

# **Every Child Matters in East Sussex**

**Interagency co-operation to improve the well being of  
children: children's trust and safeguarding  
arrangements**

**Consultation proposals for East Sussex: May 2005**

# **Target outcomes for children and young people**

## **BE HEALTHY**

- physically healthy
- mentally and emotionally healthy
- sexually healthy
- healthy lifestyles
- choose not to take illegal drugs

## **STAY SAFE**

- safe from maltreatment, neglect, violence and sexual exploitation
- safe from accidental injury and death
- safe from bullying and discrimination
- safe from crime and anti social behaviour in and out of school
- have security, stability and are cared for

## **ENJOY AND ACHIEVE**

- ready for school
- attend and enjoy school
- achieve stretching national educational standards at primary school
- achieve personal and social development and enjoy recreation
- achieve stretching national educational standards at secondary school

## **MAKE A CONTRIBUTION**

- engage in decision making and support the community and environment
- engage in law-abiding and positive behaviour in and out of school
- develop positive relationships and choose not to bully or discriminate
- develop self confidence and successfully deal with significant life changes and challenges
- develop enterprising behaviour

## **ECONOMIC WELL BEING**

- engage in further education, training and employment on leaving school
- ready for employment
- live in decent homes and sustainable communities
- access to transport and material goods
- live in households free from low income

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	<i>page 4</i>
2.	Section 1: What is a Children’s Trust?	<i>page 6</i>
3.	Section 2: Child-Centred, Outcome-led Vision	<i>page 8</i>
4.	Section 3: Integrated Front-line Delivery	<i>page 10</i>
5.	Section 4: Integrated Processes	<i>page 12</i>
6.	Section 5: Integrated Strategy	<i>page 14</i>
7.	Section 6: Inter-agency Governance	<i>page 16</i>
8.	Section 7: Safeguarding	<i>page 19</i>
9.	Conclusion	<i>page 19</i>
9.	Annex 1 Local Partnerships for Children: a position statement	<i>page 20</i>
10.	Annex 2: Inter Agency Governance	<i>page 40</i>
11.	Annex 3: Developing a Local Safeguarding Children Board	<i>page 41</i>

## **Introduction**

In line with the requirements of the Children Act 2004 East Sussex County Council is leading the development of a children's trust for the county, and, with partners, is seeking to further develop the way we work together to improve the well being of children and young people. This document explains what a children's trust is, and sets out proposals for local cooperation arrangements. The proposals build on the significant level of cooperation which already exists between agencies in the county. They reflect thinking and debate within the current East Sussex Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership (CYPSP), in other partnership groups, and between agencies generally. They are an important way in which we can promote progressive implementation in East Sussex of the National Service Framework (NSF) for children's, young people's and maternity health services. We would like to reach agreement by early Autumn 2005 on a practical way forward in relation to each aspect of the children's trust arrangements.

Some aspects of the proposals have already been the subject of earlier consultation, including consultation with children and young people themselves. The proposals build on this earlier consultation. We also aim over the summer to identify ways in which we can effectively consult children, young people, parents and carers on some of the key issues raised by the document, to take account of their views before arrangements are finalised, and to make sure that we continue to consult them as arrangements are developed and implemented.

This document will be discussed with "relevant partners" as defined by the Children Act and with other key stakeholders through a programme of meetings over the summer. We also hope that a wide range of stakeholders will let us have their views, either through the website or by writing to us or contacting us in other ways.

The proposals in the document can appear rather abstract, as well as complex. But the aim of better cooperation arrangements is not abstract at all; and much of our current and planned multi agency work is already delivering very tangible benefits for children, young people and families. For example 10 children's centres for 0-5 year olds will be created by April 2006 providing integrated child care, education for 3-5 year olds, health and family support services. Communities served by the children's centres will have a one stop shop to go to, with teams working together to improve services. Some schools, health centres and family centres have collaborated to run specialist family support programmes for families, such as those for families with children with challenging behaviour. Feedback from families about these programmes is generally very positive. Care Coordination for disabled children has been very well received by parents of very young children with disabilities. The advice material provided to parents as part of the scheme is high quality and parents feel coordination is much better. Use of the Children Index, an electronic system for maintaining information about who is working with individual children, has led to staff getting in touch with other staff, or taking decisions about appropriate action, in ways which would not necessarily have happened without it.

There are many other examples of real benefits from effective cooperation in children's services within East Sussex. This agenda is not about creating a tidy bureaucracy; it is about improving lives.

## **Section 1: What is a Children's Trust?**

- 1 Put simply, Section 10 of the Children Act 2004 defines children's trusts as a set of effective local arrangements for cooperation between agencies to improve the wellbeing of children and young people. Children's trusts are not just one aspect of cooperation, such as a set of new governance arrangements. The "children's trust arrangements" for a particular area, **are** the arrangements for cooperation – at all levels. It will not be the case that some areas have children's trusts and some do not. Rather, some areas may have effective children's trust arrangements and some may not.
- 2 Draft Government guidance on Section 10 sets out the components of effective local cooperation arrangements – children's trust arrangements. These are reproduced below.

### ***The essential features of a children's trust (effective arrangements for local cooperation)***

- (i) **Child-centred, outcome led vision:** a compelling outcome-led vision for all children, young people and their families. This must be informed by the views of local children, young people and their families
- (ii) **Integrated front line delivery:** delivery organised around the child, young person or family rather than professional boundaries or existing agencies. For example, multi disciplinary teams, co-located staff in extended schools or children's centres, joint training, and arrangements for identifying a lead professional wherever a child is known to more than one specialist agency and co-ordinated care is required.
- (iii) **Integrated processes:** effective joint working is sustained by a common language and shared processes. This includes a Common Assessment Framework used across agencies, effective information sharing arrangements, and the re-engineering of other local processes and procedures to support, rather than inadvertently distort, joint working.
- (iv) **Integrated strategy (joint planning and commissioning):** joint assessment of local needs, set against the outcomes: the identification of all available resources; integrated planning to prioritise areas for action; and joint commissioning of services from a range of providers, appropriately supported by shared resources and pooled budgets
- (v) **Inter-agency governance:** whilst each partner is responsible for the exercise of its own functions, robust governance arrangements for inter agency cooperation will set the framework of accountability for the improvement and delivery of effective services. The cornerstone must be the creation of a strong integrated governing board or structure representing all key delivery partners at senior level, able and determined to drive whole system change with clear leadership and effective local change programmes.

- 3 The five components are represented in a diagram set out in the draft guidance and reproduced below.



- 4 For 2005, all Children’s Services Authorities ( CSAs –in the case of East Sussex, the County Council) are expected to draw up local change programmes which cover each of the five rings of the diagram, which the draft section 10 guidance describes as “building blocks”. These programmes are then expected to be reflected in the statutory Children and Young People’s Plan, which must be developed, with partners, for April 2006 (see section 5 below). The Government’s aim is that these change programmes should ensure that most areas have reasonably effective “children’s trust arrangements” by 2006 and that all areas have arrangements fully in place by 2008.

### ***The Duty to Cooperate***

- 5 Section 10 of the Children Act places a duty on CSAs to make arrangements to promote co-operation between certain named partners (the “relevant partners”) and other locally determined partners to improve the well being of children in the authority’s area. The same section of the Act requires the “relevant partners” to co-operate in the arrangements made by the CSA.

- 6 Improving the way key people and bodies safeguard and promote the welfare of children is crucial to improving outcomes for children. In his report into the death of Victoria Climbié, Lord Laming concluded that “the suffering and death of Victoria was a gross failure of the system”. Section 11 of the Children Act 2004, therefore, places a duty on key persons and bodies to make arrangements to ensure that in discharging their functions, they have regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.
- 7 There are other specific sections of the Act which are relevant to cooperation in relation to children and young people’s well being and they are referred to in different sections of this document. The key focus of the document, however, is on how we interpret, and make progress in implementing, the requirements of sections 10 and 11, and the associated statutory guidance (see below)
- 8 The cooperation required under section 10 is cooperation **to improve outcomes for children and young people** across five areas, which are :
  - ❖ Be healthy
  - ❖ Stay safe
  - ❖ Enjoy and Achieve
  - ❖ Make a Contribution
  - ❖ Economic Well being
- 9 The rest of this document takes each of the five building blocks of the children’s trust ‘Onion’ in turn. Each section sets out headline points from the proposed statutory guidance and other national policy, summarises what has already been achieved in East Sussex, and sets out proposed practical steps to develop arrangements further.

## **Section 2: Child Centred, Outcome-led Vision**

### **Key points from the proposed statutory guidance/other national policy**

- ◆ All integration should be about ensuring outcome focused front line delivery; inspection will in future be based on achievement of outcomes
- ◆ Partners should focus on the five target outcomes in the Act. All partners should “own” all five outcomes and recognise they contribute to each one
- ◆ Improving the well being of all children includes the most disadvantaged and improving their well being means narrowing the gap between disadvantaged children and their peers
- ◆ One of the key mechanisms for ensuring that children and young people stay safe will be the Local Safeguarding Children Board (successor to the Area Child Protection Committee)
- ◆ Children, young people and families should be involved in assessing how far outcomes are being achieved in an area and priorities within the outcomes for strategic plans and service development. They should be consulted on a local vision underpinning the Children and Young People’s Plan (2006 onwards).

### *What has been achieved in East Sussex*

- 10 There have been many multi agency service developments in recent years which have been driven by specific outcome focused targets. For example the multi agency Youth Offending Team has targets to reduce offending and re offending rates among young people. The teenage pregnancy partnership works to reduce teenage conception and to support positive outcomes for young women who become pregnant, and their children. The Sure Start programmes across the county have specific targets which cover all the five target outcome areas as they affect young children and families. Individual services also use outcome targets to measure their success, of course; targets for children and young people's achievement have long been a very important driver for schools.
- 11 Consultation on a local "preventative strategy" in 2003 led to the development of a ten point vision for children and young people, set out in the Children and Young People's Strategic Plan 2003-2005. These ten target outcomes covered much of the ground covered by the five outcome targets in the Children Act. The consultation document was widely circulated and a group of around 100 "hard to reach" young people were consulted about the vision using trained advocates.
- 12 In developing an overarching strategy, more recently, for 0-5 year olds, the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership agreed a vision for young children which took the five outcomes in the Act and interpreted them specifically for children aged 0-5. Consultation on this strategy included all the Sure Start Programme Boards, which involved their parent representatives and parent groups.

### *What should we do now?*

- 13 We believe that we need to raise awareness of the children's trust developments and consult widely on a shared vision for children and young people in East Sussex. We envisage this consultation taking place as part of the development of the Children and Young People's Plan for April 2006. To minimise the burden on partners and stakeholders we would try to use as many existing fora as possible.
- 14 Other aspects of developing the Children and Young People's Plan are considered in section 5 below.
  - ◆ **Is there work which you/your organisation has been doing which would be helpful to build on in developing a shared vision for children and young people?**
  - ◆ **Do you have views about how consultation on developing a shared vision might usefully be done – people or organisations to involve/mechanisms which could be used?**

### **Section 3: Integrated Front-line Delivery**

#### **Key points from the proposed guidance/national policy**

- ◆ The aim should be to move towards service delivery by multi disciplinary and multi agency teams that bring together the relevant people in easily accessible places
- ◆ Co-location of staff is a key element of multi disciplinary working
- ◆ Professionals in multi agency teams should have continuous professional development and appropriate clinical and professional supervision, management and governance, with clear lines of accountability
- ◆ Where children need support from several specialist professionals or agencies, a lead person or professional who can maintain an overview of the case will be needed
- ◆ There is a strong case for basing multi disciplinary teams in and around the places where children and young people spend much of their time, such as schools and children's centres
- ◆ For many primary schools this may mean multi agency teams working across a cluster of local schools
- ◆ Co-location will help to deliver the NHS National Service Framework standard on child centred care
- ◆ A shared workforce development strategy embracing multi agency, multi disciplinary training and development activities is necessary, taking into account the nationally developed "Common Core of Skills and Knowledge for the Children's Workforce and the Workforce Development Strategy (recently published for consultation)

#### ***What has been achieved in East Sussex***

- 15 In East Sussex two main types of integrated front-line delivery of services have been developed/discussed:
- (i) specialist integrated teams to support particular groups of children, such as children in need of child protection or children with autistic spectrum disorder
  - (ii) partnership groups of services, including schools, working together to support all children in a particular geographical area or, in the case of local children's centres, all children aged 0-5
- 16 Examples of integration already operating in the first category include:
- The Youth Offending Team
  - The Under 19s substance misuse service
  - Duty and Assessment teams which include health visitors to help with child protection assessments and care planning
  - The Family Intensive Support Service for children with learning disability and challenging behaviour (operates in some areas of the county only at present)

- 17 Plans for further specialist integration include the development of a multi agency service for children with autistic spectrum disorder, the proposed Pupil Development Centre in Hastings (to be developed as part of the Behaviour Improvement Programme for the Excellence Cluster) and the county wide development of a “comprehensive child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS)” extending from behaviour support and other front line services to specialist psychiatry.
- 18 Examples of existing area based integration designed to serve all children in an area include:
- The six Sure Start programmes
  - Two full service school projects, in Hollington, Hastings and in Hailsham
- 19 A key current development in relation to this form of integrated front line delivery is consultation on proposals for Local Partnerships for Children (LPCs). These Partnerships aim to bring together groups of schools and other children’s services staff to work as a “virtual team” for the children in their area. They are designed to be equal partnerships with all parties focused on the needs of children, not institutions or teams. Over time they are expected to operate as vehicles for both coordination of support for individual children and the development of effective local strategies and services such as strategies for combating bullying, developing communication skills or developing local patterns of SEN provision. A key priority in the short to medium term for some Partnerships is expected to be the development of extended schools provision, using new Government grant for extended schools services available in the current financial year.
- 20 A full statement of our current proposals for LPCs is at annex 1. Proposed core terms of reference for LPCs are also included in annex 2, on inter-agency governance arrangements.

***What should we do now?***

- 21 We think it would be helpful to give priority over the next 12 to 24 months to:
- Implementing to the highest possible standard our plans for 10 integrated Children’s Centres for 0-5 year olds by March 2006, with significant extension of the programme from that date in line with national expectations
  - Developing an effective, integrated service for children with autistic spectrum disorder
  - Implementing proposals for Local Partnerships for Children across the county, looking for opportunities to extend the range of agencies involved, and linking work at local partnership level to that of the area planning groups (see sections 5 and 6)
  - Developing through consultation and piloting, a model for the coordination of support for individual children and young people

including a role for a lead professional. We would aim to do this as part of the implementation of common assessment through the existing multi agency Information Sharing and Assessment (ISA) programme (see integrated processes, below).

- Identifying other groups of children and young people who might benefit from a specialist multi agency team, assessing priorities and developing services as appropriate

- ◆ **Do you/your organisation have views about steps which should be taken in order to develop integrated front line delivery of children's services?**
- ◆ **Are there initiatives which ought to be taken into account within work on this strand which we may not know about?**
- ◆ **Are there any aspects of the proposals above which you would particularly welcome more discussion on?**

#### **Section 4: Integrated Processes**

##### **Key points from the proposed guidance/national policy**

The draft guidance highlights two areas as critical for the development of common, integrated processes: information sharing and assessment. These are the two areas covered by the Government's Information Sharing and Assessment (ISA) programme.

- ◆ Arrangements under section 10 of the Act should ensure that information is shared for strategic planning purposes and to support effective service delivery.
- ◆ All authorities should take action to improve understanding of the legal framework and develop better information sharing practice between and within organisations, including information about individual children. This should be done ahead of the implementation of information sharing indexes (databases) under section 12 of the Act
- ◆ Statutory and other guidance will be provided under section 12 of the Act to support the establishment and operation of information sharing databases or indexes
- ◆ Common assessment "has the potential to drive multi agency working by embedding a shared process, developing a shared language of need and improving the information flow between agencies". The Government has published guidance material on a national Common Assessment Framework which it proposes should be implemented across all authorities from 2006 and in some leading authorities in 2005, including ISA trail blazer authorities (see below)

### ***What has been achieved in East Sussex?***

- 22 East Sussex has made good progress with this “building block”. Early in 2003 the Children and Young People’s Strategic Partnership successfully bid to become a “trail blazer” area for what was then known as Identification, Referral and Tracking (IRT). Substantial, detailed consultation with service users and providers led to the development of a number of tools for joint working across agencies, including a model of electronic information sharing across children’s services through the pooling of strictly limited information from different databases. The East Sussex Children Index now provides information taken from around 50 different services across the county, and over 1600 staff have been trained in its use, and in the other tools. The Index is being steadily refined and improved in the light of feedback from users.
- 23 The other tools developed by the East Sussex IRT project (now renamed Information Sharing and Assessment (ISA) in line with the national programme) also provide a very important foundation for cooperation between agencies and have been influential in the development of the national Common Assessment materials.
- 24 A detailed evaluation of the impact of the East Sussex ISA programme on professional practice and, as far as it can be established to date, on outcomes for individual children is underway. Evidence from this full evaluation is not yet available. There is nevertheless some early independent confirmation that the Index and the other tools have led to actions being taken by some staff which they would not have taken without them.
- 25 The training on identifying needs which has been provided through the ISA to staff across the county has laid a good foundation for taking the next step of developing a common approach to assessment, using the nationally published materials.
- 26 There is in East Sussex a very well established Area Child Protection Committee that includes many of the components required for an effective Local Children Safeguarding Board (LSCB). These include a multi-agency budget, a full child protection training programme for all statutory agencies, comprehensive child protection procedures and established audit systems.

### ***What should we do now?***

- 27 We are planning at present to take the following steps:
  - Continue to implement the use of the Children Index across the county, extending access to voluntary sector as well as statutory organisations within an agreed protocol, and exploring links with district and borough housing departments

- Evaluate the impact of the Index carefully and refine/develop it as necessary, taking into account future national guidance
  - Pilot the use of the national Common Assessment Framework within a small number of Local Partnership for Children areas, linking this to the development of a model for the deployment of a “Lead Professional”. The suggested approach is to develop a core county wide model which is then piloted locally, with the aim of achieving as much consistency of approach as possible across the county.
  - Develop a Local Safeguarding Children Board that will have a new emphasis on ensuring the effectiveness of work to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. This will include establishing a system for reviewing and investigating child deaths and ensuring inter-agency co-operation in safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children who are privately fostered.
- ◆ **Are there other issues which it would be helpful to address in relation to integrated processes?**
  - ◆ **Do you/your organisation have views about any aspects of the plans above which it would be helpful to discuss further**

## **Section 5: Integrated Strategy**

### **Key points from proposed guidance/national policy**

- ◆ The partners within children’s trust arrangements are expected to agree a single Children and Young People’s Plan (CYPP), the first of which must be published by April 2006
- ◆ The CYPP should set out the local vision for children and young people, an overall integrated needs assessment, a strategic analysis showing how key outcomes will be achieved, and the actions, timescales and costs involved.
- ◆ The CYPP should “link upwards to the authority’s community strategy and downwards to their own, and other partners’, operational plans. It will be the integrated local strategy for the delivery of all services for children and young people in an area, and will provide the framework for operational commissioning activity by children’s trust partners
- ◆ “A key test of the robustness of the [local] inter agency governance arrangements [see below]..will be their capacity to deliver and implement a comprehensive, integrated plan for children and young people in the locality that covers all services available to children and a shared strategy for improving those services”
- ◆ The CYPP should be underpinned by joint commissioning arrangements
- ◆ Local planning and commissioning cycles should be key vehicles for achieving a progressive shift of resources into prevention and early intervention, within the strategic framework of the CYPP
- ◆ Maintaining pooled budgets, and pooling other resources under the powers of the Act should be key features in developing integrated commissioning arrangements

### ***What has been achieved in East Sussex?***

- 28 There are examples in East Sussex of strategies which have been drawn up on a multi agency basis, including within the last few years strategies developed by the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership such as the CYPSP Family Support Strategy, the multi agency review of specialist special educational needs, the recent anti bullying strategy, and the strategy for 0-5 year olds on which consultation has recently been completed.
- 29 The CYPSP has developed three overarching strategic plans; the most recent, for 2005-2006 can be accessed on the ESCC website at [www.eastsussex.gov.uk](http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk) different approach will be required for the development of the CYPP.
- 30 The CYPSP has also begun to develop planning for children's services on an area basis. Using the boundaries of the NHS Primary Care Trusts, which are also used as operational boundaries for ESCC children and families social care, four area Children's Services Planning Groups (CSPGs) have been established. These groups are designed to act as a vehicle both for the local implementation of strategic priorities agreed by the county wide CYPSP and for the development of local plans.
- 31 There are links between CYPSP planning and the plans of some other partners. Each of the district and borough Local Strategic Partnerships are represented on the CYPSP and there is some consistency between priorities in community plans and those in the CYPSP plan, for example the development of family support. Two of the LSPs have "adopted" area children's services planning groups as reference groups for developing community plans (Eastbourne and Rother). In the west of the county, however, the lack of coterminosity between the Wealden and Lewes districts and the Sussex Downs and Weald PCT, and Eastbourne Downs PCT has complicated the picture. Links between children's services planning and housing services planning are at a very early stage of development, and other links – such as those with the Learning and Skills Council 14-19 strategy - also need to be developed further.
- 32 Some existing multi agency strategies are already underpinning by shared resourcing arrangements, for example the work of the Youth Offending Team, which has a virtual pooled budget, and the shared use of new resourcing for CAMHS.

### ***What should we do now?***

- 33 Our early thinking about the preparation of the first East Sussex Children and Young People's Plan is that we might follow a broad timetable as follows:
  - (i) April – August 2005: Awareness raising and consultation with partners and stakeholders on the Children's Trust arrangements in

East Sussex. Self assessment by the Children's Services Authority including data analysis to inform the setting of priorities in the Plan.

- (ii) September – October 2005: Identification of key priorities at local and county level, drawing on a county –wide consultation on a vision for children and young people involving children and young people, parents and carers. Mapping of child health services on an integrated basis.
- (iii) November – December 2005: Development of a first draft of the overarching CYPP (showing links to other detailed plans, to be developed) issued for consultation and consideration within new governance arrangements (see below). The proposal is that the new Plan covers a two year period in the first instance, to coincide with the planning period covered by the NHS Local Delivery Plans (2005-2008)
- (iv) January- February 2006: County wide CYPP for 2006-2008 agreed, subject to final budget decisions by agencies

34 To assist with the development of the CYPP we envisage setting up a multi agency project team with links to colleagues within individual agencies.

35 Strategy for the use of resources, including pooling of budgets, needs to be considered carefully and over time with partners. We are very near to establishing a pooled budget for the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) and this is a specific priority within the CYPSP Strategic Plan for 2005-2006. The case for arrangements in other areas needs, in our view, to be considered in each case on its merits. Joint commissioning in a broader sense, with collective decisions about priorities and reshaping of services, needs to be a key element of the Plan.

- ◆ **Would you/your organisation be able to work with us to prepare the new Plan on the broad timetable above? Are there particular processes which we need to take into account in timetabling work?**
- ◆ **Are there particular issues which you believe it would be helpful to begin discussing now in relation to the Plan (eg major strategic priorities)?**

## **Section 6: Inter- agency Governance**

### **Key points from proposed guidance/national policy**

- ◆ Children's trusts will require strong governance, in particular a powerful integrated governing board or structure through which senior representatives of all key partner organisations can give strategic leadership and direction, and drive through change...the creation of strong governance arrangements must be central to the trajectory of change
- ◆ The Children's Services Authority (CSA) must lead on developing the co-operation arrangements in their local area, bringing together other partners to achieve radical change and improvement and championing the interests of children.

- ◆ The exact configuration of the governance arrangements that reflect this duty are a matter for local discretion and will need to take into account the implications of partner agencies' geographical boundaries, many of which may not be shared (eg district councils and primary care trusts)
- ◆ Inter agency governance arrangements must include all the “relevant partners” listed in the Act
- ◆ Other bodies involved in work relating to children, young people and their families must be involved, for example:
  - the voluntary, community and independent provider sectors
  - schools, which will be expected to work with children's trust partners through appropriate cooperation arrangements
  - other agencies with responsibility for delivering front-line statutory services to children, young people and their families, such as General Practitioners and Job Centre Plus
  - agencies such as the Immigration Service, which may come into contact with children, young people and their families on a regular basis
- ◆ The CSA should establish clear and transparent arrangements for determining which other bodies form part of the inter-agency governance arrangements and seek to ensure that representatives can speak for their wider community
- ◆ A mechanism for representing the voice of children should be built into the governance arrangements, either through direct involvement or some form of advocacy
- ◆ A clear framework of accountabilities should be agreed, and should clarify how the governance arrangements interact with and support other related partnerships such as the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership(s), Drug Action Teams or Foundation Partnerships (schools). (An outline accountability map is included in the draft statutory guidance, available at [www.everychildmatters.gov.uk](http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk) )
- ◆ Local Safeguarding Children Boards will have a particular statutory role to ensure the effectiveness of the arrangements made by agencies to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

### ***What has been achieved in East Sussex?***

- 36 The CYPSP and area planning arrangements described in section 5 have been successful in developing shared priorities and closer partnership working. They have provided an umbrella for the development of some key strategies and programmes e.g. the IRT project and Children's Fund arrangements.
- 37 There is a need, however, to review existing arrangements in light of the Children Act and ensure clear links are established with other planning structures and processes eg Local Strategic Partnerships, and 14-19 travel to Learn Groups.

### ***What should we do now?***

- 38 At Annex 2 are outline proposals for a governance structure for children's trust arrangements in the county. This structure involves:
- (i) An overarching Children's Trust Executive Group
  - (ii) Age related county wide strategic groups for 0-5 year olds and for 13-19 year olds, created through a development of existing arrangements, and a proposal for a new 5-13 age group
  - (iii) County wide specialist groups for children with particular needs, for example the CAMHS Commissioning and Development Partnership, the Disabled Children's Development Group and the Teenage Pregnancy Partnership
  - (iv) Area Children's Services Planning Groups, linking to local community planning arrangements.
  - (v) Local Partnerships for Children, operating in 22 areas of the county and linking to area CSPGs, as proposed in annex 1.
  - (vi) Development of the Local Safeguarding Children Board with the capacity to monitor and review local services and the ability to challenge when required and speaking with an independent voice (see annex 3).
- 39 It is a relatively simple matter to identify a need for a broad role of some kind for age related, specialist and geographically focused multi agency groups. The terms of reference of the overarching Children's Trust Executive Group are also fairly straightforward to identify against the background of national expectations, and draft terms are included in annex 5. The harder task is to clarify precisely the remit of different groups within the structure, in particular the area groups, to see both how they will be different from the current CYPSP network and how they relate to each other. A first outline attempt to do this is set out in annex 2.
- 40 In terms of *decision making*, we wish to explore with partners a fairly simple starting point in which only the overarching Children's Trust Executive Group is empowered on its own to take decisions which commit member agencies. The CTEG might then either delegate a particular decision to a group within the structure, perhaps within certain parameters, or invite a group to draw up recommendations for the approval or otherwise of the CTEG. Where a group has not been asked to take a decision, or make a recommendation, for the CTEG, its role would be, as now, to develop partnership approaches which do not actually bind member agencies to the decision of the majority but encourage consensus building and collective approaches. In the short term, even the Children's Trust Executive Group is likely to be making recommendations to individual agencies rather than taking decisions on their behalf.
- ◆ **The development of a new integrated governance structure for children and young people's services is a complex exercise, and we need to work with partners to clarify many aspects. We will also want to review arrangements after 12-18 months. As a starting point, do you/your organisation think the model in Annex 2 is along the right lines?**

- ◆ **What do you/your organisation see as key aims and principles which should inform the development of integrated governance arrangements?**

### **Section 7: safeguarding children**

41. Annex 3 to this document describes the requirement in section 11 of the Children Act 2004 in relation to the safeguarding of children and in particular the creation of a Local Safeguarding Children Board. It reports on discussion to date within East Sussex about these requirements and ends with a set of consultation questions on which views would be welcome.

### **Conclusion**

42. This document outlines a broad set of proposals for responding in East Sussex to the requirements of the Children Act 2004, in particular sections 10 and 11 of the Act. The proposals and consultation questions are offered in the spirit of partnership as a basis for discussion with all the “relevant partners” in East Sussex listed in section 10, and with other bodies which need to be involved in our arrangements. As the Children’s Services Authority in the area it is the responsibility of East Sussex County Council to lead debate and development of children’s trust and safeguarding arrangements for the county. The County can do nothing alone, however; what arrangements we develop, and how successfully they operate, depends on the approach of all partners. We are confident that collectively we have a good platform, in our achievements to date, for constructive, progressive development over time. We look forward to a summer of constructive discussion and to reaching agreement, we hope, on a first set of children’s trust arrangements this Autumn.

## ANNEX 1: LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR CHILDREN

### **Local Partnerships for Children: a position statement**

This position statement reports on the results of consultation in Autumn 2004 on proposals for closer working between groups of primary, secondary and special schools and local children's services professionals, and sets out proposed next steps in developing partnership working. Comments on the proposals are very welcome, to inform developing thinking about local partnerships. Please contact:

Becky Ross – Partnership development officer (West)

Dave Sugg – Partnership development officer (East)

Children's Services Commissioning Unit

01323 769433

## **Local Partnerships for Children**

### Background

1. In the summer of 2004 East Sussex County Council published a consultation document, "Working together for children: school partnerships and children's services in East Sussex". This invited views on a proposal that schools and local services should be grouped together into seven partnership groups, to help take forward the Every Child Matters agenda across the county. Consultation questions offered the opportunity to respond to specific areas for development and ways of arranging clusters as well as raising other associated concerns.
2. 24 written responses to the document were received. During the autumn term, 161 schools were also visited either individually or in groups. A number of children's services teams were also visited. Further opportunities for consultation were provided at the primary headteachers' meeting in November, Governors' Forum meetings and at area children's services planning groups.
3. This document summarises the outcome of the consultation exercise and sets out proposals for next steps in developing local partnership working.

### Summary of Main Findings from Consultation

#### Main Findings from schools

4. The key points from consultation with schools are set out below.
  - Virtually all schools were keen to work together with other support agencies to improve early intervention and support for children and families. Some were more enthusiastic than others.
  - All schools wanted to work in smaller sub groups of the 7 large groups proposed; a number of detailed suggestions were made as to groupings.
  - All of schools wanted to have a common team of professionals relating to the group to facilitate better communication and continuity. Virtually all identified Family Support as a key area to develop at all levels of need.
  - Schools with children on their roll who are in public care took the view that these children should be a focus. They were mostly concerned about information sharing and support for children from other local authorities placed in East Sussex.
  - Many schools thought bullying should be a focus, although most felt that definitions needed to be clearer. The majority felt that shared approaches within the local partnership would be beneficial.
  - Over 50% were interested in developing extended services on the school site and many felt this was a key area to work on. However, many recognised that a better way to achieve this would be through the partnership pooling some resources and working together on specific extended services.

- All thought it was essential that support was provided to partnerships to help with co-ordination, making links to other agencies, gathering information on what was already available, providing advice, eg on practicalities of setting up other services on site, for example in relation to insurance.
- Over 50% were interested in developing their workforce further but many had concerns about overstretching their existing staff.
- All schools who had nurseries attached or had had the benefit of ILTs, Link workers or their equivalent spoke highly about the benefit to the children as they progressed into and through primary school, particularly at stage of transitions. The link with Early Years services was seen as critical.

#### Main Findings from other services

5. The proposals in the consultation document were considered by each of the area Children's Services Planning Groups (CSPGs) and by a number of services individually. In addition the Children's Leads within the four Primary Care Trusts submitted a joint written response. The key points made by services included:
  - Broad support for the principle of working in partnership with groups of schools and other services. All services wanted to be part of co-ordinated arrangements, including voluntary sector providers such as NCH.
  - The need to be clear about the differences between local partnership groups and the Children's Services Planning Groups and respective roles.
  - Support for rationalising staff allocations to partnership areas where possible, with the caveats that it would not be possible for services to allocate the same resource to each partnership group, given imbalances in demand and pressure on team resources, and that personnel might sometimes need to be moved between partnerships where the pattern of need across the county changed.
  - Enthusiasm for exploring options such as more co-location of staff in future, using partnerships to develop integrated family support programmes with other services to tackle issues associated with school and family break down (already part of CYPSP strategy), and joint work around healthier living.
  - Widespread emphasis on the paramount importance of early years in enabling each child to be better equipped for school, and the need to ensure that sustainable support is offered to families and continues from Sure Start Children's Centres through to the schools and support agencies.
  - Strong support for the involvement of school representatives on the area CSPGs (now members of three out of four of the Groups) and for better communications links between all local services and the CSPGs.

#### Proposed next steps

6. The response to the consultation and possible next steps were discussed during January 2005 with the three education strategic management boards (primary,

secondary and special), the ESCC Every Child Matters Priorities Team and the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Planning Group. There was strong agreement within these groups to the following next steps:

- (i) To establish 22 partnership groups across the County, to be called Local Partnerships for Children (LPCs). Annex 1 sets out the groups, with some information about **current** service team contacts for the schools within the Partnerships.
- (ii) To encourage partners within LPCs to work together on key issues such as the anti-bullying strategy, healthy lifestyles, policies on behaviour and promoting positive mental health.
- (iii) To rationalise wherever possible the geographical allocation of service staff so that it reflects the pattern of LPCs. The aim would be to create a partnership of professionals with a core membership comprising key staff in schools with responsibility for inclusion (and key school managers), managers of children's centres in the Partnership area, staff from social services family support, SEN caseworkers, the Education Welfare Service, the County Psychology Service, the School Nursing Service and the School Improvement Service (contact adviser). This will not mean that all LPCs are allocated equal amounts of staff time, or even necessarily 1.0 FTE from each service, but is designed to create a group of staff and schools which can work as a partnership across an area. The rationalising necessary to create the teams will take some time for some services and may not happen at exactly the same time. In the case of the School Improvement Service, for example, there may be transitional arrangements in order to avoid schools experiencing too many changes of adviser.
- (iv) To develop the Partnerships beyond this core group to include other local agencies such as the Police and voluntary sector agencies.
- (v) To establish regular meetings of the Partnership, starting in Autumn 2005, probably on a termly basis, for strategic planning and liaison. The aim should be progressively to reconfigure services to better meet the needs of children and families, particularly in relation to strengthening preventative services. Some rationalisation/changes to existing meeting patterns may need to be undertaken.
- (vi) To use LPCs as the key vehicles for developing an extended school strategy across each area, with schools sharing resources and considering the needs of the area as a whole. This will be pump primed through the new extended schools Standards Fund grant, for which LPCs will be invited to bid.
- (vii) To plan for the extension of the Children's Centre programme based on Partnership areas.
- (viii) To put in place communication arrangements which allow each LPC to feed up views on service development to the area children's services planning groups (CSPGs), as part of the development of the Children and Young People's Plan 2006-2009.
- (ix) To develop and pilot within volunteer LPCs (ideally at least one in each of the planning areas), a detailed model for co-ordinating support for vulnerable children including implementing common assessment and lead professional roles. A separate consultation paper on this is being prepared.

- (x) To consider, as part of the consultation on the current specialist SEN review, how the LPCs can contribute to the development of SEN provision in the county and the proposed piloting of the delegation of SEN statement funding. The role of special schools within and beyond LPCs also needs further consideration.
  - (xi) To explore the potential of LPC arrangements to contribute to the “Owning Every Child” initiative in relation to children with challenging behaviour.
7. We recognise that individual Local Partnerships for Children cannot be the sole vehicles for collective discussion, or implementation, of children’s services developments. There are some issues on which different LPCs will need to work together, for example:
- ◆ Representation on area CSPGs
  - ◆ Dialogue with special schools about outreach services across areas of the county
  - ◆ Some strategic discussions with senior service managers
  - ◆ Developing collective educational provision which can cater for every child, including excluded children and others who may be “hard to place” in mainstream schools.
8. We also recognise that denominational schools serve populations and have links beyond the boundaries of LPCs.

### **Questions**

9. This section of the paper provides answers to some questions which we anticipate colleagues may have about Local Partnerships for Children. If you have other questions or would like more information please get in touch with the people whose contact information is given at the end of the paper.

*We are already working in a number of partnerships. How will this initiative affect that work?*

10. In taking forward the creation of Local Partnerships for Children it is important to emphasise that:
- (i) There is no intention to cut across the work of existing school partnerships, for example the Bexhill Consortium, or the Active Battle Cluster. The proposal is simply that existing schools groups (which have been taken into account in setting LPC groups) should also meet on a regular basis with other service managers and staff, as a Local Partnership for Children. We believe that the work many schools have already done to establish collective approaches will significantly enhance, and be enhanced by, multi-agency collaboration within LPCs.
  - (ii) Schools will continue to need to work collectively on a range of key learning and curriculum issues, in many cases beyond LPC boundaries. Collaboration on the 14-19 curriculum, for example, will of course need to be done across a wider area. The LPC groups may nevertheless prove

helpful as a stimulus to more co-operative working across schools on a range of issues.

- (iii) Many aspects of specialist children's services will likewise continue to need to be developed on a county wide basis, or even across a larger area.

- 11. The LPCs are thus designed to *supplement and enhance* existing collaboration over meeting children's needs, not to replace it. We nevertheless hope that they will become an increasingly important means by which we can undertake meaningful local analysis of those needs, and develop innovative ways of responding to them.

*How do the LPCs relate to the area Children's Services Planning Groups (CSPGs)?*

- 12. The LPCs will focus on what action can be taken *locally* to develop services in ways which better respond to children's needs. There are some issues about the ways in which different services work may need to be considered across a wider area. In that case the right forum in which to discuss them will be the CSPG, or even a county wide forum. CSPGs focus on key strategic developments affecting their area, and issues which need to be considered at a wider area rather than a local partnership level.

*Will the creation of LPCs mean that lots more services are delivered from schools or community bases?*

- 13. The creation of the Partnerships will not of itself involve any immediate changes to the way services are delivered. How services develop will be up to Partnerships to decide, consistent with county strategies and guidance. The pace of development of services may be different between Partnership areas depending on needs and opportunities. We see the Partnerships as a way of encouraging change which is practical and grounded in the everyday reality of service delivery, with lots of opportunity for schools and local service teams to work together to shape services for the children they serve.

*Do the LPCs create area multi-disciplinary teams?*

- 14. The LPCs provide a vehicle for strengthening links between local children's services teams/professionals and schools. In that sense the aim is that they should be the basis for developing "virtual teams" which over time in some areas may develop further into teams with common management. There will not be an overnight revolution, however. We will monitor the way in which better co-ordination develops with a view to identifying and dealing with obstacles, and take careful account of local views about what further developments may be necessary.

*Does this mean schools having control over the use of resources for children's services?*

- 15. No. It means schools and services working *together* to identify how existing resources, in both schools and service teams, can be best used to support

children. The best solutions need to be reached by discussion and agreement in which the voices of all partners are heard – especially those of children, young people and families themselves.

*Where are children themselves in all this? Do they have a voice in service development?*

16. It is really important that children, young people and families are involved in looking at how effectively local services, including activities in schools, meet their needs. We aim to work with local Partnerships to look at how survey information, user feedback, and other mechanisms for involving children and young people can best be used to help shape service development locally, and how information from local consultation can feed into strategic development across a wider area.

*Isn't this partnership working a distraction from the core business of schools, of raising standards of achievement and/or from the core activity of specialist teams?*

17. In developing our partnership arrangements we need to build on the strength of our core services, and not overstretch ourselves in terms of capacity. Partnership work needs to be focused and clearly related to identified priorities – things which will make a real difference for children and families. Managed effectively, working collectively allows schools to share development work, relieving the burden on individual head teachers and senior management teams. Our change programme aims to develop better, more efficient systems which help schools, allowing them both to focus on their key task of raising standards of achievement and to play their part in improving outcomes for children across all the areas set out in the Children Act.
18. Specialist teams often have to spend time dealing with inappropriate referrals/referrals without sufficient information. Better joint working with schools and other services will allow them, too, to focus their efforts where they are most needed and, we hope, to free up time and resources for more preventative support.

### **What will happen next?**

19. Over the next six months the two school partnership development officers for the West and East of the county respectively (Becky Ross and Dave Sugg) will work with individual LPCs to explore priorities for joint working, and approaches to improve co-ordination. Work on the development of common assessment, joint planning mechanisms and lead professional roles in the pilot LPCs will be undertaken jointly by the school partnership development officers and members of the Information Sharing and Assessment (ISA) team, also within the Children's Services Commissioning Unit, working closely with the schools and services concerned.
20. The conferences in May will be an opportunity for schools and services to take stock of the opportunities created by the LPC initiative and to begin planning

for its implementation locally, particularly through the development of extended school services.

### **Relationship to other initiatives**

#### **Primary Strategy Learning Networks in East Sussex**

Within Excellence and Enjoyment was the commitment that every primary school, whether currently in a network or not, would have the opportunity to become involved in a Primary Strategy Learning Network. A network focused on learning is one in which a group of schools join together to plan, implement and monitor a range of activities that will enhance learning and teaching within and across schools. Learning networks focus on learning of all pupils, staff, leaders and other stakeholders, as well as building capacity for learning and sharing learning between schools. In doing this, they seek to achieve together, for every pupil in their network, more than they could achieve alone. The NCSL describes this as “learning from, with and on behalf of each other”.

Collaboration between schools is now a significant feature of the education landscape. Networks and other collaborative forms have demonstrated that they can make a positive difference for both pupils and adults in schools. Promoting networks of schools with a focus on learning is a key part of the LEA school improvement strategy; we are enthusiastic about the opportunity to support the further growth of learning networks across East Sussex. From recent experience of schools involved in learning networks, it is clear that schools working together in partnerships can add significantly to the professional development for teachers and the learning opportunities for children. Over the next two years it is expected that nationally 1,500 groups of schools will be supported to become Primary Strategy Learning Networks; in East Sussex we are funding the development of 11 learning networks.

Research and experience show that effective Learning Networks:

- are designed around a compelling idea or aspirational purpose;
- focus on pupil learning and create new opportunities for adult learning;
- require planning and dedicated leadership and management.

In East Sussex priority has been given in the initial funding round to networks that demonstrate reference to the following criteria:

- a well-considered, purposeful, innovative and compelling idea;
- learning as their highest priority;
- alignment to aspects of the “Excellence and Enjoyment” and “Every Child Matters” agenda;
- links to predicted regional organisational change, eg Children’s Centres, children’s services partnership areas;
- ambition to raise standards in literacy and mathematics;
- actions that will increase the capacity of schools to deliver a rich, broad curriculum;
- transfer and transitional links, eg to secondary school;
- links to school improvement plans and the EDP;
- engagement with research and enquiry;

- regional distribution of networks across the authority.

This is an exciting opportunity for us to position the Primary Strategy firmly alongside the Every Child Matters agenda in East Sussex and to consider innovative ways to share and build our expertise, to promote excellence and to increase enjoyment with and on behalf of each other.

#### *CAMHS Commissioning and Development*

21. Both the National Service Framework for children and young people and the Change for Children Programme reinforce the expectation on all children's services to work more closely together on prevention and support of children's mental health. An East Sussex strategy for the provision of a comprehensive CAMHS, delivered in partnership through both universal services and specialist services, and including earlier intervention and mental health promotion, must be in place by April 2006.
22. The LPCs provide the opportunity for schools and services to contribute to the planning and delivery of a more co-ordinated approach to primary mental health (PMH) services, working closely with specialist CAMHS. Waiting lists for specialist CAMHS have been unacceptably long, and a new scheme is being rolled out across the county which will eventually mean earlier assessment for those on that list. At the same time, not all referrals to CAMHS are appropriate, and some may be best dealt with within other services. In order to help identify and keep children out of specialist mental health services, staff will need support, training, and information on what else might be available. Recently appointed PMH Workers have been piloting new initiatives such as jointly led groups for children of separated parents, telephone access to consultancy on cases, and training delivered by CAMHS specialists. Once evaluated, it could be our aim eventually to develop and invest in an approach to PMH in each LPC, with clear links to the specialist service, and support and co-ordination of staff and resources at the PMH level.

#### *Traded services*

23. Although the main impetus for the development of LPCs is the move towards more integrated planning and provision for children, the development of a formalised partnership structure will enable us to explore the opportunities for adopting different approaches to our broader traded service offer to schools.

#### **Further information**

For further information about Local Partnerships for Children, or other children's services developments, please contact the following:

#### **LPCs, piloting common assessment/lead professional roles/extended schools strategy**

*Schools partnership development officers*

West: Becky Ross: 01323 769433  
East: Dave Sugg: 01323 769433

**Children Index; common assessment; lead professional**

*ISA team*

Lucy Ruddy  
Sharon Paine (West)  
Mary Duffy (East)

**Extended Schools**

Nicola Podd, Extended Schools Strategy Manager

Children's Services Commissioning Unit    April 2005

## ANNEX 2: INTER AGENCY GOVERNANCE

1. The draft statutory guidance on arrangements for cooperation under section 10 of the Children Act establishes an expectation that there will be “a powerful integrated governing board or structure through which senior representatives of all key partner organisations can give strategic leadership and direction and drive through change”. The draft states that “the creation of strong governance arrangements must be central to the trajectory of change”.
2. The precise scope of the authority of any new arrangements – the extent to which they can commit organisations – is to be negotiated locally. There is a recognition nationally that the arrangements are likely to evolve over time. At the same time there is an expectation that partners can and should move quite swiftly to develop key policies, in particular on the joint commissioning of services.
3. Given the diversity of East Sussex, and the variety of different stakeholders who need to be engaged, we believe that we need to look at a governance, and planning, *structure*. On its own, the establishment of a single overarching board or committee is not enough. We need a coherent structure which ensures that the right stakeholders are engaged at the right levels before collective decisions are taken, and that once those decisions are taken their implementation can be effectively managed.
4. In this annex we set out some initial proposals as a basis for discussion. Aspects of them have been discussed within the current children’s services partnership arrangements, but taken as a whole these are “new” proposals. They represent early thinking, and we would very much value discussion with partners to tease out and clarify a range of different issues. We expect partners to have many questions which we will need to address together.
5. As a **basis for discussion** we propose a structure as follows. A diagram showing key components is also attached:
  - (i) a new overarching group of senior officers and elected members, which we suggest might be titled the Children’s Trust Executive Group. This Executive Group might meet four times over a 12-18 month period, with this frequency reviewed at the end of that period, along with other aspects of its operation. Draft terms of reference are set out below, for discussion, together with thoughts on membership. This Group would essentially determine key directions, priorities and processes, including deciding whether issues should be remitted to other groups for decision or recommendation.
  - (ii) A Children and Young People’s Advisory Forum, based on the current Children and Young People’s Strategic Partnership Board. This would meet only once or twice a year. It would bring together a wide range of stakeholders with geographical and specialist interests to enable structured county level debate of key issues around the assessment of needs, priorities and key strategies.
  - (iii) Age related strategic groups which would advise the Executive Group – and other parts of the structure - on needs, priorities and strategies affecting children and young people of particular ages: as a basis for discussion we suggest 0-5, 5-13 and 13-19. These

- groups would focus on work which needs to be done at county rather than area level, in relation to particular age ranges.
- (iv) A set of specialist groups, building on existing partnerships, to provide advice on highly specialist areas, such as disabled children and children with mental health problems. The number of these groups needs to be kept under careful review with the need for them justified in terms of the need for particular integrated service development at particular times
  - (v) Area Children's Services Planning Groups looking at service needs and the deployment of resources across geographical areas. These could be based on the groups which have already been developed using the boundaries of the Primary Care Trusts, but will need to recognise the full breadth of the planning agenda encompassed by the CYPP, and make appropriate links, for example to the 14-19 Travel to Learn groups of secondary schools, colleges and work based learning providers which together plan local education and training provision for that age range. The terms of reference of these groups could take account of the development of area planning to date, but should in our view include core components, suggestions for which are set out below. It will be important to be clear about the relationship between a planning structure for children's trust arrangements and local community planning at both county and district/borough level. In addition to the overall governance diagram attached is another showing how the area groups we propose, based on the existing groups, might link to Local Strategic Partnerships.
  - (vi) Local Partnership for Children (LPC) groups for smaller geographical areas, focusing on day to day coordination of services, and a localised assessment of needs, optimal service configurations and local service development. The role of LPCs is considered in detail in annex 1.

### **Authority of the new structure**

6. The precise scope of the authority of new arrangements is likely to evolve over time. As noted in paragraph 39 of the consultation document, our proposed starting point is that only the overarching Children's Trust Executive Group should be empowered on its own to take decisions which commit member agencies. Even in relation to this group, we would initially expect recommendations to be made to separate agencies before decisions are taken, for example about budget allocations. The intention would be, however, that over time governance arrangements acquire more delegated authority to take decisions on behalf of agencies. As paragraph 39 notes, the Children's Trust Executive Group might delegate a particular decision to a group within the structure, possibly within certain parameters, or invite a group to draw up recommendations.

## **Children and Young People's Participation**

7. The involvement of children and young people themselves in the governance arrangements will need to be addressed. At present there is a Participation Unit in the County Council which coordinates participation and consultation with young people, including involvement in the work of the CYPSP. We need to look carefully at links between young people and all the groups within the governance structure; we also need to look at the links with parents/carers, who do not currently have channels for contributing to the work of the CYPSP.

### **Timetable**

8. It would be very helpful to establish the new structure in time for it to influence and agree the first statutory Children and Young People's Plan from April 2006. This is a statutory plan for the children's services authority but is expected to reflect also the work of relevant partners under the Act. Our aim, therefore, is to achieve agreement on a new structure by September 2005. An interim report will be taken to the East Sussex County Council Cabinet in July, reporting on progress; a final report will be taken to the Cabinet in September or October. We expect that between now and then, partner agencies will want to report formally to their Boards/governing bodies also, to seek their agreement formally to what is proposed.

### **Component of the governance structure: detailed terms of reference/membership**

9. This section of the annex comments in more detail on the different components, including possible terms of reference and core membership for two of these components: the Children's Trust Executive Group and the Area Children's Services Planning Groups.

### **Children's Trust Executive Group**

10. Draft terms of reference for this Group are suggested below, as a basis for discussion.

#### *Terms of reference*

- (i) To secure comprehensive and effective data collection arrangements for children's services consistent with the national "outcomes framework" for children and young people and with national inspection requirements
- (ii) To review, on at least an annual basis, a detailed analysis of outcomes for children and young people in East Sussex (using the national outcomes framework), including outcomes:
  - (a) by geographical area and by age
  - (b) for specific groups of children and young people, to include:
    - children and young people who are in public care

- children and young people who have special educational needs or who are disabled
  - young women under the age of 18 who are pregnant or who are mothers
  - children and young people with significant long term health problems
  - children with poor school attendance
  - other groups as appropriate
- (iii) To review the broad allocation of resources across universal and targeted children's services at county and local levels as between service areas and against the analysis at (i) above;
- (iv) To agree on an annual basis a set of priorities for county and/or local service development in the light of the analysis at (i) above, including any changes required in the pattern of investment; and to make recommendations appropriately to relevant agencies
- (v) To develop joint plans for commissioning services, including plans based on pooled budget arrangements where appropriate
- (vi) To agree/review/update a Children and Young People's Plan setting out key actions across children's services, reflecting the priorities agreed at (iii) above; and to ensure that this Plan reflects appropriate consultation and participation of young people, families and carers in its development and key features
- (vii) To review on an annual basis the arrangements made to obtain the views of service users on the appropriateness and quality of services, and on perceived service gaps, including the views of families and carers, and the extent to which they have informed the development of services. The Group may select particular service areas or issues for particular focus in any one year.
- (viii) To oversee the progressive development in East Sussex of effective Children's Trust arrangements including:
- integrated front line delivery
  - integrated processes
  - integrated strategy
  - effective inter agency governance

taking into account in each case statutory guidance issued under section 10 of the Children Act 2004

- (ix) To ensure that all agencies work in accordance with section 11 of the Children Act 2004 and Section 175 of the Education Act 2002 and make arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children; protecting children from maltreatment and preventing the impairment of their health or development whilst at the same time ensuring children grow up in circumstances consistent with the provision of safe and effective care and have opportunities for optimum life chances in order that they can enter adulthood successfully. (Draft Section 11 Guidance on Making Arrangements to Safeguard and Promote the Welfare of Children.)

- (x) To oversee the implementation of effective approaches to workforce development within services for children and young people, including appropriate links with higher education and skills training providers
- (xi) To consider and take into account, in relation to all its functions, any advice provided by the East Sussex Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership
- (xii) To ensure appropriate links between the work of the Group and other key partnerships including Local Strategic Partnerships, Crime and Disorder Partnerships and others as appropriate

11. The membership of the Group might be as follows.

*Membership*

- ◆ ESCC Lead Member(s) for Children and Young People/Education
- ◆ Director of Children's Services
- ◆ The Chief Executive of each of the Primary Care Trusts
- ◆ The Chief Executive of the East Sussex Hospitals Trust
- ◆ The Chief Executive of the East Sussex County Healthcare Trust
- ◆ Either the Chief Executive or Director of housing/leisure/community services – or an appropriate elected member - of one of the five district and boroughs in the county, taken in rotation. (Decisions about whether a district/borough council place – or more than one – is taken at member or officer level could be left to the council concerned)
- ◆ Chief Constable or his/her representative
- ◆ Head teacher representing the East Sussex Joint Strategic Education Management Board
- ◆ GP Chair or member of one of the Professional Executive Committees for the PCTs, taken on rotation
- ◆ Chief Executive, Sussex Connexions Partnership
- ◆ Chair or appropriate member or officer of the Sussex Learning and Skills Council
- ◆ Chair, umbrella organisation for the voluntary sector (could be one CVS chair in rotation – but it might be better to explore the possibility of creating a specific county wide organisation for the children and young people's sector)

- ◆ Member of the East Sussex Strategic Partnership

### **Children and Young People's Advisory Forum**

12. This Group could be based on the current CYPSP Board but with perhaps an extended membership. Its role would be to provide a vehicle for discussion among a very wide group of stakeholders of key issues around the needs of children and young people in the county, priorities for development and key strategic directions. We think it could be helpful for the Group to meet perhaps twice a year, with meetings linked to the Children and Young People's Plan cycle, for example:

**Autumn:** to review priorities for the next Children and Young People's Plan (or annual update), and key actions

**Early Summer:** to monitor progress in implementing the Plan and share thinking about emerging issues which may need to be addressed in the next Plan. It would be a sounding board for ideas; its meetings would be major communications events in the children's services calendar – perhaps whole day conferences.

### **Age related Groups**

13. We suggest that there should be three age related groups:

- (i) A 0-5 Strategy Group, as proposed in the CYPSP 0-5 Strategy
- (ii) A 5-13 Strategy Group
- (iii) A Young People's Strategy Group – a continuation of the Group established a year ago from the East Sussex Connexions Local Management Group

14. The terms of reference of groups (i) and (iii) have already been the subject of consultation and development (through the consultation on the draft CYPSP 0-5 Strategy and the work of the existing Young People's Strategy Group. Core elements for all the groups might be:

- (i) To review of information about outcomes, and any trends, for children/young people in the relevant age range, across the county and in relation to different groups or areas of the county
- (ii) To identify priorities for strategic and service development which particularly affect the age range and which need to be addressed at a county level rather than an area or local Partnership level
- (iii) To recommend accordingly a programme of priority strategic or service development at county level as part of the annual review of the Children and Young People's Plan
- (iv) To contribute to the development of the overarching Children and Young People's Plan as it affects the age range

- (v) Where there are issues which affect particular areas of the county, to draw these to the attention of the area Children's Services Planning Groups
- (vi) To take decisions and/or make recommendations in relation to services for the age range, as required by the Children's Trust Executive Group.
- (vii) To review the way in which users are involved in the development of services for the age range and make recommendations to service managers as appropriate

15. The membership of the groups will need to reflect the range of stakeholders with a key interest in the age range. The aim should be to bring together people with a real expertise in the needs of the age range.

### **Specialist Groups**

16. The terms of reference and membership of specialist groups need to be considered on a case by case basis, taking into account the particular development needs in each case.

### **Area Children's Services Planning Groups**

17. The existing area Children's Services Planning Groups have slightly varying terms of reference, which are quite broad. The members of the groups have indicated that they would welcome clarification of their role in the context of the development of children's trust arrangements. The following suggestions are offered as a basis for discussion.

#### *Terms of reference: possible core elements*

- (i) To review information about outcomes for children and young people across the area, identify any significant patterns/trends, and take these into account in recommendations to the Children's Trust Executive Group, age related or specialist groups, and in drawing up local action plans (see below)
- (ii) To identify priorities for strategic and service development which would benefit from action on an area rather than a county or partnership for children area basis, including action needed to implement county level strategies
- (iii) To agree an area based action plan accordingly, involving other relevant area based organisations/groups as appropriate (for example the 14-19 Travel to Learn groups)
- (iv) To contribute to the development of the overarching Children and Young People's Plan as it affects children and young people in the area
- (v) To review other plans for children and young people affecting the area, and contribute to their development as appropriate.
- (vi) To take decisions and/or make recommendations in relation to service provision within the area, as required by the Children's Trust Executive

Group. Where it supports agreed service development, this would include the development of pooled budgets and joint commissioning of services as appropriate. Early examples of recommendations which we plan to ask area CSPGs to make are recommendations in relation to the Children's Fund and the budgets and plans of integrated Children's Centres in the area

- (vii) To review the effectiveness of user involvement in strategic and service development across the area, and evidence about both user feedback about services, and the "reach" of services to different groups of users.
- (viii) To ensure good communication about children's services developments with stakeholders across the area.
- (ix) To make arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children ensuring that all service developments consider how to protect children from harm and impairment of development whilst promoting safe and effective care with optimum life chances.
- (x) To oversee development, and monitor implementation, of key action plans at Local Partnership for Children level

#### *Core Membership*

- ◆ Primary Care Trust Children's Lead
- ◆ Primary, secondary and special school representative
- ◆ Representative from the post 16 learning sector/LSC
- ◆ Operations Manager, children's social care
- ◆ Children's Services Department (CSD) Head of Service (representing the CSD Every Child Matters Priorities Group)
- ◆ Connexions Manager
- ◆ Representative of the relevant district and borough housing and leisure departments, and community planning co-ordinators
- ◆ Children's Centre Manager, representing 0-5 services for the area
- ◆ Voluntary sector representation

#### **Local Partnerships for Children**

18. The position statement at Annex 1 sets out in broad terms the proposed role of Local Partnerships for Children. Further discussions will be had with stakeholders at local and area level about the detail of the way Partnerships will work, but as a basis for discussion we propose the following.

#### *Terms of reference: core elements*

- (i) To review the needs of children and young people living or attending schools in the Partnership area
- (ii) To review and progressively reshape local provision and policies as appropriate in the light of those needs, taking into account strategic priorities for the children's services planning area as a whole, including the need to enhance preventative services wherever possible

- (iii) To plan the development of extended school provision within the Partnership area
- (iv) To plan children's centre provision within the Partnership area and ensure good links with services for older children
- (v) Subject to the outcome of the county pilot project, to oversee the operation of new ways of working in relation to the planning and coordination of support for individual children and young people (common assessment and lead professional roles)
- (vi) To contribute to area level strategic development by providing a perspective from the Partnership area about needs and priorities

*Core members of Local Partnerships for Children*

- ◆ Key school managers including staff in schools with responsibility for inclusion
- ◆ Manager(s) of children's centres in the area
- ◆ Manager of the family support team (social care)
- ◆ SEN case worker
- ◆ Education Welfare Officer
- ◆ Educational Psychologist
- ◆ School nurse
- ◆ Local Health Visiting Manager
- ◆ The School Improvement Service contact adviser
- ◆ Others: voluntary sector, police, Youth Service

**Illustration of the operation of the governance structure**

19. It is difficult to communicate the different roles and responsibilities of groups within a governance structure, purely by setting out terms of reference. The following illustration is designed to show how the structure above might work, taking a specific issues as a "case study".

*Take up of nursery education places*

20. High quality nursery education can make a real difference to the life chances of a child. It can help children arrive at school with:


- Good confidence, sound self esteem and some understanding of themselves
- key communication skills
- a readiness to take on responsibility for themselves
- an understanding of the needs of others and the ability to relate reasonably to other children and adults
- key building blocks of early learning which will help them make progress at school

21. A place in a nursery education setting is now available free to all children aged 3 and above. Many families take up this place; but in some areas, particularly some of the more deprived areas in the county, the take up of places is relatively low – as low as 60%. This means 40% of children could be arriving at school, therefore, without some or all of the above. The potentially long lasting impact on their development is significant.

22. Within the structure above we might see the following:

- (i) Recommendation by the 0-5 strategy group of a county wide strategy for 0-5 year olds which highlights the importance of promoting take up of nursery education places
- (ii) Advice by the 0-5 strategy group on ways in which take up can be promoted effectively, looking at best practice here and elsewhere in the country
- (iii) Analysis by the 0-5 strategy group of data on take up of places by area, and identification of an area which is doing less well relative to others
- (iv) A recommendation by the 0-5 strategy group to the children's services planning group for that area that it addresses this issue, explores possible causes and develops an appropriate action plan
- (v) Further analysis by the area planning group identifies two Local Partnership for Schools areas where the problem is particularly acute. Action is agreed both at an area level (for example the health visiting teams for the area agree actively to promote take up of nursery education places as part of their regular and targeted work with families across the whole area), and at LPC level (primary schools within the Partnership work together and with the children's centre in the area to develop user friendly advice materials which encourage families to take the issue seriously, and make it easy for them to find about options and decide what is best for their child).
- (vi) The area group monitors data on a regular basis, to establish the impact of measures taken

Annex 2: CHILDREN'S SERVICES INTER-AGENCY GOVERNANCE: KEY FEATURES



## ANNEX 3: SAFEGUARDING

### **Developing a Local Safeguarding Children Board**

This annex reports on progress to date in relation to the development of a Local Safeguarding Children Board for East Sussex. Comments on the proposals are welcomed and will inform the development of the board. Please contact: -

Fiona Johnson, Head of Children's Safeguards & Quality Assurance  
County Hall, Tel 01273 481289

## Developing a Local Safeguarding Children Board in East Sussex

### 1. Context - Safeguarding and Promoting Welfare

Within the Children Act 2004 there is a duty to make arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children this primarily deals with how organisations in working with or coming into contact with children ensure that they have a regard to the safety and welfare of children in carrying out their normal functions. This duty applies to Local Authorities, District Councils, the Police, British Transport Police, PCTs, Strategic Health Authorities, NHS Trusts, Probation Boards, Youth Offending Teams, Prisons and Connexions.

Clause 11 of the Children Act 2004 requires that: -

- Agencies ensure they give appropriate priority to their responsibilities towards the children in their care, or with whom they have contact;
- Encourages agencies to share early concerns about safety and welfare of children and to ensure preventative action before a crisis develops.

The duty of all agencies is to ensure that their functions are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard children and promote their welfare. This applies even if **services are sub-contracted and others are discharging their functions**. These duties do not apply to education because Section 175 of the Education Act 2002 applies instead and is equivalent.

#### **Definition in draft section 11 guidance of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children.**

Safeguarding and promoting welfare are two sides of the same coin.

#### **Safeguarding has two elements:**

- protecting children from maltreatment; and
- preventing impairment of children's health or development.

#### **Whereas promoting welfare is a proactive responsibility: -**

- ensuring that children are growing up in circumstances consistent with the provision of safe and effective care; and,
- creating opportunities to enable children to have optimum life chances such that they can enter adulthood successfully.

*Source: Draft Section 11 Statutory Guidance on Making Arrangements to Safeguard and Promote the Welfare of Children, <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/consultations>*

### 2. Local Safeguarding Children Boards

The Children Act 2004 also includes a requirement to establish a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) by 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006. This is the mechanism by which the Government intends that the duties to safeguard and promote welfare will be developed and monitored. The purpose of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) is to strengthen local arrangements for safeguarding children.

The core objectives of the LSCB are set out in section 14.1 of the Children Act 2004 as follows:

- to co-ordinate what is done by each person or body represented on the Board for the purposes of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the area of the authority by which it is established; and,
- to ensure the effectiveness of what is done by each such person or body for that purpose.

The following bodies are included in Clause 9 of the Children's Act 2004 as being core Board Partners: -

NHS bodies, the police, local probation boards, the Connexions Service, prisons in the area which normally detain children (this includes Young Offenders Institutions), secure training centres, Youth Offending Teams, the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CAFCASS) and district councils where relevant.

The local authority should also secure the involvement of other relevant local agencies and organisations. At a minimum these should include: -

Local schools and FE Colleges, Sure Start children's centres, and voluntary and community sector organisations, including where relevant the NSPCC and bodies providing specialist care to children with severe disabilities and complex health needs. In areas where they have significant local activity, the armed forces and immigration and asylum support agencies should also be included.

Representatives should be able to speak for their organisations with authority on policy and practice matters. They will need to be people with a strategic role in relation to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children within their agency.

Clause 9 requires core Board Partners to co-operate with the Local Authority in the establishment of boards. Board Partners have a power to contribute, in cash or kind, to the cost of the LSCB, at present this is not a duty.

### **3. The LSCB and the Children's Trust**

The LSCB will have a dual function within the Children's trust operating within the Trust to maintain and develop safeguarding systems while at the same time operating more independently to provide a scrutiny function ensuring that all services within the Children's Trust meet minimum safeguarding standards. This will involve the LSCB in two areas of work: -

- Activities to safeguard and promote the welfare of children that sit within the wider context of arrangements to improve outcomes for children (staying safe, being healthy, enjoying and achieving, making a positive contribution and social and economic well-being.) LSCBs will be operating in the context of the development of children's trust arrangements, including the local workforce strategy, which will be very relevant to LSCBs' objectives.
- At the same time, LSCBs will have a particular statutory role: to ensure the effectiveness of the arrangements made by agencies to safeguard and promote

the welfare of children. To do this they will need to form a view of the quality of local activity and challenge as required, speaking where necessary with an independent voice. Their place in local governance arrangements will provide them with a clear and distinct identity.

#### **4. Functions**

The functions of LSCBs will be specified in regulations. LSCBs will have much in common with a good Area Child protection Committee (ACPC) and it is expected they will evolve from existing ACPCs during the next year. They will be based on the guidance set out for ACPCs in Chapter 4 of *Working Together to Safeguard Children* (1999), retaining the core focus on co-ordinating local policies and procedures. However, unlike those in *Working Together*, these will be statutory functions which the LSCB and all statutory board members will be required to cooperate in discharging effectively.

#### **What is the difference between an ACPC and a LSCB?**

##### **Traditional ACPC Functions**

- To develop and agree local policies and procedures for inter-agency work to protect children, within the national framework provided by Working Together;
- To audit and evaluate how well local services work together to protect children, for example through wider case audits;
- To put in place objectives and performance indicators for child protection, within the framework and objectives set out in Children's Services Plans;
- To encourage and help develop effective working relationships between services and professional groups, based on trust and mutual understanding;
- To ensure that there is a level of agreement and understanding across agencies about operational definitions and thresholds for intervention;
- To improve local ways of working in the light of knowledge gained through national and local experience and research;
- To undertake case reviews and to make sure that any lessons from the case are understood and acted upon;
- To communicate clearly to individual services and professional groups their shared responsibility for protecting children, and how each can contribute;
- To help improve the quality of inter-agency child protection work through inter agency training and development;
- To raise awareness within the wider community of the need to safeguard children and promote their welfare;

##### **Broad functions of the LSCB are: -**

- Strategic planning on safeguarding and promoting welfare with adequate plans in place to safeguard children across all the relevant agencies linking to the work of the Children & Young Peoples Strategic Partnership;
- Monitoring the effectiveness of the work of members in their contribution to inter-agency activity to safeguard and promote the welfare of children;
- Setting policy and procedures with regard to: -
  - Activities to protect individual children from harm;
  - Prevention of abuse and neglect or maltreatment;

- Improving the quality of child protection work and of inter-agency working through specifying needs for interagency training and development, and ensuring that training is delivered;
- Establishing screening teams to investigate all sudden, unexpected child deaths, liaising with current statutory systems, and reaching conclusions about whether and how they could have been prevented;
- Commissioning serious case reviews, to be chaired by an independent person, along the lines set out in Part 8 of *Working Together to Safeguard Children* (1999).

## 6. Progress so far within East Sussex

An ACPC planning day held in November 2004 reviewed the current structures and defined the areas needing development. The key findings from this day were: -

- **Is the membership and functioning of the ACPC able to develop strategic planning for safeguarding and promoting welfare of children?**

### Summary response

- The current membership of the ACPC is broadly right for the LSCB should keep the current balance between senior managers and professionals.
- Need to have better links with Health Chief Executives.
- Need to involve District and Borough Councils and Connexions.
- Members must represent their agency not themselves.
- CPLGs need better links to the LSCB – chairs to be members of the LSCB.
- A Project Group should be established to be responsible for the Child Safety/Promoting Welfare agenda.
- The current sub groups should be retained - Training; Audit & Review; Pan-Sussex Policy & Procedures; Disabled Children; Health Forum
- The LSCB should be responsible to the Children's Trust Board with scrutiny by County Council Members.
- The LSCB should be chaired by the Director of Children's Services.
- **Does the current ACPC monitor the effectiveness of the work of members to safeguard and promote the welfare of children?**

### Summary Response

- Audit & Review Group will need to further develop its current role by moving into a scrutiny role in addition to audit work it should be able to hold agencies to account and should develop in the following ways: -
  - Expand the role and mandate of the group
  - Develop a range of audit tools
  - Have more multi-agency review
  - Require member agencies commit their audit resources
  - Develop a quality assurance role – processes rather than audit
- **How well does the ACPC set policy and procedures with regard to protecting individual children?**

### Summary Response

- Current East Sussex ACPC Procedures work well in individual cases and should be developed into pan-sussex procedures.
- The major development issue is how to develop a policy for safeguarding/promoting welfare across Sussex.
- Existing group is robust enough to work through O/S issues.

- **Does the ACPC training programme improve the quality of child protection work and of inter-agency working?**

**Summary Response**

- The current training programme is generally good. There are some areas where current arrangements need to be strengthened: -
    - Involvement of hospital doctors in multi agency training
    - Monitor teachers' access to multi-agency training.
  - Also some newer areas needing to be developed: -
    - Further Education and Independent Schools Sector
    - training needs of Borough and District Councils
  - Current arrangements are well funded this needs to be maintained
- **How to develop screening teams to investigate all sudden, unexpected child deaths?**

**Summary Response**

- The current arrangement for investigating unexpected child deaths goes some way to providing a response to individual unexplained child deaths but only for 0-2 years. There is a need to develop this further but there are insufficient resources at present.
  - Must learn from models of screening teams elsewhere and scope the range of the problem before developing further child death screening teams.
  - Must develop links with Public Health services within Sussex to develop the wider public health role and consider the possibility of a pan-Sussex approach.
  - There are considerable workload implications in developing this work further.
- **Are there any actions needed to improve how we commission serious case reviews?**

**Summary Response**

- Current systems work reasonably well but there is a need for review of processes within Health to ensure more robust adherence to timescales.
- There needs to be greater clarity about how Serious Case Reviews are triggered – this could link to work in developing child death screening processes.
- There is a need for training for agencies contributing to the SCR process particularly for Health staff.

## **7. LSCB Steering Group**

A steering group has been established to undertake the work necessary to ensure the smooth transition from ACPC to LSCB.

The routine work of the ACPC has continued in tandem with the development of the LSCB. The role of the steering group is to develop shadow systems for the LSCB whilst the ACPC continues to provide existing child protection functions.

The Steering Group is short-life and is acting as a co-ordinating body probably ceasing to function after the establishment of the LSCB in April 2006.

Detailed national guidance on the development of LSCBs is due in Summer 2005 and the final action plan will be developed in accordance with it.

## **8. Key Issues for the future development of the LSCB**

- To function effectively the LSCB will need to be supported by the partners with adequate and reliable resource.
- In developing the LSCB, existing ACPCs and their partner organisations will need to review current funding arrangements. The partners' shared responsibility for the discharge of the LSCB's functions will entail shared responsibility for determining how the necessary resources are to be provided to support it. As with the ACPC, the core contributions are likely to come from the County Council, the health bodies, and the police.
- Other partners' contributions will vary to reflect their resources and local circumstance. Other partners may wish to contribute by committing resources, rather than funds. Examples of this may include seconding staff or providing accommodation, or contributing to a training pool or specific project work.
- The particular resources for the LSCB will be for the Board to determine but it will need to be staffed so that it has the capacity to:
  - drive forward the LSCB's day to day business in achieving its objectives
  - take forward any training and staff development work carried out by the LSCB, in the context of the local workforce strategy
  - provide administrative and organisational support for the board and its sub-committees, and those involved in policy and training.

## **9. Key Consultation Questions**

- **How would key partners want to become involved in the Local Safeguarding Children Board?**
  - Via full membership of the board in a manner similar to the ACPC?
  - Via a smaller board with sub-groups that report to the board and chairs of the sub-groups being board members?
  - Limited involvement in the board but receiving regular reports about LSCB activity? (this option would not be possible for core board members but might be appropriate for bodies such as the Strategic Health Authority where there would be a requirement for them to be represented on a number of LSCBs)
  - Direct links to the boards via a nominated representative who might represent a number of similar bodies and who would report back to all? (this is the current model of PCT representation on the ACPC).
- **How do key partners envisage they will ensure they are meeting their responsibilities under Section 11 of the Children Act 2004?**
  - Are their ways in which you are doing this already that we need to be aware of?
  - Are their particular issues/difficulties that need to be taken into account?
  - Do you/your organisation have views about how this duty should be implemented?
- **How would key partners want the LSCB to provide the scrutiny function as to whether all agencies are complying with Section 11 of the Children Act 2004?**
  - Should this be via review processes when things go wrong? (Similar to the current Serious Case Review on the death of a child).

- Should there be more proactive audit and monitoring of systems and procedures?
- Do you/your organisation have views about how the LSCB should implement this duty?

For further information about the Local Safeguarding Children Board or the Area Child Protection Committee please contact; -

Fiona Johnson, Head of Children's Safeguards & Quality Assurance  
County Hall, Tel 01273 481289