



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

Shropshire Safeguarding Community Partnership

Minutes of the Children's Safeguarding & Protection Practice Oversight Group

Friday the 21st of July 2023 – 2:00pm Via Microsoft Teams

*The Shropshire Safeguarding Community Partnership minutes will take note of discussion, challenge and actions, they will not be a full minutes of the meeting.
Please note that meetings will be recorded for the purposes of supporting the minuting of the meeting.*

Name	Organisation	Job Title
Tanya Miles (TM)	Shropshire Council	Executive Director for People in Shropshire
Elena Lloyd (EL)	Shropshire Telford & Wrekin Integrated Care Board	Designated Nurse for Safeguarding
Sonya Miller (SM)	Shropshire Council	Assistant Director for Children's Social Care
Teresa Tanner (TT)	Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital Trust	Safeguarding Lead for Children
Bernadette Jones (BJ)	Shropshire Community Health Trust	Nurse Specialist
Danielle Logan (DL)	West Mercia Police	Detective Inspector
Emma Harding (EH)	Shropshire Council	Safeguarding Officer, Education Improvement Service
Tracy Ryan (TR)	West Mercia Police	Chief Inspector SNT/PSH
Sharon Conlon (SC)	Midlands Partnership NHS Foundation Trust	Safeguarding Lead for Children
George Branch (GB)	The Probation Service	Head of Service
Charlotte Percival (CP)	Shropshire Council	Safeguarding Officer, Early Years Team
Anne-Marie Speke (AS)	Shropshire Council	Health Improvement and Health Protection Operational Lead
Tracie Jones (TJ)	Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital Trust	
Sue Carroll (SC)	Shropshire Council	Early Years Improvement Advisor
Sue Green (SG)	YSS	Operations Manager
Jo Kelly (JK)	Shropshire Council	Virtual Head Teacher
Keith Barham (KB)	Youth Justice Service	Head of Service
Sarah Rock (SR)	Shropshire Community Health Trust	Head of Safeguarding
Tracie Watson (TW)	Shropshire Council	Leaving Care Team Manager
Nikki Thorne (NT)	We are With You	Missing from Home Service Manager



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

Stephanie Kelly (SK)	Shropshire Council	Team Manager for Children's Occupational Therapy Team
Wendy Bulman (WB)	Shropshire Council	Domestic Abuse Development Officer

Shropshire Safeguarding Community Partnership Business Unit

Lisa Charles (LC)	SSCP Development Officer
Corinne Chidley (CC)	SSCP Learning & Development Co-Ordinator
Ben Leach (BL)	Business Unit Administrator

Not in Attendance

David Shaw (DS)	Shropshire Council	Assistant Director for Education and Achievement
Christine Kerry (CK)	Shropshire Council	Team Manager, Education Access Service
Siobhan Hughes (SH)	Shropshire Council	Service Manager, Early Years

Item	
1.	<p>Welcome & Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apologies <p>Suzanne Marsden – Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic Hospital Tamsin Waterhouse – Adult Social Care Paul Kelly – Housing Services Marc Millward – Shropshire Fire & Rescue Service Julie Mellor – Taking Part</p> <p><u>Conflict of Interests</u></p> <p>No conflicts of interest were declared by the group.</p>
2.	<p>Relevant Actions from previous Children's Safeguarding & Protection Practice Oversight Group</p> <p><u>Accuracy of Minutes</u></p> <p>The minutes were agreed to be an accurate representation of the previous meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Tracker</u></p> <p><i>Corinne Chidley to agree timescale with animator for the animation for G family SCR.</i></p> <p>It was confirmed that the G Children Serious Case Review animation has been circulated for comment. TM requested comments are returned from the group as soon as possible. Action ongoing.</p>



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

Jayne Randall and John Foster to discuss including in the data set information on drug and alcohol new presentations coming to services where a parent is living with children.

AMS assured the group that she would contact Ian Houghton to request that this action was followed up. Action ongoing.

SHB to change the wording in the business plan about establishing minimum standards to aid managers in their discussions with staff about their Neglect cases, as the group said it is up to the managers to ensure their staff are using the tools through supervision. Therefore, it was agreed for JD and FD to hold a multi-agency focus group with managers about what would support them to ensure they prompt their staff to use the tools.

TM asked SM to check with Siobhan Hughes to follow up this action in advance of the next meeting of the Group. Action ongoing.

FD suggested getting the Neglect Screening tool and GCP2 onto the Integrated Care Board agenda.

This action awaiting an update from Siobhan Hughes which was requested for the next meeting. Action ongoing.

SSCP Business Unit to raise the issue with the partnership around the inconsistent attendance from health at the Disabled Children's Triage.

SM confirmed that attendance at the Disabled Children's Triage had improved and is now working well. Action closed.

SH to provide the full report on Children Looked After who were on a Child Protection Plan for Neglect.

SM said that she was under the impression that this report had been supplied to the Neglect Strategic Priority Group and TM asked for Siobhan Hughes to follow this action up. Action ongoing.

Agencies to provide the feedback on the frontline practitioner's usage on the Neglect Screening Tool.

The request for this feedback has now been sent out to the Group and would be discussed at the next meeting after the deadline of the 15th of September. EH suggested that actions around the Neglect Screening tool be combined into one, which was agreed. Action ongoing.

Action: BL to condense actions related to the Neglect Screening Tool into a single action.

The Business Unit to ensure that agencies are included with the roles in the membership list in the Terms of Reference.

BL agreed that he would check with LC to confirm whether this action has been completed.

BL to investigate whether it is possible for partners to receive updates when new documents are uploaded to the website.

BL explained that he has requested that Shropshire Council IT work on this function for the SSCP website but is yet to receive a reply. Action ongoing.

SM to investigate whether concerns around online harm are coming to Children's Services or whether this is being dealt with within schools.

SM still investigating this action and will update at the next meeting. Action ongoing.



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

Business Unit to schedule a Multi-agency Case File Audit around children aged 0-5's suffering from significant harm who belong to large sibling groups.

BL confirmed that the Multi-Agency Case File Audit is taking place on the 24th of July 2023. Action complete.

LC to check whether the comments from the Strategic Planning Day have been incorporated into the dataset.

BL confirmed that the dataset will be reviewed by a Task & Finish Group on the 9th of August 2023, therefore this action will be discussed at the next meeting. Action ongoing.

The Children's Safeguarding and Protection Practice Oversight Group will discuss the Early Help single point of entry at the next meeting.

SM explained that the overall decision had been that First Point of Contact will be the single point of access for all enquiries for health and support, safeguarding and child protection and therefore the mechanics of the front door will sit behind First Point of Contact. This will simplify the process for Partners, however if there is a safeguarding concern then Partners will still be required to complete a multi-agency referral form. Action closed.

SM, SH and AS to discuss moving Graded Care Profile 2 training into Early Help and to report back at the next meeting of the group.

As confirmed prior to the meeting, it has been agreed by People's Directorate will pick up the GCP2 training however where it will ultimately sit is yet to be determined. Action ongoing.

3. Children's Safeguarding Summit Update

TM gave an update on the Summit meeting, noting that the set up of the venue was not ideal. SM commended Public Health for their summary of the evidence base as this gave a road map for Working Together and what needed to be achieved in order for Partners to make process around the safeguarding of children under the age of four. AM agreed that the updates from other agencies were really helpful and was interested to see the outcomes of the summit.

Action: Partners to put their summaries into a slide or into an e-mail in order to capture all of the information from the Children's Safeguarding Summit.

SM explained that in Children's Social Care and Public Health looked at every referral that had come in before their fifth birthday which showed that there were eighty-two children. The core dataset has been shared to key individuals within key agencies who will explore how many of those children were open to them and the level of interaction with those agencies. Once those responses have been returned, ten will be selected randomly who have had multi-agency involvement and then carry out a dip sample audit to assess why these children were escalated into becoming strategy discussions around significant harm. The core dataset was sent out on the day after the Children's Safeguarding Summit and SM believed that this would be on target with the audit.

AS raised that at the Early Help Board on the 20th of July 2023 a question was raised by Partner agencies who had asked for the sibling names to cross reference to see if they had involvement with the family rather than the individual and SM confirmed that this can be done by checking the address. SC said that Midlands Partnership Foundation Trust would require all of the names but will search for the children by names and addresses only and acknowledged that this may limit the responses the Trust can provide.



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

	<p>EH asked how the learning and themes from this audit would be brought together with the Multi-Agency Case File Audit which was taking place on the 24th of July 2023 as there may be themes and patterns which are identified in both audits. TM suggested that the outcomes would be discussed in this group as well as the summit.</p>
4.	<p>Update from Strategic Governance Group</p> <p>TM informed the Group about the discussion from the Strategic Governing Group meeting which resulted in the Group deciding that Development Officers from the Business Unit would author reports and the reason why this decision has been made. TM also updated on the publication of the 2021/2022 Annual Report.</p>
5.	<p>Performance Review</p> <p>The Group was reminded that a Task & Finish group will be taking place on the 9th of August. TM reminded the group about the discussion at the Strategy Planning day around the dataset and asked that this agenda item would be discussed at the next meeting of the Group.</p>
6.	<p>Strategic Action Plan Review</p> <p>The Action Plan statements of success was shared and TM asked if the Group would accept the action plan. EH raised that there were a number of actions on the action tracker which were also recorded on the action plan and asked whether the action tracker and action plan could be amalgamated and EH agreed to look into how do carry this out and communicate these to the Business Unit.</p> <p>Action: EH to look at actions that are recorded on both the Children’s Practice Oversight Group’s action tracker and Strategic Action Plan to see whether they can be amalgamated.</p> <p>AS asked about the dates when actions needed to be completed by as a number of them were quite out of date and asked how the group can resolve this issue. TM asked all Partners to look at actions which are assigned to them on the Strategic Action Plan to confirm whether actions are still outstanding or whether they have been completed and SM highlighted that some of the actions were very broad. SM explained to the Group some of the issues that she had faced in the previous week in locating specific documents and that the West Midlands Procedures website was not easy to operate. SM suggested that urgent work needed to be done around accessibility to local procedures and TM asked why this was so difficult and SM explained that the localised procedures are available on the West Midlands Procedures website and the difficulties and reasons why it has increased in complexity.</p> <p>EH confirmed the reasons why the document in question had been removed from the West Midlands Procedures webpage which had been suggested by SM. EH explained that the feedback from schools has been that there are too many procedures to follow and raised a concern that not all of the key points of the procedures are being retained by practitioners which is being shown in learning reviews. EH raised that Shropshire were still part of the regional procedures group and that this has been raised previously by the Business Unit. EH highlighted the importance of the Threshold document and suggested that this should be the document which guides practice locally along with managing allegations against staff.</p> <p>SC asked about EH’s concern regarding the national, regional and local procedures stored on the West Midlands Procedures page and whether the concerns were just around the local procedures and EH said that she was concerned about there being too many procedures on all three levels. EH explained that if a practitioner who does not only work within Safeguarding was asked to locate a specific procedure then it was quite possible they would have difficulty doing so. EH suggested that the group assess the impact of using the</p>



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

West Midlands Procedures Page had on practitioners and look at the numbers of staff were looking at procedures as the number of procedures may act as a barrier to staff. EH asked the Group whether the key messages that needed to be conveyed to staff were getting lost due to the number of processes which were displayed on the Procedures page and TM raised the concern of the low numbers of staff logging on to the Procedures page to find them.

SM raised that the document that she was looking for was available within three clicks on the Essex Safeguarding webpage and challenged the Group as to why there were challenges to accessing this document locally. SM agreed with EH that there was a concern around procedures not being utilised in Shropshire by front line staff. DL raised the lack of buy-in recently regarding responsibility, using as an example a lack of Education representation and assistance in sending out documentation to schools and following meeting with Health in the last week found they were struggling with Health representation at strategy meetings. DL suggested that the issues may extend further than just front-line staff not making active use of procedures.

TM challenged the Group that the system in Shropshire had “forgotten how to do safeguarding”. EH agreed with TM, suggesting that the system was over relying on processes to carry out ‘good’ safeguarding. TM emphasised the urgent need for a Task & Finish Group to examine the amount of Child Protection procedures in Shropshire and EH raised a concern around the capacity of the Business Unit as a representative from the Unit still was a part of the Regional Procedures group. SC highlighted that these are regional procedures and SM explained that the concern was specifically around the local procedures.

Action: To form an urgent Task & Finish Group to examine the amount of local Child Protection procedures in Shropshire and their availability on the West Midlands Procedures Page, to be attended by EH, DL, SC and Lisa Charles.

TM raised the issue of the “buy-in” into Safeguarding and asked the Group what they needed to do support staff’s understanding their responsibilities around safeguarding. SM asked for the discussion and challenge around whether all Partner agency front line practitioners understand Child Protection and whether the language has merged into Safeguarding overall and whether all front-line staff understood the timescales involved. SM asked whether it would be beneficial for staff to be walked through real life examples of where this has been challenging and the consequences for the Child and for decision making.

SR asked whether the audit which had been launched following the Child Safeguarding Summit was going to examine this issue and SM clarified that the audit would be looking at the work that takes place before a child is referred into Children’s Social Care.

Action: All Partners to share at least two examples at the next meeting of the Group where Safeguarding Children has not been done right within their organisation and what changes need to be made to correct these issues.

Action: EH to inform TM by Monday the 24th of July 2023 the reasons why Education colleagues are not being represented at Safeguarding meetings with Compass.

Action: Health colleagues to inform TM by Monday the 24th of July 2023 the reasons why Health colleagues are not being represented at Safeguarding meetings with Compass.

EL asked whether it was triage or strategy meetings where Health colleagues are struggling to attend and DL explained that the Level Four and Urgent strategy meetings are well attended, it’s the Case Management meetings which are less well attended and has discussed this issue with Helen Cooper who is aware there is an issue. DL explained that it was more of a commissioning issue and agencies deciding who was responsible for attending those meetings.

EH asked whether the issue of attendance was around Section 47 strategy discussions or about triage meetings which do not meet the level four notification to Compass? SM clarified that sharing information with




Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

	<p>Education in Compass has been on hold due to sickness and understood from Jeanette Hill that this is now back up and running and that there is a challenge as a system due to a lack of staffing. SM confirmed with the Group that Compass have consistent Health representation and that the issue is that strategy discussions on children who are open to Children's Social Care further down the line due to an upcoming contract review.</p> <p>EL agreed to speak with Helen Cooper as if there should be a health visitor or nurse in attendance at these meetings and SM acknowledged that due to the tight timescales (within forty-eight hours) often professionals will not have the capacity to attend. SR added that there are conversations taking place within Health to try and resolve this issue and that Helen Cooper is very much involved in getting the right practitioners around the table to get the right outcomes for these children. DL added that when she met with Helen Cooper they discussed looking at missed opportunities to identify the risk to the Child before it reaches the stage of the strategy meeting.</p> <p>SC asked whether the risk around Operation in Compass and when there is a delay in notifications and whether this was recorded on the Risk Register and TM confirmed that it was not. EH asked where the delay sat and SC explained that during the Domestic Homicide Review meeting it was stated that there had been a two-week delay to getting a notification and the child had been in school throughout this period. EH asked if this was an administrative delay sending the details to the school or whether it was a delay of the Police receiving the information from the Local authority? WB explained that it was due to when the co-ordinator was not in work and that this Review was from two years ago, the risk identified was that when Karen was off sick as she was the only staff member who completed this role. WB has taken an action to take this risk to Laura Fisher to be raised to the Strategic Governing Group. TM said that the risk would be better to be raised to this Group first prior to it being raised to the Strategic Governing Group and WB acknowledged this.</p> <p>Action: AS to update TM on the new arrangements which would result in increased Health representation at Strategy meetings.</p>
7.	<p>Children's Statutory Case Review Group Update</p> <p>TM went through the report for the benefit of the group and highlighted the escalation from the Children's Statutory Case Review Group.</p> <p>SM confirmed that she has responded to the actions and identified that some actions have been superseded by other reviews. SM asked whether the actions around audits can be closed, as these have been completed under another audit and Partners were happy with this approach. SM raised that some actions were not within the gift of the agency to complete and asked that Partners consider the plausibility of actions being completed when setting actions within Reviews.</p>
8.	<p>Access to Children's Mental Health Support Progress Update</p> <p>TJ gave an update for the benefit of the group on access to Children's Mental Health support.</p> <p>SM highlighted that when the initiatives don't work then this results in an increase in referrals to Children's Social Care and asked if there is an opportunity to work together to address those children escalating in different ways. TJ suggested that it would be best to discuss these with Liam as the Trust are wanting to look more closely at the risk whilst waiting and if the risks can be identified earlier there will be very different outcomes.</p> <p>SC raised children under the age of five and families on the point of crisis and how Partners can make them aware of the advice lines to stop them going into crisis as part of the Early Intervention Provision. TJ explained that in terms of the ASD that was presented, the ASD for children under the age of five, that will focus on the</p>



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

	<p>ages of five to twenty-five, as there is another provider for children under the age of five. There is a piece of work being carried out local mapping services and how to provide that service on the local offer and get it out to communities.</p>
9.	<p>National Consultations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Together to Safeguard Children: changes to statutory guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) • Information sharing advice for safeguarding practitioners - Department for Education - Citizen Space • Mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse <p>TM requested that Partners read these consultations and ensure that they are aware of them.</p>
10.	<p>SUDIC Thematic Report</p> <p>AS and BJ presented the report for Partners.</p>  <p>SUDIC Thematic Review July 2023.pp</p> <p>SM asked where data sits nationally per every ten thousand/hundred thousand children and BJ confirmed that she did not have that information. SM suggested that there has been an increase and didn't know whether this was in line with any increases nationally and BJ explained that there have been increases nationally in child deaths, practice reviews and child neglect issues. AS added that there are some lags in the data and often data is from two years prior.</p> <p>EL asked about safer sleeping and emphasised the importance of professionals visiting a property and seeing where children sleep during the day and that this was raised during a recent Case Review. AS agreed and highlighted the risks around car seats which was also a significant risk.</p>
11.	<p>Local Procedures due for revision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Threshold Document</u> • <u>Pre-birth Assessment Guidance (Assurances required in relation to the M&N action plan)</u> <p>EH said that the Threshold Guidance will depend on how it aligns with the Early Help guidance but given the proposed changes in Working Together and the Information Sharing Practitioner Guidance whether it was worth waiting for those to be confirmed before reviewing the Threshold document. WB also asked about what will be done about children who are victims of domestic abuse and how that will be captured in the threshold document and that if the document is updated now without considering that, it was likely it would require updating again in a few months' time. DL agreed and proposed that reviewing the Threshold Document should be postponed which was agreed.</p> <p>Action: The reviewing of the Threshold document will be included on the agenda for the next meeting of the Children's Practice Oversight Group.</p>
12.	<p>Benchmarking Tool for Missing and Transitional Safeguarding</p>



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

	<p>TR went through the benchmarking tool for the benefits of Partners and asked if anyone had answered the questions and TR asked if this could be discussed with relevant Partners outside of the group which TM agreed.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Voice of the Child Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Voice of the Child • Voice of the Child Guidance and Resources toolkit • Cafcass Top Tips for Professionals • Decision as to what to include on the SSCP website. <p>TM said that the SSCP website was not fit for purpose in regard to procedures.</p> <p>EH said that the seven-minute briefing produced for Wolverhampton could be adapted for Shropshire and could be theme for the Children’s learning event in November and raised concerns about how the resources could be further promoted. TM acknowledged that this is an important area, but the discussion should not just be around what resources are promoted on the website as staff do not appear to be accessing the website.</p> <p>KB said that the discussion was about different websites, as the website discussed earlier in the meeting was around the West Midlands Procedures website and the ask of this agenda item was around the SSCP website. EH asked if analytics could be run on the SSCP website and BL confirmed that they could be and TM assumed that the numbers were low.</p> <p>Action: BL to find and share the numbers of staff who had accessed the SSCP website within the last three months and share them with the Childrens Practice Oversight Group.</p> <p>SC asked whether the Business Unit were making use of the staff who specialise in communication and language on how to a young person to communicate well. TM suggested asking Corinne Chidley to arrange a learning event in November around capturing the voice of the child. The Group then agreed to postpone this agenda item until the next meeting to have time to read the documents and agree what needs to be added to the SSCP website.</p> <p>Action: Voice of the Child resources to be delayed until the next meeting of the Children’s Practice Oversight Group.</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p>Risk Register</p> <p>No additional risks were agreed to be added to the risk register, pending EH’s investigation in her action into Education representation at Strategy Meetings.</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>Matters to be Raised to Strategic Governing Group</p> <p>SC asked that the availability of procedures on the West Midlands Procedures Website be raised to the Strategic Governing Group and TM agreed but acknowledged it was the responsibility of this Group to investigate this issue.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>What was discussed today that makes a difference to people’s lives?</p>



Shropshire Safeguarding
Community Partnership

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Challenging and uncomfortable conversations about the concerns around Child Protection practices in Shropshire.-
17.	Any Other Business No other business was raised by any members of the group.
	Next Meeting Agenda items: Date of meeting: Friday the 22 nd of September 2023 – 9:00am – 11:00am