. This will be presented to the September Board Meeting. **Action: Forward Plan.** It is a good time to review this in light of the new Neglect Strategy.

- 7.4 The Early Help Assessment has been replaced by a simplified version of the Strengthening Families Assessment and Plan, and now the same assessment and planning model will be used across all levels of need. The assessment will travel with a family through the different services, and Strengthening Families should be a clearer model for families to understand. The form is available [online](#) for professionals in all settings to use, and they will be putting more toolkits and resources online in the future.
- 7.5 The Front Door for Families webpage will include more information for children & young people, particularly regarding mental health and emotional wellbeing in response to the high level of referrals about these concerns. This work will be tied into the new Community Wellbeing Service which launches this month as a single point of access for mental health services in the city.
- 7.6 The phone number has not changed from the MASH's number, but they have introduced a new online referral form as well. This is already improving the quality of referrals and is a more efficient use of admin time. A large number of professionals will still want to make a phone call, and they will receive the same rapid response as they did through the MASH directly.
- 7.7 There was a peak in referrals when the Front Door launched in May but the Head of Service, Front Door For Families advised that this is now settling down as pathways are embedding. Additional referral officers will be recruited, and the Service Manager is now chairing the Weekly Allocation Meeting to oversee those cases that are stepped down to Early Help. This has helped encourage more challenge in the planning around Early Help, and the team are inviting feedback from all agencies about all parts of this process.
- 7.8 Yvette Queffurus said that the online referral form is simple to go through, clear and easy to follow. She has received positive feedback on this from Health Visitors, even though Early Help referrals are often more complex to submit.
- 7.9 Richard Bates said that this has not impacted on the processes for the police around submitting a SCARF, but they are trying to enhance their staffing at the Front Door.
- 7.10 We discussed the need for a specialist mental health nurse in the Front Door as the current health representative is not a mental health specialist and does not have access to the SPFT systems. Jayne Bruce said that the new model they are putting in at SPFT will include more staff working in safeguarding so they should be available to provide more support and advice. This was welcomed by the Board, as there has been an identified gap in the partnership working, and Emma Cockerell said that the Early Help Hub undertook a lot of mediating between different teams around mental health and this was a challenge.
- 7.11 Terri Fletcher asked whether there will be any changes in the way that referrals are recorded, as previously it has been difficult to see how many are from the community & voluntary sector. Emma Cockerell said that Early Help will now also be recorded on CareFirst, whereas they previously had their own system, and this will contribute to better information sharing. In the future they will look at how they can better capture this information.
- 7.12 Mary Flynn and Yvette Queffurus expressed concerns over health information being more widely accessible on Care First. Emma Cockerell gave assurance that any information shared is still protected and ring fenced in the MASH Guardian system and only limited information will be seen on Carefirst. This needs to be made explicit when information cannot be shared further.
- 7.13 Graham Bartlett asked if the Strengthening Families Assessment turns into the Single Assessment, and Emma Cockerell confirmed that just the one assessment is now used. This will impact on the information reported around timeliness of single assessments, as the data will include social work and ITF assessments, but currently around 96% of Social Work assessments are completed within timescales.
- 7.14 Kerry Clark said that when they were creating the scope for the Healthy Child programme that asked that School Nurses and Health Visitors would use the Strengthening Families Assessment, but they have not been able to build this into System One. Yvette Queffurus said that this is because the system was designed for GPs, but they do use the word document and attach it. The Board felt that it is important for all professionals in the city to have this as a common language and a shared planning model.
- 7.15 The intention is to move the location of the Front Door for Families team from Woodingdean to John Street Police Station later this year, and Pinaki Ghoshal will be meeting the police later this week to look at the costings.

8. Monitoring & Evaluation Annual Report

- 8.1 In Helen Davies absence Deb Austin presented the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee's annual report for 2016-17. The subcommittee now meets on a quarterly basis, rather than bi-monthly, as their work plan is progressing well. They now undertake two multi-agency audits per year in recognition of the capacity of partner agencies, but they have an increased focus on scrutiny of the single agency audits that are undertaken across the partnership.
- 8.2 The first audit last year addressed child sexual exploitation and was undertaken 18 months after the previous multi agency audit of CSE. Ten cases of young people aged 15 – 18 were selected from the Multi Agency Child Sexual Exploitation (MACSE) meeting to be audited. Three of the young people had a learning difficulty, and this was a purposeful selection to test how robust our response is to these young people. While there was some good practice identified, 6 cases were judged to require improvement, and one was deemed inadequate and then considered by the Case Review Subcommittee who asked for a joint agency review to be undertaken.
- 8.3 Positive findings included:
- CSE was identified appropriately in all cases, and as early as possible in most cases
 - in most cases, the response to CSE was effective and there was good evidence that agencies were working well together to reduce risk
 - in most cases there was a focus on the child, including their involvement in decisions made in respect of them, and there was evidence that their voice was being heard.
 - in the majority of cases, the risks for the young person had reduced, and their physical, emotional and educational needs were being met more consistently
- 8.4 The Neglect Audit will be presented to the Board later in this meeting.
- 8.5 The subcommittee received summaries from several agencies of key findings from their own audits. No audits were undertaken by Sussex Police, and no return was received from CAF/CASS. They have been challenged by the LSCB Chairperson. Following earlier challenges, audit information has now been received from the National Probation Service and from Kent Surrey & Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).
- 8.6 The subcommittee has scrutinised Children's Services' audits on areas of concern to the Board – including re-referrals, and strategy meetings in cases of child sexual abuse. In addition, some requests were made to the subcommittee throughout the year to audit or analyse areas of concern, including the pod workloads.
- 8.7 The subcommittee also looked at the MAPPA report and the timescales for young people held on police bail, and sought assurances from all agencies about their use of physical restraint. They scrutinised a MARAC audit and routinely received feedback about the findings of MASH audits. The findings of the annual Safe and Well at School survey were also considered. During 2017/18, the subcommittee plans to examine more closely audits from all agencies, in the light of the decision to reduce LSCB multi agency audits to two per year
- 8.8 The LSCB Quality Assurance Framework still underpins the multi agency audit programme.
- 8.9 During 2016/17, changes were made to the LSCB's Management Information Report, focussing on key data and presenting this information in a more visual way. One key performance indicator will be highlighted each time the information is presented to the Board. Graham Bartlett said that the new format for the Management Information Report created a very rich discussion at the last Board meeting, and this shows the importance of presenting data well.
- 8.10 Terri Fletcher asked what the cases in the CSE Audit that were found to not be focused on the child were focusing on, and why was their voice not heard. The CSE Audit will be circulated with the minutes to allow members to re-read this.
- 8.11 Nahida Shaikh asked how these judgements compared to the previous CSE audit, and whether only 30% graded good is an improvement. Deb Austin explained that they have set a high benchmark for the judgements in this audit, and although they did identify some good work in those cases that required improvement there were still areas where they wanted to do better. This audit has seen an improvement since the previous one, and reflects the increase in staff confidence when working with CSE.
- 8.12 Pinaki Ghoshal asked if we understand what is meant by an audit in the same way across the partnership, and whether all agencies understand what the Board expects from the quality assurance activity. Deb

Austin said that in Children's Services there is a clear understanding, as they are the main agency for safeguarding, but she thinks this should be considered by the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee. The audit tools used for the multi-agency audits are quite complex and ask questions about outcomes, but there is a lot of variety in those used in single agencies and some do focus more on quantitative data. Graham Bartlett said that it is the role of the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee to challenge, and that they must do so if partners are not given adequate assurance on quality and outcomes.

- 8.13 Vera Jakimovska said that her background is in regulation in aviation, and explained the importance of focusing on the root cause. Soline Jerram said that in the Serious Investigations (SIs) undertaken by health they also expect a root cause analysis, and there are often more than one factor identified. If they see issues in their audit activity they will be asked for a root cause analysis to be undertaken to look underneath this data at the systemic issues.
- 8.14 Graham Bartlett said that he thinks of the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee as the "workhorse" of the LSCB as they have to provide the Board with assurance on the quality of the safeguarding work taking place across the partnership. Some other Boards do not undertake audits as they say that their role is purely strategic, but he thinks that it is essential that we get this assurance so that we can be confident that what we are doing does improve outcomes for children and keeps them safer.

10 Neglect

Multi-agency Neglect Audit

- 10.1 Jo Tomlinson presented the multi-agency neglect audit that she co-led with Yvette Queffurus in February 2017. The audit looked at nine cases where neglect had been highlighted as a concern over three age ranges; 0-5; 6-11 and 12-18. These cases were open to different levels of intervention from Early Help to Child in Need and Child Protection, and included some open to the Children with Disabilities Team.
- 10.2 Eight different agencies took part in the audits and they focused on the following areas of enquiry;
- identification and initial responses to neglect;
 - assessment, planning and intervention;
 - the impact of the work undertaken by agencies in protecting and meeting the needs of children who have experienced neglect.
- 10.3 The overall judgements were that one case was rated Good with outstanding features (this was a case of a child with disabilities), 4 cases were rated as Requires Improvement with some Good features identified, and four cases were rated Requires Improvement.
- 10.4 The audit identified many areas that were working well, some examples included:
- In all cases the assessment undertaken by social works took into account family history and cumulative impact of neglect on the child, and the parent's capacity and motivation to change.
 - In one case the Police took immediate action following a neglect incident and this was followed up by child protection processes
 - The child and family's identity and cultural needs are sufficiently considered and addressed in the majority of cases
- 10.5 Areas identified as needing improvement included:
- No evidence of using the Quality of Care Tool which has been designed to support practitioners to assess neglect cases and monitor improvement
 - In two cases, not all risks have been assessed and acted upon.
 - In one case there is a lack of comprehensive assessment and lack of clarity
 - In five cases (56%) there was no up to date chronology
- 10.6 The recommendations from the review on page 18 have been drafted into an action plan to be overseen by The Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee. They have also been fed into the development of the LSCB Neglect Strategy.
- 10.7 The information provided by schools was noted as being particularly good, but a gap was noted in the participation in the audit from adult services. Six of the cases involved parental mental health, five adult substance misuse, and in two both of these were a factor. Providers of adult services will be involved in any future neglect audits.
- 10.8 Graham Bartlett thanked Jo and the audit team for this work and said that neglect is an area that needs to be looked at as it underpins many other safeguarding concerns. It is a priority concern of the Board and is it very important that we get this work right. The Board accepted the report and agreed with the

recommendations, and asked the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee to conduct a re-audit when appropriate.

- 10.9 Peter Wilkinson asked how wide the audit findings will be disseminated, and how will we ensure that it is shared with staff in appropriate services such as Pavilions. It was confirmed that we are working on a Learning Together from Quality Assurance Briefing to promote the key findings. This will be published on the [Professionals Briefings](#) page of the LSCB Website as well as being circulated throughout the partnership.

LSCB Neglect Strategy

- 10.10 Emma Cockerell presented the LSCB Neglect Strategy that has been developed by a short life working group from across the partnership. It is designed to be a resource for those agencies who do not see neglect every day as well as those who are routinely working with vulnerable families. Examples of these agencies are on Page 5. Soline Jerram said that rather than A&E it should say acute and urgent care services, and Terri Fletcher asked why some voluntary organisations were listed but not others. This will be replaced with more umbrella terminologies to cover the organisations, and possibly a more indepth list as an appendix.
- 10.11 The strategy ties in with the recommendations from the Multi-agency neglect audit and the action plan that will be overseen by the Monitoring & Evaluation Subcommittee. It identified four priorities, and makes recommendations on how to measure success for these:
- Priority 1: Strategic Commitment Across all Agencies.
 - Priority 2: Improve Awareness, Understanding and Recognition.
 - Priority 3: Prevent Neglect through Early Help activity.
 - Priority 4: Improve Effectiveness of Interventions and Reduce the Impact of Neglect.
- 10.12 Terri Fletcher asked how young carers are considered in the strategy, as they will often have inconsistent parenting. Emma Cockerell said that there is work going on around working with parents with disabilities that will encompass young carers, and this will sit under the neglect strategy as more detailed practice guidance.
- 10.13 Terri Fletcher asked whether community and voluntary organisations were consulted during the development of the strategy, and it was confirmed that the working group consisted of Board members from statutory agencies. **Action: It was agreed that the strategy should be sent out within the CVS for consultation and comment.**
- 10.14 Pinaki Ghoshal said that this is a comprehensive strategy but asked how we plan to get the key messages out to the wider workforce. We did a lot to raise awareness of CSE and Neglect is such a common concern that it deserves to be promoted as well. In particular links with adult services should be made due to the connections with mental health and substance misuse. **Action: This Strategy will be shared at the Safeguarding Adults Board**
- 10.15 Jayne Bruce said that she thought that the strategy was very good and very informative, and asked if there were plans to produce any resources for staff to promote this and help put this into practice, i.e. pocket sized cards to be used as a quick reference guide. Graham Bartlett said that as everyone can spot signs of neglect it is very important to get these messages far and wide with a robust communication strategy. **Action: The publicity for the Neglect Strategy will be considered at the next joint LSCB & SAB Participation & Engagement Subcommittee**
- 10.16 Vets can be an important partner in recognising cases of neglect, as research shows that there are links with animal abuse. We queried how we will link with local practitioners, and were informed that there is an animal welfare team in the council.
- 10.18 The Board agreed the Neglect Strategy and this will be reviewed in two years.

11. Learning & Development Training Needs Analysis

- 11.1 Jo Tomlinson presented the report on the Training Needs Analysis carried out across the partner agencies of the LSCB, SAB and Safe in the City Partnership in November 2016 by the LSCB Learning & Development Office, Dave Hunt. There were 15 responses received to the online service, and the analysis considers what training offers are being presented, whether these are on a single or joint agency basis, if there is any obvious duplication of courses, and whether there was the scope to amalgamate any training offers.

- 11.2 There is a comprehensive offer of training available in the city, and most agencies provide in-house safeguarding training with many accessing the LSCB offer as well. Many staff who are newly appointed to safeguarding lead roles undertake the three day core training offered by the LSCB, and the Board also offer a range of one day sessions on specialised safeguarding concerns as well as shorter briefings to share findings from local learning reviews and national SCRs.
- 11.3 We discussed the difficulties that probation services have in accessing the LSCB training at the Leadership Group, as their IT system will not allow access to the Learning Gateway. The issue of police attendance was also discussed
- 11.4 The recommendations from the Training Needs Analysis include:
- Thought to be given to any aspects of LSCB and VAWG programmes where subject matter may overlap around Domestic Violence
 - Health to consider amalgamating delivery of some staff training
 - Further joint delivery of some subjects by the three Sussex LSCBs
 - Consider developing a basic Introduction to Safeguarding e-learning package for all partner agency staff
 - Further exploration of a more cohesive delivery between Adult and Children's safeguarding
- 11.5 The LSCB Learning & Development Officer already works closely with his counterpart in the Violence Against Women & Girls Board to ensure that they are not duplicating the training they offer to the city, and recently have held joint events on Harmful Practices. He also works with the Childcare Workforce Development Manager for the council to amalgamate courses where possible.
- 11.6 The Learning & Development officer is also exploring whether more training can be opened up across the three Sussex LSCBs, and we have recently joined the MAPPA Workshop with East Sussex
- 11.7 The actions from these recommendations will be taken forward by both the SAB and LSCB Learning & Development Subcommittees.
- 11.8 This report was presented to the Safeguarding Adults Board on Monday, and Graham Bartlett said that the concise summary hides the amount of work that has gone on since the request from the main funders of the LSCB to look at whether we can make any efficiencies in this area.
- 11.9 Terri Fletcher said that a meeting took place last week with herself, Graham Bartlett, Pinaki Ghosal, Soline Jerram and Jason Tingley to look safeguarding training for the Community & Voluntary Sector. Historically this has been provided by Safety Net, but with dwindling funding and resources this is becoming more of a challenge to provide in an affordable way for small groups. There are plans to see how this can be more linked into the LSCB training to provide a sustainable offer going forward.
- 11.10 There is a recommendation for health providers to look at whether they can amalgamate any of the training they offer, and Yvette Queffurus explained that they provide slightly different training to different groups of staff within the organisations due to their roles and caution must be used as more general training may water down the effect of the key messages. This was discussed at the Leadership Group and Graham Bartlett said that he recognises these challenges for health, and the logistical problems they may face, but hopes that they will look for opportunities to work together where practical and possible.
- 11.11 Ruth King asked whether schools were meant to complete this survey, and it was confirmed that they were not asked for this information. She said that they had identified a gap in their training a year ago and the LSCB Learning & Development Officer put on a course at their school to meet this need.
- 11.12 Debbie Piggott queried the information submitted by KSS CRC as she said that all their staff have to do safeguarding training every two years as a minimum. It was thought that the TNA was just referring to multiagency training, but this needs to be clarified. Andrea Saunders said that they can no longer use the LSCB as part of their CPD in Probation, but they do promote the value of attending multi-agency events amongst their staff. Richard Bates said that the Police follow the training curriculum set by the College of Policing which includes safeguarding. David Feakes said that East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service buy in their safeguarding training from East Sussex County Council. **Action: Can all members please contact David Hunt david.hunt@brighton-hove.gov.uk about any factual errors in the TNA report by the end of June. The Board accepted the report subject to these alterations.**

12. Any Other Business

Safety Planning

- 12.1 Although Jamie Carter was unable to attend today's meeting he has sent in a question: "Will risk of radicalised attacks in Brighton & Hove be discussed at all in light of recent events in London and Manchester, do schools in particular have a contingency plan, and is the Channel panel reviewing its cases?"
- 12.2 It was confirmed by members that these discussions are taking place within the city amongst appropriate agencies, but the LSCB is not the forum to look at these issues. Nahida Shaikh said that she has sent information to all schools and other partners after each of the recent critical incidents, and Jo Lyons said that she has had a lot of contact from schools over the past two days with questions and is reviewing the information. Jason Tingley has also provided a link in the Counter Terrorism Unit who can provide support to schools, and Elizabeth Cody said that they had helped Brighton College with a site visit and she would highly recommend them.
- 12.3 Domenica Basini said that NHS England held conferences on Prevent and Modern Slavery in May at Gatwick and in Kent, and reported that most areas have resiliency teams and recovery plans in place.
- 12.5 Nahida Shaikh said that there will be a new post of Communities Co-ordinator starting in her team who will take a lead on some of the Counter Terrorism Work.

LSCB Annual Report

- 12.6 We are in the process of writing the LSCB Annual Report 2016-17 and a request has been sent round for agency contributions. Graham Bartlett asked for all partners to keep their submissions succinct.

South East Coast Ambulance Service

- 12.7 June Hopkins said that SECamb have had verbal feedback from their CQC monitoring visit and they did not refer to any safeguarding issues so this is not their primary concern.

Membership

- 12.8 Jayne Bruce said that she will be meeting with Mia Brown to map the representation from Sussex Partnership at our Subcommittees and plan how to improve their attendance following their staffing structure redesign.
- 12.9 This will be the last meeting for Gail Gray and Soline Jerram as both are leaving their posts in Brighton & Hove. Graham Bartlett thanked them both for their commitment to safeguarding in the city, partnership working. They have both helped make real changes that have improved outcomes for both children & vulnerable adults, and Graham said that he appreciated the support they both offered to him when he was new to post as chair.

Future Meetings

- Tuesday 12 September 2017, 1.30-4.30pm, Brighton Town Hall
- Thursday 7 December 2017, 1.30-4.30pm, Moulsecoomb Great Hall