

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **SOCIAL CARE SERVICES BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 2 September 2016 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 26 October 2016.

**Elected Members:**

(\* present)

- \* Mr Keith Witham (Chairman)
- \* Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Ramon Gray
- Mr Ken Gulati, Substituted by Mr Bob Gardner
- \* Mr Bob Gardner
- \* Miss Marisa Heath
- \* Mr Saj Hussain
- \* Mrs Yvonna Lay
- \* Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- Mr Adrian Page, Substituted by Mr Bill Chapman
- \* Mr Bill Chapman
- Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
- \* Mrs Pauline Searle
- \* Ms Barbara Thomson
- \* Mr Chris Townsend
- \* Mrs Fiona White
- Mrs Helena Windsor

**Substitute Members:**

(\* present)

- \* Mr Bill Chapman
- \* Mr Bob Gardner

**Members in attendance**

(\* present)

- \* Clare Curran, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing
- Mary Lewis, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families

**52/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Ramon Gray, Ken Gulati, Adrian Page and Dorothy Ross-Tomlin. Bill Chapman substituted for Adrian Page and Bob Gardner substituted for Ken Gulati.

Apologies were also received from Linda Kemeny and Mel Few.

**53/16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 23 JUNE 2016 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

**54/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**55/16 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no questions or petitions received.

**56/16 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]**

**Witnesses:**

None

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. Members noted their disappointment with the response of Cabinet, suggesting that the charging policy would be detrimental to the quality of life of those affected by the policy. Members also noted that the recommendations to Cabinet made by the Social Care Services Board had not been considered as fully as was hoped by members of the Board.

**Recommendations:**

None

**57/16 STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES VERBAL UPDATE [Item 6]**

**Witnesses:**

Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families and Deputy Chief Executive

Julian Gordon-Walker, Head of Safeguarding, Children's Services

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families outlined the plan for continuous improvement within the service. The efforts undertaken since summer 2015 with regard to creating a stable leadership team, improving work with partners and the Safer Surrey practice guidelines were all highlighted as particularly successful.
2. It was noted that the Department for Education (DfE) review of July 2016 confirmed the improvement of the service with regard to its Improvement Plan. The service reported that its progress had met

internal expectations, but that an Ofsted comment noted that improvement needed to be initiated with greater speed across the service. However, Ofsted also noted that staff morale was at a high level and that the service had taken the correct initial steps. It was noted that a full report was due to be published autumn 2016.

3. It was noted that a refreshed Improvement Plan with a focus on improving practice was due to be formulated in September 2016.

*Bob Gardner entered the meeting at 10.45am*

4. Officers highlighted that the service was in the process of creating a quality assurance record which was due to be delivered to the Improvement Board on 29 September 2016.
5. It was explained by officers that there was an improvement in practice within the service, but that its implementation was inconsistent. The Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families did, however, note that in areas where the Safer Surrey practice guidelines were being utilised, instances of good practice had increased significantly and that parent and child understanding of the service aims and responsibilities had improved. It was emphasised that the Safer Surrey practice guidelines were being implemented across the service.
6. Members highlighted their concerns regarding the high level of caseloads for social workers within the service. The Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families pointed out that the service response of recruiting a team of temporary specialist assessors with a focus on completing new assessments was a positive step towards easing this issue.
7. It was noted that the long term solution to issues regarding high caseloads would be resolved by: the establishment of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) in October 2016, the revision of thresholds guidance and review the Early Help strategy.
8. Members queried the procedures in place for young people leaving the system and whether the current “step up” and “step down” procedures were sufficiently robust. It was noted that the Ofsted judgement of the procedures was positive and that the service had addressed the previous concern that children were being “Stepped Down” without being signposted on to further support.
9. Members suggested that the service engage with other partners to work with to improve service quality. Officers noted that the service was working to scope all possible partners and would welcome suggestions and connections from the Board regarding ideas relating to this.

**Recommendations:**

None

**58/16 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME  
[Item 11]**

**Witnesses:**

None

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

*This item was moved forward at the Chairman's request*

1. The Board noted and approved the recommendations tracker and forward work programme.
2. The Board also received an update from the Performance and Finance Group. It was highlighted that the Chairman of the Board would like to arrange a meeting with the new Head of Children's Services, to ascertain future plans. The Board expressed the wish that the positive changes implemented by the Interim Head of Children's Services be continued.
3. The Board also expressed concerns regarding social worker caseloads.
4. It was noted that the formulation of the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector Task Group would be raised at the next meeting of the Council Overview Board of the 21 September 2016 for approval.

**Recommendations:**

None

**59/16 CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION SAFEGUARDING REPORT [Item 7]****Witnesses:**

Linda Cunningham, Deputy Designated Nurse Child Protection, Guildford and Waverley CCG

Claire Curran, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing

Ben Byrne, Head of Early Help

Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families and Deputy Chief Executive

Paul Furnell, Detective Chief Superintendent, Surrey Police

Julian Gordon-Walker, Head of Safeguarding, Children's Services

Mary Lewis, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families

Karl Mittelstadt, Partnership Manager (Child Sexual Exploitation)

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Officers highlighted the distinction between Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and Child Abuse and the challenges that arise with regard to the age of consent. It was noted that all young people under the age of 18 within the service would be classified as “children,” constructing a robust response from the service with regard to those experiencing exploitation within that age group. Members highlighted this definition, noting that the difference must be clear between a healthy relationship and an exploitative one. Officers responded that the service and Surrey Police look closely at individual cases and act accordingly to determine whether the child is being exploited.
2. The Board queried the structure of the Multi-Agency approach, questioning the number of Surrey Police and Surrey County Council specialist staff available to work with cases of CSE. The representative of Surrey Police responded that there were approximately 190 officers spread across several specialist teams, including a unit for online investigations and other CSE related teams. Surrey County Council officers noted that there were approximately 400 dedicated social workers across the four areas and 140 Youth Support service workers who would have a role in identifying and working with victims of CSE. It was also noted that Surrey County Council was also working closely with District and Borough Councils.
3. The Board expressed concerns regarding the high number of Looked After Children (LAC) at risk. It was pointed out that approximately 20% of those considered at risk of CSE were LAC. The Board queried what Surrey County Council was doing to reduce this risk. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing responded that the wellbeing of LACs at risk of CSE was a standing item for the Corporate Parenting Board. It was also noted that Cabinet Members regularly meet with the Interim Head of Children’s Services to be updated on any issues arising.
4. Members questioned how information regarding spotting CSE early warning signs was distributed amongst the service. Officers responded that the service was improving awareness, citing presentations on the issue of CSE awareness being undertaken and the work being done in partnership with District and Borough authorities and with Surrey Police to raise awareness. It was noted that Surrey County Council was investigating the possibility of working closer with the Metropolitan Police and their work with “Operation Makesafe,” an awareness raising campaign involving the community. Officers noted that more work could be undertaken with voluntary and faith sectors and that these avenues would be explored.
5. The representative of Surrey Police highlighted the creation of a “Make Safe Toolkit,” including a mobile phone application to engage with families and children who may not normally come forward with information as a means of prevention being utilised by the police.
6. Members raised concerns with children’s access to the “Dark Web” and the risks that potential ease of access to this could create and if any preventative measures could be taken to prevent online grooming and access to indecent imagery. The representative for Surrey Police noted that there was an issue with children’s ease of access to this

material and that Surrey Police and officers were looking into ways of raising awareness in schools.

7. The Board queried the Deputy Designated Nurse Child Protection, NHS regarding how many children were referred for therapeutic support for those who have suffered from CSE in childhood and adulthood. Figures for those referred to therapeutic support were unavailable as due to the report being published relating to quarter one of 2016 and it was noted that there was currently no specific service commissioned for victims of CSE. However, the Deputy Designated Nurse Child Protection, NHS responded that discussions had taken place with the Chief Executive of Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust to prepare for possible increased demand for mental health services given the nature of the Goddard Inquiry in relation to sexual abuse in childhood.
8. It was questioned how the service had modified itself as a result of increased awareness of CSE. It was highlighted that the NHS utilises a CSE tool to identify children at risk of CSE. It also was noted that General Practitioners (GPs) have had access to CSE awareness training and should have full access to the CSE prevention toolkit. It was stated that all GPs were expected have good knowledge regarding CSE recognition and prevention as a result of this.
9. Members queried the post-18 support for victims of CSE. It was noted that Youth Support Services was working with victims of CSE beyond 18 and was working with Adult Social Care to create a crossover service for victims of CSE. It was also noted that the Sexual Exploitation and Management Board (SEAMB) was working across children's and adult's services and with partners to support victims of CSE.
10. Members questioned whether the Youth Support Service's "Sliding Doors" support programme for young girls who were victims of CSE could be extended to young boys at risk of CSE. It was noted that more work needed to be undertaken to identify young boys at risk of CSE and a future "Sliding Doors" project for boys would be a key aspect of this, acknowledging that this could be a future project for the service.
11. The Board questioned the number of convictions relating to CSE and checks on perpetrators of CSE. Surrey Police noted that all perpetrators would be placed on a national register for a minimum of 15 years. It was also noted that a conclusive compilation of conviction data was a challenge within the police service due to the difficulties arising from CSE not being a specific offence. It was noted that the police service was working on putting in place a framework to compile this data into one place for analysis.

### **Recommendations:**

The Board thanks witnesses and officers for their contributions to the item.

It expresses concern about the number of children who are Looked After who have been identified at risk of CSE, but also notes the efforts of the Corporate Parenting Board to ensure this is a priority.

The Board Recommends:

1. That officers develop the work to support families in identification of CSE, and how parenting tools can help them reduce risk.
2. That officers, the Clinical Commissioning Groups and Adult Social Care give further consideration to what therapeutic support can be commissioned to support those victims of CSE, both as children and in later life.
3. That officers provide a further short report to the Board on efforts to engage faith networks, licensed venues, families and communities on the subject of CSE.
4. That the Board receive an update on what consultation has been undertaken with those children at risk, or victims, of CSE, and how services have altered to take account of this feedback.

*Keith Witham left the meeting at 12.00pm. Margaret Hicks resumed the meeting as Chairman.*

## **60/16 SURREY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN'S BOARD VERBAL UPDATE [Item 8]**

### **Witnesses:**

Claire Curran, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing  
Elaine Coleridge Smith, Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board Independent Chair  
Julian Gordon-Walker, Head of Safeguarding, Children's Services  
Mary Lewis, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families

### **Declarations of Interest:**

None

### **Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Independent Chair of the Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board (SSCB) advised the Board that the SSCB was in the process of analysing a number of audit reports to ascertain how processes with partners are performing.
2. The Independent Chair noted that the Neglect Oversight Group found problems within Surrey with regard to neglect of children within Surrey and planned to create a toolkit to respond to this issue.

3. The Independent Chair highlighted that the Board's input with the SSCB was welcomed, and invited members to the Multi-Agency Conference to look at hidden aspects of CSE in November 2016.
4. The Independent Chair explained to the Board that the SSCB had implemented information sharing protocols with police and school partners to improve practice.
5. Members raised a concern with regard to academies and private schools, querying whether these institutions were forthcoming with information to the SSCB. The Independent Chair noted that more work was being done with independent schools, however, it was noted that there were no independent school members or faith schools members on the SSCB. The Independent Chair wished to expand membership to these groups in future. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing noted that links between these groups did exist within the Surrey County Council Safeguarding group, and that independent schools were not un-represented.
6. The Board thanks the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board Chair for her update. It notes the work of the Safeguarding Children Board, and looks forward to receiving the annual report in December 2016.

**Recommendations:**

The Board thanks the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board Chair for her update. It notes the work of the Safeguarding Children Board, and looks forward to receiving the annual report in December 2016.

The Board Recommends:

1. That officers provide a short update on efforts to engaging fathers to attend child protection case conferences for information.
2. That the Safeguarding Board provide a short update accompanying the annual report in December on:
  - a. Outcomes from the November 2016 multi-agency CSE conference.
  - b. The work of Surrey County Council and the Safeguarding Board in engaging with independent and faith schools.

**61/16 FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION TASK AND FINISH GROUP [Item 9]**

**Witnesses:**

Elaine Coleridge Smith, Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board Independent Chair

Julian Gordon-Walker, Head of Safeguarding, Children's Services

Paul Furnell, Detective Chief Superintendent, Surrey Police



**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Officers noted that the Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Task and Finish Group was led by Public Health to ensure that an appropriate response was in place to counter the threat of FGM within Surrey.
2. It was noted that Surrey County Council was adopting the Manchester FGM Protocol with regard to combating and raising awareness of FGM within Surrey. It was questioned whether the service could provide a response to any progress made with the implementation of the Manchester model within a 12 month period.
3. It was highlighted that the service was working closely with the Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum as part of the wider engagement with the community regarding FGM.
4. It was queried how the subject of FGM was broached in primary schools and if behavioural change was monitored at the critical ages of 10-11. Officers responded that the primary phase was a key point to engage with children and families on the subject of FGM and that awareness raising campaigns were being undertaken in schools in the primary and secondary phase. However, it was also noted that some work could be done and that the service would analyse the teacher training programmes in primary and secondary phase with regard to FGM awareness.
5. Officers explained to the Board that the Task Group was looking into extending its remit to include the issues of Honour Killing and Forced Marriages and that a further update would be provided to the Board. It was noted that this was an area looked at by the SSCB.
6. Members queried what penalties were in place for perpetrators of FGM and what Surrey County Council could do to support this. Officers responded that a strong penalty would be applied under current law and that the service also had a robust policy with regard to FGM prevention.

*Julian Gordon-Walker left the meeting at 12.42pm*

**Recommendations:**

The Board welcomes the work of the FGM task group, and endorses an extension of its remit to include forced marriage and honour-based violence. It welcomes an update in 12 months time.

The Board Recommends:

1. That officers clarify the legal framework and action taken by Surrey Police if an offence was to occur

## **62/16 EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SURREY'S PRISON SOCIAL CARE SERVICE IN YEAR ONE [Item 10]**

### **Witnesses:**

Elaine Coleridge Smith, Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board Independent Chair

Caroline Hewlett, Senior Manager for Prison Social Care

Liz Uliasz, Deputy Director - Adult Social Care

### **Declarations of Interest:**

None

### **Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Officers highlighted the necessity for equal access to adult social care services for those within the prison system in Surrey. It was brought to the attention of the Board that the Association of Directors of Adult Social Care Services Survey (September 2015) had noted high activity and referrals. It was highlighted that the reviews into prison services social care services pointed out that positive progress had been made within the service in year one.
2. Officers explained that the early issue faced by the service of social care provision was explored by the service and resolved with the employment of Support Time and Recovery Workers. Officers assured the Board that other avenues of approach were considered and that this was the option that provided best service.
3. It was brought to the Board's attention that the service was engaging with peer support programmes, an initiative that was being promoted nationally. It was added that good systems of peer support were in place within two prisons and that the programme was being implemented within the other prisons in Surrey.
4. It was highlighted that there had been made, as of September 2016, 49 self-referrals by prison residents, which was noted as a significant increase.
5. The Independent Chair of the SSCB queried what provisions were in place for LACs and mother and baby support within the prison service. Officers gave the commitment to engage with the Independent Chair of the SSCB to ensure these groups are well supported.
6. The Board requested information regarding the support given to prisoners whom were the subject of domestic abuse. Officers responded that the service was looking at methods of supporting those who had suffered domestic abuse.
7. There was a query from members relating to the number of referrals made in prisons over year one. It was explained by officers that there were 222 total referrals made and that these were broken down individually in the report.

8. It was questioned by the Board as to what the future plans were for the service with regard to prison social care. Future care was highlighted as a key area of improvement within the service. It was also highlighted that prisoners whom provided non-invasive care support to other prisoners would work towards earning a Social Care Certificate

**Recommendations:**

The Board thanks officers for the report, and recognises the hard work of staff in taking on the new responsibilities in this area.

The Board Recommends:

1. That officers engage with the Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board to ensure that those identified as Looked After, or in mother and baby units, are supported.
2. That a future update is brought about the progress of the peer support programmes.

**63/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]**

The next public meeting of the Board will be held at County Hall on Wednesday 26 October 2016 at 10.00am.

Meeting ended at: 12.58 pm

---

**Chairman**

**Social Care Services Board**  
**Performance and Finance Sub-Group**  
**Tuesday 16 August 2016**

Verbal update for the Board

**Risk Registers**

The sub-group reviewed the Children, Schools and Families risks and issues log with the Assistant Director of Commissioning and Prevention, and the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement.

High risk levels were identified for the following:

- transformation of Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) services
- development of early help/prevention systems
- systemic safeguarding failures leading to death or serious harm of a child
- implementation of the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)
- workforce recruitment
- delivering a sustainable budget
- increasing demand, including numbers of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children.

The sub-group discussed the range of actions that sought to minimise or mitigate these identified risks. The sub-group explored the role of partners such as district and borough councils in reducing risk.

The sub-group raised concerns regarding a reduction in the quality of service due to potential future cost cutting measures. This will be carefully considered through the budget planning process.

Officers stated that the service was doing more with regard to prevention; seeking to reduce pressure on safeguarding services and thus reduce costs while also improving outcomes for children and their families.

The sub-group felt that there was a lack of focus on the role of families in relation to the risk register. The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement commented that families were playing a key role, citing the role of Family Voice in developing the SEND strategy as a key example in this respect.

The sub-group was told that there was an issue related to the number of people taking up free Early Years places. There was concern that families would not register in time for the council to receive the correct level of Dedicated Schools Grant funding. This will be closely monitored.

The sub-group noted that it had reviewed the Directorate risk and issue log in response to a request from the Chairman of the Council Overview Board (COB), and would feedback. It requested a further update was brought to a future meeting. It also asked that the risks identified were assessed for financial impact, and that this was included as part of the budget planning discussions for the sub-group in autumn 2016.

## **Children's Services Key Performance Indicators Review**

The sub-group reviewed the Key Performance Indicators with the Interim Head of Children's Services.

Officers shared the Children in Need Census 2015/16. It was highlighted that the number of children on Child Protection Plans (CPPs) for two or more years had been reduced to 1.9% in July 2016 since the figures reported in the census, and that the Service had undergone significant improvement in this regard. It was noted that one of the key reasons for this was the improved management oversight of which children were subject to CPPs.

The sub-group was informed that there were an increasing number of children becoming subject of a CPP for a second or subsequent time. It was noted that the greater number of children coming off a CPP meant an increased risk of them becoming subject of a CPP at a later stage.

Officers proposed a future item outlining the audit and quality assurance processes for case management, highlighting that this would demonstrate how the service was developing consistent standards.

The sub-group discussed the number of assessments by the service carried out within 45 days. It was noted that there was an increased in year demand for the service by circa 3000 assessments. Officers explained that a team of temporary specialist assessors were being recruited to focus solely on completing assessments. This was a short term measure aimed at reducing caseload for social workers, and increasing the number of assessments in the lead up to the introduction of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) in October 2016.

The sub-group noted that South East regions and North East regions were in need of improvement. A number of factors were cited, including high case-loads and a high turnover of staff. The Interim Head of Children's Services outlined the targeted work in these areas, and praised the team for having worked to meet the challenges they faced.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the role of the MASH and the Safer Surrey practice guide in improving consistency of practice. It was requested that the Safer Surrey Practice Guide be distributed to the Board.

Officers informed the sub-group that management of social workers had improved and that a consistent approach was being undertaken by all area managers.

It was noted that staff morale was currently higher, citing that staff turnover had slightly decreased, and that social workers presented their work on individual cases well in recent interview sessions with improvement advisors.

It was recommended that children becoming subject of a CPP for a second or subsequent time was reported as part of the Children's Services Key Performance Indicators.