**Local Safeguarding Children Group (LSCG) – Norwich**

**Date: 8th May 2024**

**Time: 10:00 – 12:00**

**MS Teams**

**Present:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organisation** |
| Abby Whittaker | Administration Assistant (Level 2) | NCC |
| Annalisa Puricelli | Border Officer | Border Force, Central Region |
| Annalisa Puricelli | Boarder force officer | Norwich airport |
| Carol Jacques | Head teacher | Earlham Nursery School |
| Caroline Hill | Service coordinator | Magdelene group |
| Charlotte Reed | Designated Safeguarding Lead & Attendance Officer | Norwich High School for Girls |
| Clare Harrison | Family Programme Co Ordinator | Action for Children |
| Dean Thomas | Probation practitioner | Probation Services |
| Donna Darton | School + Communities Manager Norwich | NCC |
| Jayne Buckingham | Senior Manager | Hamlet charity |
| John Haberson | Deputy Head | Parkside Special Needs School |
| Katie Burrell | Safeguarding Assurance Officer | NCC |
| Letasha Reeve (Co-chair) | Head of service (South & Norwich) | NCC |
| Lisa Baron (Co-chair) | Deputy named professional | Cambridge Health Services |
| Louise Cowell | Probation practitioner | Probation Services |
| Mandy Marriott-Sims | Team Manager Community & Partnerships | NCC |
| Maria | Rose project | magdalen group |
| Pip Yaxley | School + Communities Manager Norwich | NCC |
| Sandy Lovelock | Case Co-Ordinator | Leeway services |
| Tina Chuma | Interim clinical lead | NNUH |

**Apologies:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organisation** |
| Mark Osborn | Safeguarding Intelligence & Performance Co-ordinator (SIPCo) | NCC |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Item** |
| **1** | **Welcome - Minutes from the last meeting including updates from actions**   * Welcomed the attendees to the meeting and asked them to introduce themselves. * Minutes from previous meeting were discussed and approved – No issues |
| **2** | **Serious Youth Violence - Katie Burrell**    This is just a brief overview of the learning taken from the serious youth violence mock JTAI audit. The audits were completed back in January by the Multi Agency Group.  The purpose of the audit was to understand the quality baseline of arrangements for, assessment of and support offered to children and young people at risk of serious youth violence, but also to assess our readiness as a county for a joint targeted area inspection in future. So as we know we didn't get the JTAI, but it was really helpful in terms of learning and recommendations given for the MAAG to take forward within our agencies.  5 cases were selected where they'd been involvement from the five agencies completing the audits. So that was Children's Services, Health, Police, the Youth Justice Service and then each agency completed a full case audit for their intervention with the young person.  The audit tool itself was produced by the quality assurance team based around the JTAI framework and this was then signed off by the multi agency audit steering group and we used a RAG rating system to grade the cases.  So we would grade individual section grades and then an overall grade based on our agencies intervention. It was really positive to see that no individual audit sections or overall rag ratings of red were given from any of the agencies. And then following this the multi agency group undertook a joint moderation session where we looked at the cases holistically and we agreed the final overall grade for each case based on the partnership working as a whole rather than our single agency involvement.  Several strengths were identified for individual agencies and in the overall quality of the partnership working. The audits demonstrated that agencies have a shared understanding and assessing and managing the risks of serious youth violence and where there is high risk. We saw that the multi agency response was swift and it was robust with mostly in effective information sharing positively within and outside of formal review processes.  Also positively, the audits demonstrated effective safeguarding not only of the young person themselves but their wider group of children, so such as siblings, peers, but also consistently balancing this with public protection.  All cases identified the challenges in reintegrating the young people into education or training, either following a permanent exclusion or post 16. And it was also considered that therapeutic and mental health support could have been more robust at an earlier stage of the intervention as well.  We did see that there's a clear multi agency understanding of the importance of supporting young people's mental health and emotional well-being and that these needs were consistently addressed within their planning. But again there were those challenges in finding ways for young people to feel able to accept the support at that stage. It also raised the question as to whether there is sufficient therapeutic resources specifically targeted at young people with trauma as a result of contextual harm and serious youth violence. And again it was considered whether actions to address those needs were sufficient before the risks for the young person became too high, and also to mitigate against that sort of natural increase in risk taking behaviour that we know is a natural part of all adolescent development.  Several of the audits did recognise that the initial assessment was thorough, and it sought to understand the root causes of the young person's vulnerability. But updating assessments perhaps weren't utilised as often as they could be, particularly for young people where the risks of exploitation and serious youth violence were not materially changing or reducing in any way. And assessment could have been used to better understand impact and how we could ensure that that risk would not increase once services had withdrawn and that it was having a lasting change for the young person rather than that just immediate safeguarding and management of behaviours.  Really positively. The significance of the transition to adulthood was well understood and particularly for those young people who would not receive ongoing support post 18. So, for young people that weren't LAC and wouldn't receive a leaving care service. However, often the support did feel quite service reliant and so we considered whether more could be done directly with parents, carers, and families to aid their understanding of how they could continue to support the young people with these risks and factors once the services had stepped back.  Overall the audits demonstrated that there is a really strong multi agency response to safeguard and support young people at high risk of exploitation and serious youth violence and agencies are mostly able to establish positive and trust in relationships with those young people. But this could still be developed further to progress beyond that relationship building to specific and targeted direct intervention to address those factors. And we can see that young people are effectively safeguarded. But it would be even better if the actions to address the wider risks that underpin that vulnerability such as education, mental health, childhood trauma and similarly at an earlier stage to prevent that risk from escalating once intervention has started.  It was also considered during the moderation discussion with the MAAG that young people's educational needs are not included within liaison and diversion screening tools and whether including this would be beneficial given the significance of education as a protective factor. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3** | **Presentations from LSCG members**  **Sandy (Leeway)** – We are currently celebrating our 50th anniversary this summer. So there's lots of activities and things going on and we had a garden party a couple of weeks ago and we had a lot of talks from two of our original founders of Leeway and the Commissioner, Nicole Jacobs, came to visit us and do a speech as well, which was really moving.  **Carol Jaques – Headteacher at a maintain nursery, Earlham**  I'm the head teacher at one of the 3 maintained nursery schools we have in Norfolk. We've been here about 85 years, we're a local authority school, but we're not funded as a local authority school and that is one of our biggest challenges. Because we are a maintained nursery school and not an Infant School, it makes a difference of approximately £400,000 to our budget, but we have the same expectations of any school. Such as, we have the same Ofsted inspection as any primary or Infant School would have. So it creates quite a lot of challenges for us.  We've got three designated safeguarding leads in school where we have approximately 90 children on roll now but can go up to 150 children at a maximum.  Our children range from 2-year-old up to seven because we have got a complex needs unit that we opened six years ago. However, we've got a contract with the local authority to provide 10 places for children with complex needs as we have a lot of children who were remaining with us because there wasn't a placement for them to move on to for their special educational needs.  About 50% of our children have got an identified additional need around SEN and over 70% of our children have safeguarding concerns. So, we have high level of need across the school. The worries generally are around neglect, domestic abuse, parent mental health, debt and housing.  In December 19 we set up the NR 5 Partnership. This was set up following the closure of our children's centre as the closure did create quite a significant vacuum for us as a school. And the main thing that we found was missing was the opportunity for parents to drop in somewhere and to see a familiar adult.  A lot of our families have had engagement with services, some from being very young children themselves. We've got quite a few families where parents, either one or both have been in care themselves and been through the care system. So the kind of apprehension of wanting to work with external agencies can be quite high. And so, having that one base where they could go to and have that regular person there on the desk that they could go and ask for support. So, we've now got about 60 members of that partnership across the NR5 area.  The Partnership group is currently chaired by Peter Gosselin who works at the Saint Elizabeth Church just off Kenton Rd.  We've also set up a community interest company and we are working with the Norfolk Community Foundation which. So, we've set up a community shop on our school site. Currently we will be the first one in the country where it isn't just families within school who can access it. We have worked closely with them over the past 18 months to set up that provision on site. And that's been interesting where there's families who are going into the shop and because it's seen as being slightly separate to school, it's been an interesting way of giving parents the opportunity to make disclosures. We have had a lot of families who've come in who have made disclosures about controlling coercive behaviour around access to money and that's been the kind of initial starting point. |
| **4** | **Multiagency Chronologies**  NSCP done a pilot in summer 2023 and the evaluation of that resulted in a few recommendations which have been actioned. We now have a practise guidance and multi agency practise guidance which I believe has been sent out.  Action: Lisa to check the guidance has been sent out to everyone and if not, it will be sent out via Abby. Lisa has asked that everyone please cascade within your agencies and colleagues.  So when it comes to writing an initial review at a child protection conference, the guide can be used as an aid to write the report up. It's quite an innovative practise and it's based on what works well and what’s been identified by research and practise. Norfolk is ahead of the game where this is concerned so that's absolutely brilliant and we're aiming to ensure that chronologies are used at all different stages in the child's journey as the practise becomes embedded and hopefully will not only enable us to maintain an oversight of the child's lived experience over time but also hopefully it will reduce the amount of time required in writing lengthy and potentially siloed reports.  The guidance will be published on the NSPCC website and there will also be some **Neglect champion workshops in June and July this year So please look out for them and promote and support your neglect champions to attend.** |
| **8** | **A.O.B.**  Louise from Probation and Sandy from Leeway to present at the next meeting around what they provide as a service. |
| **9** | **Next meeting**  Thursday 11th July 2024  12:00 – 14:00  Norwich Family Hub – Hunter Road |