

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

**Present:**

<b>Michael O'Connor (Chair)</b>	<b>MOC</b>	Independent Chair
Becky Canning	BC	<b>Assistant Chief Officer, London Probation Trust</b>
Jim Crook (Vice Chair)	JCK	<b>Interim Strategic Director of Children's and Adults' Services</b>
Kerry Crichlow	KC	<b>Director Strategy &amp; Commissioning</b>
Ann Flynn	AF	<b>Safeguarding Children Board Development Manager</b>
Merril Haeusler	MH	<b>Director of Education, Southwark Council</b>
Tina Hawkins	TH	<b>Safeguarding Children Board Senior Administrator</b>
Gwen Kennedy	GK	<b>Director of Quality and Safety, CCG</b>
Alex Laidler	AL	<b>Interim Head of Adult's Services, Southwark Council</b>
Mary Mason	MM	<b>Designated Nurse, NHS Southwark Health</b>
Chris McCree	CMc	<b>Interim AD of Nursing –Trust N. Nurse for Safeguarding Children</b>
Gordon McCullough	GM	<b>Chief Executive, Community Action Southwark</b>
Rory Patterson	RP	<b>Director of Children's Social Care</b>
Greg Pople	GP	<b>DCI, Metropolitan Police</b>
Geri Scott	GS	<b>Strategic Director of Housing &amp; Community Services</b>
Jane Shuttleworth	JS	<b>Head of Strategy (int), Planning &amp; Performance, Southwark Council</b>
Claudina Tuitt	CT	<b>Lay Member</b>
Jonathon Toy	JT	<b>Head of Community Safety &amp; Enforcement, Southwark Council</b>
Ruth Wallis	RW	<b>Director of Public Health, Southwark Council</b>
Geraldine Walters	GW	<b>Executive Director of Nursing &amp; Midwifery, KCH</b>

**Apologies:**

Andrew Bland	<b>Accountable Officer for the CCG, NHS Southwark Health</b>
Jackie Cook	<b>Head Of Social Work Improvement &amp; QA, Southwark Council</b>
Zander Gibson	<b>Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police</b>
Ros Healy	<b>Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust</b>
Victoria Mills	<b>Councillor, Southwark Council</b>
Debbie Saunders	<b>Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust</b>
Susi Whittome	<b>Head Teacher Representative, Keyworth Primary School</b>

**1. Introductions and apologies**

MOC welcomed Board members and invited guests. Apologies were noted.

**2. Change makers: Discussion with young people on engagement on the SSCB**

MOC welcomed six young people to the meeting with representatives from their support agency. MOC noted that there was shared understanding of how important it is to listen to and engage with young people, but that it can be difficult to do, and difficult to show what difference it makes and evidence the impact it has on the SSCB. Many groups of young people in the borough are affected by the sorts of issues discussed by the Board and it will not be possible to reach all young people, but the Board should initiate the process of reaching as many as possible. The Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013 makes it critical that we have ways of directly talking to young people. MOC emphasised that he had been feeling impatient to get this process started and was pleased that work had taken place over the summer to enable these young people to attend.

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

AF explained that invitations had been sent through various agencies including Youth Offending (User Voice), Young Southwark, Speakerbox and Young Carers to identify young people to participate. The young people had met four times in the summer with colleagues from the Youth Service and speakerbox in preparation for the meeting.

A young person gave an overview of their work to date, which included looking at what safeguarding means, and what different types of abuse can occur, including modern day slavery and child sexual exploitation. They had learned about the membership of the Board and done a spoken word exercise exploring the significance of safeguarding for them and their generation. A young person read aloud a poem, entitled *Safeguarding*, which was their own work. The Board applauded the young person.

A young person added that they had considered child sexual exploitation and recognised that it is often hidden and can involve younger girls going out with older guys – thinking that this is a good thing but being naive and not realising that the older guy is taking advantage of her.

A young person clarified what the group wanted from the Board:

- To make a change
- To have their voices heard
- To be updated with actions from the Board, potentially via Vimeo
- For the Board to be truthful about what can be done – and be honest when things are not possible

They also had several ideas for spreading awareness including the use of blogs, doing questionnaires on the street about safeguarding with peers, social networking and an annual event to bring a larger number of young people together. They felt that safeguarding is not well understood by most young people. A young person said that they had been aware of safeguarding in the news and seen that it is a very large subject – but often undermined or disregarded. A young person said that we need to go to young people, ask them about safeguarding, tell them about safeguarding as they don't know what it is, and overall provide more education about it, perhaps in PHSE.

MOC invited Board members to respond and ask comment on what the young people had said

GK said that she was impressed that the young people had picked up on the idea of using electronic platforms and agreed that the Board needs to be more creative in reaching out to young people. MOC emphasised to the young people that the Board members were very senior people in their organisations and really can make a difference through their work.

JCK introduced himself as the person responsible for safeguarding in the Council. He said he was particularly interested in their ideas for raising awareness – and that he was also keen to understand what young people feel about trust: can young people talk to teachers about a concern? Do they trust social workers? JCK noted that one major finding from the Rotherham Inquiry was the fact that many young people felt abandoned and that nobody listened to them.

AF stated that during their preparation sessions for the Board meeting, young people had said that targeting business would be a good idea, because young people would like safe businesses they can go to. MOC asked the young people for any further response to JCK's question, and a young person responded that we need to build trust in authority and move forward. Safeguarding a very strong topic for young people but young people don't want to talk about it. It's not a big part of PHSE, maybe there was a need for another lesson on safeguarding specifically as it is a very big role.

AL explained that she spends a lot of her time at work thinking about safeguarding for children with disabilities or learning disabilities, including young women with learning disabilities approaching adulthood. AL asked for the young people's opinions on supporting more vulnerable young people – and on working with people with (learning) disabilities across all age ranges.

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

MOC said he felt this was a complicated question and maybe could be addressed in future. He wanted to focus today's discussion on how the Board works together with children.

JS thanked the young person for the poem and the meeting applauded their appreciation. JS reiterated the need to ask the right questions to young people and work out how we can do more of it. It was important to realise on issues such as CSE that victims do not always know something is wrong, making it harder to tackle.

A young person asked the board three questions:

1. When children go missing, what does the Board do to help find them?
2. What happens when a young person is a victim of CSE? What help do they get and what do you do to make sure it never happens again?
3. What is the Board doing to build a better community?

GS asked about how the Board can be better connected and picked up on the idea of blogs as a way of knitting young people into the business of the Board, asking whether this was enough, or whether there was a better way of ensuring young people's presence around the work of the Board. A representative from Youth Services, accompanying the young people, said that the young people had discussed attending three to four Board meetings with preparation sessions beforehand and debriefings. Young people would also need preparation if they were expected to respond to consultations and time to speak to other young people, the young people also wanted to know whether they could choose their own topics to bring to the Board.

MOC confirmed that this has to be a two way process, and that young people can absolutely bring matters of their own to the Board. It is vital that the dialogue is not conducted just on the terms of Board members – meetings are the Board's way of going about things but we need to develop different ways of engaging with young people.

JT strongly endorsed MOC's comments and explained that in Community Safety, staff engage with people in their own homes. JT wanted to know who the young people would tell and what support they would want, if they knew of someone falling victim to CSE. Michael asked for this question to be followed up by young people outside of this meeting as it required more thinking and consideration of the issues.

MH introduced her work concerning Southwark's schools. MH asked how the Board can better use schools: are schools a good place to engage with children and young people on topics such as safeguarding and CSE? Schools already have School Councils – can we do some extra engagement on these issues – or would young people prefer this engagement to take place elsewhere?

A young person responded that there should be more lessons on what CSE is because at the moment, young people might not think that going out with an older man could be CSE, or they might have friends doing that. JCK added that he was also interested in other aspects of safeguarding and raising awareness across the board.

MOC invited the young people to re-state their questions.

A young person asked the Board what the Board is going to do to make the situation around CSE better. The young person recommended working more with parents. Another young person challenged the Board to look at them as more than just young people – but to see them as the future, as something better.

MOC reflected that a lot more work needed to be done, and asked Board members how this can best be done, how well we can engage with young people. This will take time and inviting young people to the meeting isn't the only thing to do, it is just one part. MOC asked whether young people agreed with this.

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

A young person commented that some young people, particularly those with learning disabilities, will be abused but won't be able to talk about it. The Board needs to communicate with them and understand them better,

MOC said that the Board's temptation is to ask young people lots of questions, but we cannot expect instant responses. The Board needs to work on how it engages with young people.

RP added that it is essential not just to emphasise the 'guarding' element of safeguarding – but also the 'safe' element – something that also celebrates something, that's about promoting wellbeing and making people feel secure. We will turn a lot of young people off if we talk about safeguarding in a negative way.

MOC thanked everyone for their contributions.

### **3. CSE Strategy**

MOC asked RP to introduce the document. RP recounted that there had been a number of very shocking inquiries into CSE, including Rochdale, Oxford, Derby and most recently Rotherham. The DfE also published guidance in 2009. There must be the assumption that CSE happens in Southwark but that the issue is establishing the extent of it – we don't have a detailed grip on the number of victims or young people at risk. Across the partnership, about 100 young people had been identified as such in a recent exercise. On the back of this work and of the deliberations of the CSE subgroup, this strategy had been developed which was about being proactive. It's intent is in:

- Prevention (including awareness)
- Building intelligence
- Supporting young people
- Disrupting perpetrators
- Prosecuting perpetrators

The document before the Board was a draft strategy that would have to be reviewed on the back of the Rotherham report. The next subgroup meeting was scheduled for November, but an earlier meeting was being scheduled to build in learning from Rotherham.

MOC first asked young people for their comments on the issue. A young person replied that when you have a job, you have to do it properly, otherwise stuff is going to happen. People have to know what their job is and do it properly. Another young person added that social services and the police need to work closely, because social services can get more involved with families and children and know what the signs are and how to ask questions.

MOC agreed that we can all write strategies – but that if we don't do our job properly, the strategies are pointless.

GS said she had read the draft Strategy alongside the Rotherham report, and challenged the Board that the strategy felt too much like a practitioner's point of view. There wasn't enough about awareness, about helping young people understand what CSE and unhealthy relationships are and about giving young people confidence that they will be listened to. Rotherham is a shocking report and offers many lessons. The strategy didn't make her feel good about the Board having a tough enough focus on how we can tackle CSE and get bottom-up knowledge from the people it affects.

GK added that she does training and that the important thing to do is to suspend disbelief, especially about ages. Rotherham showed how very young people can fall victim to CSE as well as older teens. It needs to be in all training and worked on interactively; GK had been surprised by delegates at training events who didn't even know what CSE was.

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

MOC accepted the challenge from GK about making the Strategy more real, adding that anything can be written in a strategy – but asked what it means.

A youth worker accompanying the young people related that what had come out of their preparatory work was the need for community awareness. Young people had said that for many, CSE is seen as acceptable and not frowned upon – and that it is thought to be a bit ‘dodgy’ . It all goes back to awareness.

RW said she was struck by the overlap with the work on teenage pregnancy – again this an instance where young people get into situations they can’t get out of. Earlier on in teenage pregnancy work there were widely held views that it was a choice for girls – but later it was more widely acknowledged that coercion and domestic violence were factors. RW urged the Board to ground CSE work in strong messages about access to help, and not make a new category. Vulnerable populations are vulnerable to allsorts, not just one risk. It is a difficult environment for young people at the moment.

CT picked up on the young person’s remark about engaging parents and felt it was a strong point. Agencies need to be educating parents. Parents need to know who they can talk to and how they can talk to young people.

BC challenged that the Board must also consider how it communicates with older men – the perpetrators or potential perpetrators? What do we do about raising awareness in the community that thinks the sexual exploitation of children is OK? MOC accepted this as a tough task requiring large culture shifts.

MOC summarised that there are still questions for the Board to explore with young people and confirmed that RP would work further on the draft Strategy, which would be further developed by the end of September 2014. KC reminded the Board that a key action point was a communications strategy – which would probably have to include hard-hitting messages. GW asked whether young people could help in writing the document in young people language, and challenged whether the Board was using social media as much as it should.

Decisions and/or actions agreed		
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1</b>	Forward questions for young people about CSE to RP	All
<b>2</b>	Revise draft Strategy in light of Board discussion and Rotherham CSE Inquiry	RP

**4. SH24: Presentation of research project into using online sexual health services**

Vicki Spencer-Hughes (VSH) and Gillian Holdsworth (GH) from Public Health joined the meeting. GH introduced their work on a 24-hour online sexual health service for young people, in response to historically high teenage conceptions, abortions and high rates of STIs locally. Clinics often close at 4pm because there is not enough capacity. An online solution was identified as a way of improving access to services. Guys and St Thomas’s Charity had funded the development of a first phase of this work, namely the ability to order an STI test online. But the project leads are acutely aware that there are things that need to be put into place relating to safeguarding and are looking for support in developing guidelines for robust safeguarding in online services.

SH24 will not be a separate standalone service, it is just another channel for accessing the existing clinics. An evaluation has been commissioned from a consultant academic in the field.

MOC asked YP to confirm whether they were following the discussion and understood the topic.

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

VSH told the Board that according to their research, there was no evidence or guidelines to inform safeguarding procedures for an online service such as this. Benchmarking had been undertaken with services such as Check Yourself and various private services, all of which had different age cut-offs, and not all of which were linked to follow-up clinical provision. One finding from the literature review was a suggestion that patients might be more honest about the sexual practices online than face to face. Expert interviews had been conducted with a range of bodies including Brooke and Childline. The draft presented to the Board was not for detailed discussion. GH asked the Board what they feel comfortable with in terms of planning the safeguarding procedure. VSH asked specifically about the appropriateness of working with young people.

A youth worker accompanying the young people said that it was probably best to discuss the issue outside of the Board meeting. A young person fed back that SH24 sounds like a very good idea, because people will be more honest online, and because people feel embarrassed talking face-to-face.

KC endorsed the proposal to work with safeguarding leads, particularly in the context of previous discussions on CSE. It is appropriate to test the processes with young people, but also important to build intelligence about vulnerable groups and about how to reach them sooner.

GH added that another advantage of an online service would be its wide reach and the ability to make sure the right service users are seen in the right places, including young people where there may be safeguarding issues. KC reiterated MOC's reflections on the Rotherham Inquiry. MH drew the Board's attention to the Teenage Pregnancy Committee and Healthy Living Group, both of which have health and education teams looking at raising awareness among communities. The Teenage Pregnancy work has involved work in the Health Huts in schools and youth centres. MH urged the SH24 work to be linked with this, adding that many health-related programmes have been identified boroughwide, which are happening everywhere but not necessarily anchored anywhere.

RP fed back that he had been concerned, within the SH24 concept, about what could be out-of-sight and out-of-mind, but had been reassured by the safeguarding measures being put into place by the SH24 team and by the potential to reach more young people via the service.

MOC sought Board members' agreement confirmed that the Board endorses SH24's approach. GH queried whether the young people at the meeting might be able to work with her on the plans. MOC checked whether engagement from voluntary organisations had been sought and GM confirmed that this had taken place. CT reassured the young people that the Board did not want to overwork them, and a youth work representative agreed the need to make sure expectations are fair and clear. MOC reminded the Board that engagement with young people needed to be two way and not just take place for the purposes of the Board, but that there must be clear benefits for young people too. He added that the Board must accommodate this, for example by finding ways to engage outside of school/college time and setting timescales for work (e.g. on the CSE strategy) which are consistent with the young people's capacity to engage.

MOC thanked the guests from Public Health re: SH24 and young people for their attendance.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>3</b>	GH and VSH to liaise with safeguarding leads from member agencies to develop safeguarding approach within SH24,	GH/VSH
<b>4</b>	MH to link SH24 work with Teenage Pregnancy Committee and Healthy Living Group as part of coordination of health-related programmes.	MH
<b>5</b>	CYP engagement with SH24	AF

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

**5. Minutes and actions arising**

The draft minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed and agreed for accuracy. JS fed back that a lot of work was being done on the placement sufficiency strategy which would inevitably lead into work on wider services for children at the edge of care (in the form of a Children in Need strategy). RP had nothing further to add on Private Fostering, but that an updated multi-agency Action Plan (based on the work of the Private Fostering Steering Group) would be provided at the December Board meeting. The missing young people mentioned in the minutes were confirmed as no longer missing. The further work on the Single Assessment Protocol was still outstanding but being prepared for the November Board meeting

MOC asked Board members for their thoughts on the involvement of young people in the meeting.

BC fed back that she was acutely aware of the language difference between Board members and the young people. Board members need to do more to speak in plain English. MOC commented that the Board is expecting a lot of the young people and that members need to think about how they speak. It is not an opportunity to put questions onto young people and meetings must be disciplined.

JCK remarked that for him it, their attendance is first and foremost a matter of transparency and accountability. Children and young people have a right to be at the Board. JCK went on to challenge that this is not the way to reach young people in terms of engagement – the Board needs to think far beyond that. JS suggested that each member of the Board could undertake to meet four young people directly before Christmas.

GS reminded the Board that young people had said they had told the Board that they wanted to be communicated with well, and said that had she been in their place, she wouldn't want to come back to the Board. Young people have said that they want the Board to use blogs and social networks.

MOC acknowledged the comments and assured that he understood the reflections. JCK added that it is not about numbers of young people engaged per se, but how the Board gets young people it engages with to talk to other young people. The exercise should be organised by them and supported by the Board. JCK said he felt there was a lot of work still to be done. CMC agreed that the Board has a lot to learn from young people about CSE and about the language of engagement.

MH explained that the Healthy Living committee is funding a PHSE consultant to work with schools, each of which have an existing School Council. School Councils are potentially an open market for the Board – and the Board could nominate individual topics for discussion. This could be coordinated by the aforementioned PHSE consultant.

CT reminded the Board that a young person had said that young people are more likely to be honest online, not face-to-face. The Board needs to remember this when planning engagement opportunities.

KC endorsed the Chair's commitment to involving young people on the board itself, adding that it is important for young people to be there: it is not a question of 'either-or' – young people said they would like a range of methods of engagement and provided a strong challenge to the Board about being updated with the Board's actions. The Board must not dumb down their challenge, but must also recognise that there is work to be done both before and after meetings to enable their contributions. MOC responded that the Board will see whether it has been too excruciating for young people to attend by whether they come back. GK warned against the assumptions about the ability of a small number of young people to be representative of the borough's wider population.

**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

RP fed back to the Board Ofsted's findings from its Thematic Review, which took place between 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> July 2014. Ten local authorities were part of the review (of which five were using strengths-based approaches such as Signs of Safety), which focussed on the quality of assessments. Ofsted had broadly positive feedback for Southwark, including:

- Correct decisions were being made
- Thresholds were clear
- Practitioners were trained in the Signs of Safety approach
- There were good examples of the model being put to use and embedded in both CiN and CP cohorts
- No evidence that the approach was diluting CP arrangements or assessments
- Children were being seen alone by social workers
- Assessments were of good quality
- Good examples of Early Help and social care working together, with the two services well aligned
- Positive feedback about Social Work Matters and the borough's organic approach to its implementation

Concerns outlined by Ofsted included:

- Large numbers of cases still being referred into social care that need not be
- Greater shared ownership of threshold required by partners
- Greater depth in plans needed, with more comprehensive chronologies

RP summarised the positive confirmation that social care is heading in the right direction. MOC thanked RP and reflected that this may mean an inspection is not imminent.

JS updated the Board on the Single Assessment Protocol, which had been very generic when presented at the previous meeting. It is being developed and shared with others before presentation to the Board in November,

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>6</b>	RP to update on private fostering action plan at December Board meeting.	RP
<b>7</b>	JS to circulate SSCB scorecard	JS
<b>8</b>	Develop Protocol for Single Assessment and present to December Board meeting	JS
<b>9</b>	Past SCRs and MRs to be a future agenda item for the Board	AF
<b>10</b>	Continue to develop the Boards' means of engagement with children and young people	AF

**6a. Performance Management: Governance**

MOC reminded the Board of the modification of Governance arrangements agreed at the previous meeting. AF introduced the paper which confirms the establishment of a single Southwark Safeguarding Children's Board, with an accompanying Partnership Group. Sustaining engagement in the latter group will continue to be a priority.

MOC commented that the changes were straightforward and the changes were agreed.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>11</b>	Circulate organogram of Board / Partnership structure	AF



**Minutes and Actions**  
**Southwark Safeguarding Children Executive Board**  
**2 September 2014**  
**10.30am – 12.30pm**

**Minutes and actions**

**6b. Performance Management: Annual Report**

MOC queried progress on the SSCB annual report. JS responded that more contributions from Health and the Police were required to make sure their priorities were adequately represented. JS highlighted that the Board is already delayed with the publication of its Annual Report.

MOC commented that the report is a dry document, but that it needs to be self critical, so good engagement from partners is important. JS confirmed that SSCB partners will be approached directly by Children's Services staff to seek their input, reflecting key successes and areas for improvement for the 13/14 financial year. MOC asked partners to provide an honest appraisal of their work: the report needs to transparently reflect where we are and where we are going reflecting pressures and changes – recognising that many partner agencies had had a complicated year. JS confirmed that partners' reflections on areas for improvement will directly inform the workplan for the remaining months of the current financial year.

MH stated that the Annual Report draft was much punchier and a lot easier to read. AF confirmed that feedback provided on the initial draft had already been incorporated.

KC drew the Board's attention to Ofsted's comments on Annual Reports and Business Plans from recent inspections, and emphasised the need for analytical and honest commentary within the report.

MOC thanked the Board and concluded the main business of the meeting.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Action</b>
12	Gather contributions from agencies re: successes and areas for improvement in safeguarding over financial year 2013-14, and add to Annual report	JS

**7. Any other business**

Deborah Parker is leaving the Trust; MOC acknowledged her contributions as an important member of the Board, thanked her for her work and wished her ongoing success. Debbie Saunders is understood to be her replacement.