

SAFEGUARDING SUB (COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 2 June 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Safeguarding Sub (Community & Children's Services) Committee held at on Thursday, 2 June 2016 at 11.30 am

Present

Randall Anderson
Marianne Fredericks
Professor John Lumley
Gareth Moore
Deputy Joyce Nash (in the Chair)
Dhruv Patel
Deputy Elizabeth Rogula

In Attendance

Officers:

Ade Adetosoye	- Community & Children's Services
Chris Pelham	- Community and Children's Services
Pat Dixon	- Community and Children's Services
Marion Willicome-Lang	- Community and Children's Services
Paul Jackson	- Community and Children's Services
Rachel Green	- Community and Children's Services
Monica Patel	- Community and Children's Services
Elizabeth Malton	- Community and Children's Services
Kes Walker	- Community and Children's Services
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerk's
Sabina Johal	- Town Clerk's

It was proposed by Elizabeth Rogula and Seconded by Gareth Moore that Deputy Joyce Nash take the Chair.

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations of interest.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

RESOLVED, that – the Terms of Reference be noted.

4. TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 29

Being the only Member willing to serve, Gareth Moore was elected Chairman for the ensuing year.

5. **TO ELECT A DEPUTY CHAIRMAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 30**

Being the only Member willing to serve, Deputy Elizabeth Rogula was elected Deputy Chairman for the ensuing year.

6. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that - the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2015 be approved.

7. **PRESENTATION: FRAMEWORK I**

The Sub Committee received a presentation and demonstration of the adult and social care recording system. During the presentation, Members noted the following features:

- Once a subject had been input, the system would provide links to various outcomes.
- Any further episodes could be recorded, along with profiles of need, next steps and referrals.
- Each stage would need to be authorised by a manager, possibly leading to a child protection 'workflow' which would include a case conference, reviews, visits etc.
- The system creates purchase orders and payments.
- The system ensures sign offs at appropriate intervals and produces statutory reports and performance data. Any missed sign-offs would trigger an alert to the caseworker.

In response to questions from Members, the following points were covered:

Framework I does not cover homelessness, which was administered by a separate system. However, it was hoped that the two systems could be consolidated in the future.

Other local authorities use the system, tailored to their specific requirements but currently the systems cannot 'talk' to each other. However, officers remain vigilant to cross border cases and keep in regular contact with colleagues in neighbouring boroughs.

The system can only be accessed by social workers, with no access outside the City of London Corporation. Adoption cases have further restrictions and the system is very robust. Amendments are restricted to the relevant case workers and are fully traceable, with audit trails.

Given the relatively small number of cases in the City of London Corporation, Case Workers have very specific knowledge of their looked after children (LACs).

Searches can include names which are spelt alike (in the case of typing errors) and post codes, addresses, NI and NHS numbers.

The details of persons reporting episodes or incidents are recorded and, should a potential client refuse help, the offer of assistance would be recorded, along with the reason for refusal. In accordance with 'making safeguarding personal' Members noted that, unless a potential client does not have mental capacity, then it is their right to refuse assistance.

8. **HOUSING SAFEGUARDING POLICY**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services, which detailed a specific safeguarding policy for the City of London Corporation's Housing Services, complementing the City's wider Corporate Safeguarding Policy.

How is the attendance and impact of housing staff training monitored?

The officer advised that a dedicated training officer monitored attendance on courses and undertook post training evaluations. Training and development were part of regular 1-1 meetings with line managers and the annual appraisal process.

Are Housing fully engaged in the work of the Safeguarding Boards, for example, through audits?

Members noted that all safeguarding incidents were directly supervised to ensure any gaps were identified immediately and all officer working groups had senior management representation. Local Housing Associations were expected to have similar procedures in place and effective corporate parenting required regular information sharing with host authorities.

In response to further questions, Members noted that the Guinness Trust were fully engaged in the 'Notice the Signs' campaign and City of London safeguarding officers met regularly with the Guinness Trust's Designated Officer.

Should a City of London Safeguarding Officer receive a referral from another Local Authority, it would be assessed and possibly added to Framework I. Members noted that cumulative records could help with criminal prosecution in cases of domestic violence, for example. Similarly, the City of London records all its referrals on to other boroughs and attended meetings when necessary. It was noted again that not all adults welcomed intervention and unless the person did not have mental capacity, it could not be enforced.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

9. **ADULT SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PROCEDURES UPDATE**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding the update of the Adult Safeguarding Policy and Procedures.

How will you ensure that practice will be compliant with these policies?

Members noted a new approach to 'making safeguarding personal' which included individual risk assessments and co-operation with the client. The Safeguarding Team had developed a new auditing tool to use during supervisions. A new Chairman had been appointed to the Adult Safeguarding Board (Dr Adi Cooper) and the Adult Safeguarding Manager was also a Member of the Board. The Board had an action plan which included capacity and training.

In response to a question about rough sleepers, Members noted that referrals from the Square Mile would be included in these new procedures. Members noted that the safety and information of rough sleepers across London was supported by a London wide system called CHAIN.

Will the new practice requirements place any pressure on resources/capacity to deliver?

Demand is continuously monitored to ensure there are no capacity issues that would compromise the service ability to meet need. The service has reviewed its structural arrangements to ensure it can meet these new requirements.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

10. LOCAL AUTHORITY DESIGNATED OFFICER 2015/16 ANNUAL REPORT

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding the activity and performance of the Local Authority Designated Role (LADO) for 2015/16.

The good work of the LADO is noted. Is the issue regarding no referrals from the Police an issue specific to the City?

Members noted a similar situation had arisen in Hackney and the issue had been raised at the Safeguarding Children Board, which reserved the right to scrutinise the Police's work in this area. The City of London's LADO was working with the Police to ensure they understood the role. Similarly, there had been some lack of understanding concerning the new procedures for DBS checks and the LADO had been addressing them.

Members also noted significant progress in respect of children missing from Education and an update report would be presented to the next Committee.

RESOLVED, that -

1. The report be noted
2. The Police Committee receive the regular LADO report

11. SAFE COMMISSIONING MINIMUM STANDARDS

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding the minimum set standards for recruitment and audit of the safeguarding mechanisms in place for commissioned services in the City and Hackney.

What are the implications and actions taken if the provider does not comply with these minimum standards?

The officer explained the procedures in place for holding Contractors to account and Members noted the contract was soon to be re-let and the current suppliers would be including in on-going negotiations. There could be further assurances included as part of the PQQ stage of the tender.

If necessary a poor performance notice would be issued to providers if concerns arose.

The Chairman commended the report and asked for it to be included in the welcome pack for new Members.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted

12. SUBMISSIONS TO THE CITY AND HACKNEY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding the City of London Corporation's submission to the City and Hackney Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report on behalf of the services delivered by the Adult Social Care Team and City of London Corporation's partners.

Can you explain a bit more about what Making Safeguarding personal actually means and how you will measure its effectiveness?

Officers advised that to make safeguarding personal was a recent development in the Care Act which sought to measure outcomes and shape how people would want to continue to their lives through consultation and advocacy.

The report is titled 'Partner Contributions' however it seems to be mostly Adult Social Care. How effective are local partnership arrangements?

Officers explained that, generally, the position with partnerships was good but accepted that there was always room for improved ways of working and delivering customer care. The report also included good references from partnerships and volunteering agencies.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

13. QUESTIONS OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no other business.

15. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item	Paragraph
16-21	1, 2 & 3

16. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the last meeting held on 17 December 2015 be approved.

17. **CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING REPORT FOR QUARTER 3 (2015/16) AND PROVISIONAL QUARTER 4 DEADLINES**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding children's safeguarding performance information for quarter three.

18. **ADULT SAFEGUARDING - QUARTER 4 REPORT**

Members received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which set out the nature and level of safeguarding alerts received in the final quarter of 2015-16.

19. **CITY OF LONDON PLEDGE - UPDATE 2016**

Members received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which provided feedback from the City of London (Children in Care Council) and the delivery on the promises contained within the Pledge to its young people who are looked after or care leavers.

20. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

21. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no items of urgent business

The meeting ended at 1.35 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Julie Mayer/Sabina Johal
tel. no.: 020 7332 1410
julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk