

Minutes
Meeting Title: Leicester Safeguarding Children Board Meeting
Date: 21st March 2019
Venue: Room G.01, City Hall, Charles Street, Leicester

Name	Role	Agency	Present	Apologies	Absent
(The Chair)	Independent Chair of the LSCB	Independent	✓		
(AT)	Lay Member	LSCB	✓		
(ASp)	Consultant Nurse, Safeguarding Children and Adults	Leicester Clinical Commissioning Group		✓	
(AEJ)	Designated Doctor for Safeguarding Children	Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust		✓	
(AC)	Deputy Chief Nurse	Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust		✓	
(BB)	Head of Service	DLNR Community Rehabilitation Company	✓		
(CT)	Director of Social Care and Early Help	Leicester City Council	✓		
(CS)	Headteacher, <i>City Primary Heads Representative</i>	Education	✓		
(CW)	Director of Nursing and Quality	Leicester Clinical Commissioning Group	✓		
(CM)	Head of Service	CAFCASS	✓		
(JDF)	Head of Service, Early Help (CC, Youth & FS)	Leicester City Council		✓	
(JB)	Principal, Representing Secondary Heads	New College Leicester	✓		
(MD)	Head of Serious Crime	Leicestershire Police	✓		
(MH)	Senior Operational Support Manager	HMPPS, Nation Probation Service		✓	
(NT)	Children's Service Manager	Barnardo's	✓		
(PT)	Director of Learning & Inclusion	Leicester City Council	✓		
(PP)	Head of Law, <i>LSCB Legal Advisor</i>	Leicester City Council		✓	
(RH)	LLR CDOP Public Health Consultant	Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland CDOP		✓	
(RL)	Director of Adult Social Care	Leicester City Council	✓		
(JA)	Consultant Public Health	Leicester City Council		✓	
(SR)	Lead Member, <i>Participant Observer</i>	Leicester City Council	✓		
(SI)	Deputy Principal, <i>Further Education Representative</i>	Leicester College		✓	
(SH)	Director of Clinical Quality	University Hospitals Leicester NHS Trust	✓		
(SF)	Strategic Director Social Care & Education	Leicester City Council	✓		
(TB)	HoS Children's Safeguarding and Quality Assurance	Leicester City Council	✓		

In Attendance

Name	Role	Agency	Role at Meeting
OR	Admin and Business Support Officer	LSCB	Minutes and Business Support
SF	Admin and Business Support Officer	LSCB	Shadowing OR
(PrP)	Policy Officer	LSCB	Advisor to the Board
(KM)	Service Manager, YOS	LCC	Deputising for JDF
(NK)	Trust Lead for Safeguarding	LPT	Deputising for AS
(FG)	Principal Solicitor	LCC	Deputising for PP
(MCS)	Head of Nursing	LPT	Deputising for AS

1.	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies.
1.1	The Chair welcomed members and noted the above apologies.
Part 1	LSCB Strategic Board Business
2.	Minutes and matters arising from Board meeting on 06.12.2018 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Board Meeting Minutes • Action Log • LSCB Forward Plan
2.1	<p>It was noted that a report is expected for the July Board meeting concerning the Young Person’s Event that took place in February 2019.</p> <p>The subject of austerity was raised, and SR informed the Board that the subject was, as agreed, discussed at the Children Trust meeting that took place last week. SR noted that the statutory sector is reliant on the voluntary sector for the services that people need. A need to consider how they can more effectively support each other was noted. SR stated that many of the same people would have been around the table 10 years ago and they would have been working and considering employment, skills and aspirations. They are now working on and considering food, shelter and water. It was noted to have been a difficult meeting and it was recognised that the same lens cannot be applied to things as previously and it also cannot be assumed that because something worked in a particular way previously, it will continue to work in that way now. The meeting was noted to have been positive in the sense that people recognised that they could support one and other. The Board were informed that the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) can make small checks, conducting a monthly check-list to consider applications for monthly credit. However, DWP have informed that they cannot provide figures on where claimants are that are not getting support. They are also unable to confirm how many of the 20% that do not receive a payment within 5 weeks have children. The Board were in agreement that this is a very important question and is a national issue. SR confirmed that outcomes will be written up and shared in due course, with the process being led by a team led by the City Mayor’s Office. NT noted that the VCS Reference group need to be linked into the process.</p> <p>BC brought to the attention of the Board AP28/18 - LSCB Threshold review to take into account access to CAMHS Thresholds and the CAMHS Traffic Light system to strengthen and ensure alignment between these three documents. JH to support this work. It was noted that the work around the thresholds document is currently paused due to issues around the number of tiers within the document. A lot of consideration around this took place at the LLR Joint Executive Group meeting in February.</p>

	<p>AP01/19 It was agreed at the Board that CT and SC (AD in Leicestershire and Rutland) should have an urgent discussion around the number of tiers and seek urgent resolution and report back to the Board. The importance to have consistent approach across LLR was agreed.</p> <p>The LSCB Forward Plan was presented and it was confirmed that there are no issues or updates.</p>			
Ref	Action	Person/s responsible	By	Desired outcome/Progress Update
4.5.1	AP01/19 CT and Sharon Cooke (AD in Leicestershire and Rutland) to have a discussion around the number of tiers and seek urgent resolution report back to the Board.	CT	22/06/19	
3.	<p>Chair's Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-agency Safeguarding Reforms DfE Event 			
3.1	<p>The Chair confirmed that she attended the Multi-agency Safeguarding Reforms DfE Event and noted that it offered the opportunity to hear the National Panel's view on how the Panel is working under Working Together 2018 and what sort of notifications they are receiving. The National Panel are currently writing policy guidance from Edward Timpson, that although not statutory, should support how Rapid Reviews are approached. The Chair stated she that will ensure that dialogue continues with the National Panel and it was noted that no feedback has been received that suggests that the LSCB is not doing what is required.</p> <p>The Chair noted that there is a lack of consistency with advice being given and the National Panel have been strongly challenged around this and are working on it. The shifting interpretation on what is considered as serious harm was raised and it was agreed that the LSCB will continue to make decisions using guidance on a case by case basis.</p>			
4.	<p>Core Business and Chairs Executive Highlight Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAAG Highlight Report • LSCB Business Plan • LSCB Work Plans • LSCB Budget Report • LSCB Risk Register 			

4.1	<p>PAAG Highlight Report</p> <p>TB presented the PAAG Highlight Report to the Board and noted that PAAG met last week and reviewed performance data, with highlights within the report.</p> <p>Quoracy at conferences was discussed in terms of progress and it was confirmed that no critical messages were required at this time. TB informed the Board that the LSCB Audit Programme was also discussed and attempts to be aligned with LLR to ensure consistency have been made. It was noted that there is ongoing development work on how this will be achieved.</p> <p>TB stated that the number of Child Protection (CP) Plans have dropped dramatically, however this is not an area of concern, as the Ofsted visit in January showed no areas of concern in that area after a robust investigation. The drop in CP Plans is due to the conclusion of a great deal of work, including focus intervention with families and the Signs of Safety approach. TB confirmed that the LA is under the national average for the number of children on subsequent plans.</p> <p>JB noted that CP Plan numbers have also dropped from the school point of view and the system seems to be working. TB stated that with quoracy high, this provides assurance that every agency is an involved party to this process. CT noted that a more robust application of threshold is also in evidence. It was clarified that the Child Protection process is very formal and while the Children in Need (CiN) meetings are similar, they are voluntary. The LA will take the lesser of two processes where possible. It was noted that the CP arena can be very serious for families and has a higher impact on them. The Chair stated that more support at CIN level can prevent more CP level engagement. In summation, it was agreed that the whole system seems to be working and this is very positive.</p> <p>The Chair noted that LADO notifications have been seen to have gone up, however TB stated that there has been an increase for drivers, however no patterns have been identified. CT noted that the LA is still in the process of raising awareness, although the way referrals are recorded has already been strengthened. TB agreed to look at the Safer Recruitment process for additional assurance, as they may be less robust than they need to be.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that the PAAG report has been noted and CAMHS waiting times are to be discussed as part of agenda of today's meeting.</p>
4.2	<p>LSCB Business Plan</p> <p>Upon discussion, it was agreed to await the Multi-agency Safeguarding Arrangements before updating the LSCB Business Plan. A new Business Plan may be required in September when safeguarding arrangements are in place.</p>
4.3	<p>LSCB Work Plans</p>

	<p>BC presented the LSCB Work Plans to the Board and noted that there are no red impact RAG items within any of the work plans, although there are a number of ambers, however work is progressing. Unborn and Vulnerable Infants, marked as amber, was discussed and it was confirmed that revised training around pre-birth assessments is in place and a Safer Sleep week took place from the 11th to the 17th of March 2019</p> <p>Moving on to the SIRG Work Plan, BC confirmed that two SCRs were published today (D1 - Nadiya and E1 - Robyn) and a 3rd (OD) is currently with NSPCC, awaiting confirmation regarding publication date. It was confirmed that the OD case will be published anonymously on the NSPCC Repository. A clear steer has been provided from media leads if a link to the case is made back to Leicester, however, this is very unlikely.</p> <p>BC informed the Board that there are still a high number of Rapid Reviews in progress and attempts are being made to stick to timescales, although this is a challenge. The Chair acknowledged that the Rapid Review process causes a lot of work and pressure on the LSCB Office and the partners.</p>
4.4	<p>LSCB Budget Report</p> <p>BC presented the LSCB Budget report and confirmed that the budget is broadly balanced and there are no areas of concern. It was noted that there is a £XXXX carry forward, which is ring-fenced to training and relates to an LLR contribution. This carry forward will be used to support the budget going forwards. BC informed the Board that less has been spent than anticipated on SCRs, and the new models seem to be less costly.</p> <p>BC noted that there is clear evidence that people are willing to pay for training, with £XXXX received based on bookings. JB noted that school training is excellent and was thanked for her feedback.</p> <p>CT informed the group that the £XXXXX that was originally provided to the LA by CCG for Looked After Children, will be moved to the LSCB budget, with a view to look at potential thematic training events and raising awareness. CT noted that this was a very kind and generous offer that leaves the LSCB in a healthy position and will benefit a number of areas. An opportunity to commission Young People's to partake in a work project for the LSCB was raised as an option. The Board were in agreement that this is a very positive news story. The Chair thanked BC for robust assurance about funding and budget.</p>
4.5	<p>LSCB Risk Register</p> <p>BC presented the updated LSCB Risk Register to the Board and noted that the register previously only set a priority could only be amber or green, but has now been aligned to other processes, including other LSAB work and the LCC Risk Register model and Risk Register Management procedure. It was noted that a new scoring matrix, that provides a residual risk score is now in place. It was confirmed that a number of risks have been moved to amber on the basis of received assurance. The CAMHS waiting times is an example of this, with the waiting time still high but progress can be seen. It was stated that items can go up or down and be scored accordingly. Board members were happy with the new approach and supported the model.</p>

However, the risks need some further work to separate out operational risk and strategic risks. SF stated a need to discuss this outside of the meeting. **AP02/19** It was agreed that further discussions around the LSCB Risk Register are to take place. JM will meet with CT to agree where the register needs to sit and a clean, revised register is to be prepared for next Board meeting. The Chair thanked BC for the useful guidance document that was presented alongside the register.

AP03/19 The LSCB Annual Report was discussed and it was confirmed that a template will be set up across LLR to assist partners with their contributions to the report and sent after 29/03/19, after the templates have been agreed, with responses sent back to the LSCB Office by 30/04/19. The Chair requested that Board members commit to timescales and noted a need for specific answers to specific questions. It was confirmed that there will be one template across children, adults and LLR, which should help ensure that everyone has the required partner contribution. It was noted that much shorter contributions are required from previous years and assurance and effectiveness of safeguarding process should be considered. It was confirmed that the report will be completed for the July board.

BC raised the MARF Form to the Board and noted that it was agreed at the JEG meeting that took place in February 2019. It was confirmed that a communication plan and briefing package is required and a meeting with communications leads and LA leads is to take place next week to ensure that actions are signed off. The goal is to ensure effective referrals are made.

The Chair noted the contents of the report and the actions agreed.

Ref	Action	Person/s responsible	By	Desired outcome/Progress Update
4.5.1	AP02/19 Further discussions between the Chair, BC and CT are to take place regarding the LSCB Risk Register. Clearer, revised Register to be presented at next Board meeting.	The Chair, BC & CT	22/06/19	
4.5.2	AP03/19 LSCB Annual Report template to be sent to partners after 29/03/19, with responses sent back to LSCB Office by 30/04/19	LSCB Office/Board Members	30/04/19	
5.	Multi-Agency Safeguarding Arrangements (MASA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MASA Transition Arrangements • Date for Publication and Implementation • CDOP Arrangements 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Steps
5.1	<p>SF presented Multi-agency Safeguarding Arrangements (MASA) report to the group.</p> <p>The report was completed by SF, CW and MD who had a number of conversations. SR and the Chair were also involved in discussions, along with a number of colleagues around LLR. SF noted that the report was seen as an opportunity to refresh strategic priorities and not just meet what Working Together requires.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the report is not finalised, and an action plan will be created going forwards. Attempts will be made to try to align the process across LLR but will be a challenge. The arrangements are seeking to align the Board Office's support functions and some efficiencies will be required, whilst some opportunities will arise to streamline commitments and maximise areas that are already in place. It was noted that some of the individual arrangements may be challenged potentially, for example by having meetings on the same day and certain other areas that should streamline arrangements. Some differences with Leicestershire County were noted, with a key difference being that Leicestershire County will not have an Independent Chair, whilst Leicester City will continue to.</p> <p>It was noted that the role of the Board is to state assurance that young children are safe at any time and to be assured that systems work to ensure this safety. SF stated that the aim is to combine the Leicester City Children and Adult Board Office and it was agreed that the balance of resources across LLR is a challenge. SF stated that the intention is to not destabilise what has previously worked and there is no reason to make a radical change on the children side as the LSCB has worked.</p> <p>MD noted that although it is an aligned process across LLR, there will however, still be local accountability.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the new arrangements offer a big opportunity to do things better and differently but not discard what is already working. The Chair stated that she welcomes the alignment and appreciates that it is a step by step process, with a need to build on the good work already achieved.</p> <p>BB noted that he also attends Safeguarding Board meetings in Nottinghamshire and welcomes the step by step approach, as anything that progresses alignment is a positive. It was agreed that simple things can make a difference, such as using the same templates. BB stated that he felt the conversation to be very encouraging.</p>

CW noted that there may be a danger that the focus on Leicester is lost, but steps are being made to ensure this is not the case. It was agreed that although it is a difficult process, it can be advantageous. MD noted that the process was benefitted with strong partnerships at a strategic level. SF stated that there are a number of side benefits regarding the adult and children Boards being together, with all four meetings on the same day, with joint section at the start being an option.

BC noted that operationally joint work is in evidence, with the Joint Executive Group and Rapid Reviews being aligned across children Boards The recent LLR Adult and Children Safeguarding Conference was noted to have gone very well.

The Chair raised the subject of Lay Members and noted that they offer independent scrutiny in a different way. It was agreed that this is an important consideration. CW informed the Board that ASP was unable to attend today's meeting, but is happy with what has been proposed, but did note that he felt that it was not quite clear enough around the role of independent scrutiny. CW was also in agreement that more detail is required around this.

RL stated that the process was useful for conversations across adults and children and noted the difficulty in obtaining assurance from agencies so that members are not asked to duplicate work, while still requiring sufficiently detailed information. It was noted that the process seems to rely on self-assurance. SF agreed that a balance between streamlining and giving enough assurance is required, as well as a balance between assurance and self-assurance. It was agreed that there needs to be enough operational performance detail to receive assurance.

The Chair noted that the plan is expected to be published by the end of June and offered Board members the opportunity to request clarity on the report.

JB noted that clarity is required around which partners will contribute to the Board and consideration around who best represents partners is required. Following on, NT requested clarity around whether a replacement for herself from Barnardo's would be needed. SF responded that consideration of who will be around the table will happen shortly and it is unlikely that anything will change until September at the earliest, with significant changes unlikely prior to April 2020.

BC confirmed that once the detail is in place, the regulations set out that relevant agencies will be part of the process.

NK noted that he likes the direction of travel, and feels it is very positive. NK confirmed that he works across all four safeguarding boards and stated that it would be very helpful if the language, in terms of the names of the groups, was unified.

The Chair raised that CDOP arrangements are missing from the report and SF noted that it is currently under review and further work will be done with a task and finish group in place. The Chair also suggested that there should be more clarity in the MASA document around arrangement for Local

	<p>Practice Reviews, and whether or not the independent Chair should continue to have oversight of decision making to ensure there is appropriate challenge. There is also a need to ensure that existing SCRs are completed under the statutory guidance which gives the existing LSCB an chair 12 months post Sept to complete all SCRs.</p> <p>PT noted that schools and colleges have a clear responsibility to keep children safe and stated the importance that this be strengthened within the report, as it is only hinted at currently.</p> <p>MD confirmed that the next step for the process is to take the plan through an internal governance process in April and May. SF noted that today's comments from the Board will be taken into account and further conversations will take place with colleagues. A final publication date in June is expected, although the final date is yet to be agreed. The Chair stated that a short, reassuring statement is required. In terms of queries in the meantime, it can be confirmed that nothing changes until it has been finalised.</p> <p>BC noted that a number of queries have already been received and the Chair wrote an explanatory letter to statutory partners regarding this. SF stated that he is willing to have a conversation with groups that have queries.</p> <p>The group were in agreement that a lot of work is still required around independent scrutiny. AP04/19 The Chair is to meet SF, CW and MD to have further discussions around this. MASA will remain as a standing agenda item until the end of April next year. The Chair noted that timescale updates will be important going forwards. AP05/19 It was agreed that the MASA will be recirculated taking into account the required updates around CDOP, independent scrutiny, lay membership, SCRs and other gaps and queries that were raised.</p>			
Ref	Action	Person/s responsible	By	Desired outcome/Progress Update
5.1.1	AP04/19 The Chair is to meet SF, CW and MD to discuss the detail and inclusion of independent scrutiny within MASA.	The Chair	21/04/2019	
5.1.2	AP05/19 SF, MD and CW to revise MASA and recirculate taking account of updates needed around CDOP, independent scrutiny, lay membership, SCRs etc and other gaps and queries made.	SF, MD & CW	21/04/2019	
Part II	LSCB Spotlight: Theme – Moving Forward Wider Vulnerability of Young People			

6.	<p>CSE Operations Group Performance Report</p> <p>Child Exploitation Arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on ToR and Workplan • Next Steps
6.1	<p>CT presented the LLR CSE report and highlighted that young people who are being criminally exploited are already within CSE Hub arrangements.</p> <p>NK raised paragraph seven, in relation to Rutland, and noted that they went to the National Panel for consideration of SCRs. After over 12 hours of meetings, it was established that none of the cases met the statutory requirement for an SCR. AP06/19 A detailed case audit on the cases was effectively completed and NK noted that some of the thematic learning can be used. Board members agreed that the learning should be shared.</p> <p>SR discussed paragraph 3, which includes Chart 3 – Ethnicity of risky people (long term), with Board members and stated that it may be worth having something that reflects ethnicity of the area. It was agreed that this is politically very sensitive and needs to be carefully considered.</p> <p>CT noted that it has been agreed that the NSPCC money will be used to fund a post to lead on strategically developing a response to criminal child exploitation. A strategy and delivery plan for the Vulnerabilities Operational Group is expected by August and will look at the CSE process. It was confirmed that there is no commitment for extra resources currently and the strategy and delivery plan will be presented at a future Board meeting.</p> <p>SR noted that CSE is now understood, however ten years ago this was not the case. Board members agreed that CCE needs to be understood in the same way. It was stated that exploited children can commit a crime or be a suspect for a crime, whilst still being exploited. MD noted that raising awareness will be part of the delivery plan and CT informed Board members that awareness raising will be delivered in the Autumn term at city schools.</p> <p>CS noted an issue with ethnicity in her school (Spinney Hill Primary School) area, as there has been a large influx of Romanian families and there is a growing community. It was noted that there are areas that potentially feel like exploitation, but this cannot be evidenced, as it can be difficult to establish who the parents are as family groups appear to be very fluid. It was stated that there are a lot of children that are unknown within the community and potentially lots of things going under the radar. MD noted that this is a broad issue that is relevant to many communities. SR stated that CS's point raises a question around how we understand fluidity within families and whether there is a communal, different way of upbringing. The importance to understand how a family's sense of operating is different to our expectations and whether this different way is still keeping children safe.</p>

	<p>The Chair raised the CSE Report, as the Board had previously requested assurance and queried whether the report provides assurance and whether there is anything missing. AT noted a balanced approach whether children are CCE or criminals and CT confirmed that reassurance has been obtained that a high percentage of online issues are reported.</p> <p>SF stated that he feels that the report misses the outcome and does not confirm what has been done to minimise the risk, as the report does not state this. The Chair agreed that assurance questions should be within the report and SF noted that key assurance statements are about outcomes.</p> <p>CT confirmed that a city report will be provided, with Rebecca Small, Head of Service, CSC, to take responsibility to take this forward. Key assurance questions required. Board members agreed that the report was useful but does not offer assurance. AP07/19 The CSE Operations Group Performance Report is to be updated and presented to the Board in July, with assurance questions confirmed.</p> <p>BC noted that contextual safeguarding training has also been offered.</p>			
Ref	Action	Person/s responsible	By	Desired outcome/Progress Update
6.1.1	AP06/19 The detailed case audit on a number of Rutland cases, including thematic learning is to be shared with the Board.	NK	21/04/2019	
6.1.2	AP07/19 The CSE Operations Group Performance Report is to be updated and presented to the Board in July, with assurance questions confirmed.	RS/CT	22/06/2019	
Part III	LSCB Learning and Assurance Reports			
7.	Update on Child Protection Quoracy			
7.1	TB provided Board members with an update on quoracy at Child Protection Conferences and noted that she does not feel that quoracy should be remain on the LSCB Risk Register. It was confirmed that there has been an increase in quoracy for the last two quarters and this increase has been maintained. MD stated that Leicestershire Police ensure that they attend conferences where they have an involvement and provide a report to every conference whether they attend or not.			

	AP08/19 The Chair noted that report as very positive and it was agreed that it will be removed from the Risk Register. TB noted that good relationships have been developed and real-time escalations are possible.			
Ref				Desired outcome/Progress Update
7.1.1	AP08/19 Quoracy at Child Protection Conferences to be removed from the LSCB Risk Register.	LSCB Office	04/04/2019	
8.	Feedback from Other Strategic Partnerships and Partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CQC Inspection of Leicestershire Partnership Trust – Neil King • Ofsted Focus Visit Leicester City Council – Caroline Tote 			
8.1	<p>NK presented the CQC Inspection of Leicestershire Partnership Trust and noted that assurance is provided to CCG, NHS England, NHS Improvement and the NHS Regulator. NK requested clarity around what the Board needs to be assured on and it was confirmed that the Chair and Anne Scott (AS), Deputy Chief Nurse, LPT, will have further conversations around this.</p> <p>The Chair noted that caution is required, and it was confirmed that CCG are the commissioners and responsible for the LPT service. CW informed the Chair that CCG are owning this at a high level and the recommendation to the Board is that CCG need to provide assurance to the Board. SR noted the importance to understand that changes in performance may dip and rise and as a partnership, the Board can contribute to improvement. NK confirmed that assurance for the Board is in relation to CCG, NHS Improvement and the NHS Regulator, however clarity is required around this. MCS agreed, noting that the Board needs to negotiate with CCG regarding how assurance is obtained.</p> <p>SF stated that not everything in the report is bad and the CQC identified some good areas of practice. SF requested to attend the meeting with the Chair to have a dialogue with governance at LPT and noted that governance has been identified as the key weakness and the Board cannot trust LPT's assurance and governance process currently.</p> <p>AP09/19 The Chair and SF are to meet with AS to requested assurance of governance and leadership.</p>			
8.2	<p>The Ofsted Focus visit report was presented to the Board.</p> <p>SR noted that she is very happy with the report and it shows a massive improvement from 4 years ago and a significant change to the full Ofsted Inspection. It was stated that complacency can be an issue but is clearly not in evidence. SR thanked SF and CT in regard to consolidating the senior team and ensuring stability. The morale of staff was also noted as a huge positive.</p>			

	<p>SF noted that being able to feel confident and speak honestly about where the LA is was important and it was key that the LA 'knew itself'. It was noted that a lot of time was spent with frontline practitioners and some key areas were identified.</p> <p>The Chair recognised and thanked the contribution by partners.</p> <p>SF informed Board members that the annual conversation will take place in May and CT confirmed that another focus visit is expected in the Autumn. A Joint Targeted Area Inspection is possible, although unlikely. It was stated that the next main Inspection is likely in early summer 2020, however the deadline for anything in 2020 inspection needs to be in place by November 2019.</p>			
Ref	Action	Person/s responsible	By	Desired outcome/Progress Update
8.1.2	AP09/19 The Chair and SF are to meet with AS to requested assurance of governance and leadership.	The Chair	21/03/2019	
9.	Reflections and Next Steps			
9.1	<p>CS made Board members aware of the focus on relationships in sex education and it was noted that the Department for Education (DfE) announced changes to both primary and secondary curriculums. The changes will look at a wider agenda in terms of relationships, what is healthy and what is not and will also offer more detail on mental health.</p> <p>CS confirmed that the sessions seem to be going very well, with most of the controversy in relation to the LGBT agenda. It was noted that there is unrest regarding this, particularly within the Muslim community. Consideration as to how schools can look to develop a city-wide strategy, including the adoption of a new set of principles, are on-going. Work is being done with Public Health, Education Psychology, other teams within PT's division, and community groups. Board members agreed that this will have a massive impact on children when done correctly. It was noted that parents threatening to pull children out of schools is very common.</p> <p>The Chair requested assurance as to how this is delivered and that it meets the requirements of what DfE are asking for.</p> <p>The Chair offered a big thank you to NT, as today is her last meeting. The Chair noted that NT provided a very valuable contribution to the Board and will write to the regional director of Barnardo's to thank them for NT's hard work and dedication.</p> <p>NT thanked the Chair and Board members for their kind words.</p>			

10.	Next Meeting
10.1	Monday 22 nd July 9.30am to 12.30pm – City Hall, Ground Floor, Room G.01