



**CRITICAL SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP
MINUTE OF MEETING OF 25 JANUARY 2010**

Present:	<p>CSOG : David Hume, Chief Executive, SBC (Chair); Callum Campbell, Chief Executive, NHS Borders; Chief Supt Graham Sinclair, Lothian & Borders Police;</p> <p>Attendees: Andrew Lowe, Director of Social Work; Brian Kerr, Chair of Adult Protection Committee; Pauline Walker, Chair of CPC, Gillian Nicol, Child Protection, Alana Notman, Adult Protection; Stella Everingham, Head of Integrated Children's Services (left at 3.20pm during CP update)</p> <p>Apologies: Glenn Rodger</p>
----------	--

1.	<p>WELCOME David Hume welcomed Callum Campbell to his first meeting of the Group and the members introduced themselves. The Group had not met since 19 June 2009, the next two scheduled meetings in 2009 having had to be cancelled.</p>
2.	<p>ELBEG David Hume updated the Group on the meeting held on 15 January.</p> <p>(a) He advised that Edinburgh and West Lothian Council Chief Executives would be meeting to discuss the new Chair for the ELBEG Adult Protection Co-ordinating Group.</p> <p>(b) A presentation on Getting it Right for Every Child (GIRFEC) had been made by the Scottish Government and their evaluation of the pathfinder would be available this week. GIRFEC will underpin the inspection process. Pauline Walker and Gillian Nicol had had regular updates on GIRFEC. They had raised some concerns about the model matching all of the requirements for protecting children, were anxious that child protection should remain at the top of the agenda and thought that this had been taken into account. David Hume said that he had a CD on GIRFEC and would pass it to GN. Andrew Lowe advised that Harriet Dempster (President of ADSW) of Highland undertook the main pilot and had kept Social Work Officers well informed throughout. Stella Everingham had seen the Highland pilot and there has been a lot of discussion in children's services across Scotland about what this will mean. She advised that a seminar will take place locally within the next few weeks around the pathfinder model to see what lessons can be learned and what can be introduced into the Scottish Borders context. We are proceeding with the integrated assessment framework in the Borders and this is a tool which will help us implement GIRFEC. David Hume asked that the SBC response should be fed back to both the NHS and Council as soon as possible. Graham Sinclair said that he would get the ELBEG secretariat to provide an electronic copy of the presentation which could be circulated to CSOG.</p> <p>(c) The Child Protection item included an update on a DVD commissioned by ELBEG, to be shown in shopping centres in Almondvale and Edinburgh, alerting people to respond to signs where a child is vulnerable or subject to abuse. Authorities will be</p>

	<p>provided with copies to be shown in public offices and places where the public can access DVDs. CSOG may be able to view this at their next meeting.</p> <p>(d) The Adult Protection update included feedback on the Adult Protection Guidance launch at the Corn Exchange</p> <p>(e) Data Sharing – No proper consideration had been given to the report. DH and AL had discussed the Borders situation but needed to take this further as communication between authorities is not taking place. The main theme of the ELBEG conference, to be held on Friday 12 March with Sir Michael Bichard and Kenney MacAskill, is to encourage good practice and debate around information sharing but the partnerships are not delivering what we need. AL confirmed that we have protocols in place between SBC and NHS, and agreement with medical practitioners. We have had success with our own education and social work departments sharing electronically. NHS are currently procuring new systems and SBC cannot build adaptors until that procurement has taken place. With regard to the Single Shared Assessment, there has been a lot of data sharing but this has been largely paper based. The technology side seems to be holding up progress and until these issues are resolved it is difficult to get managers responsible for the business to become committed. ELBEG has been experiencing that the reports are too technical. Mention was made of West Lothian where data sharing seems to be more integrated and successful. Brian Kerr said that it was the CHCP in WL which had been driving the implementation of this. Callum Campbell said that if West Lothian had managed to deal with this then presumably there was a way forward for the Borders. CSOG confirmed their concern about data sharing and that progress needed to be made. AL stated that the Borders DS Manager had left in September 2009, funding had come to an end and that there was not a dedicated manager to drive it forward. He was asked to come back with proposals to the Group. Within this discussion it was noted that the future role of the CHCP needs to be reviewed and DH and CC would be discussing this.</p> <p>Action: (b) GS to arrange for ELBEG Secretariat to provide an electronic copy of the GIRFEC presentation. (e) (i) AL to bring proposals back to CSOG on data sharing; (ii) CC and DH to discuss the role of the CHCP at their meeting on 28 January.</p>
3.	<p>DAAT UPDATE (Now Alcohol & Drug Partnership)</p> <p>Graham Sinclair spoke to the note which had been circulated by Eric Baijal who took over as chair at the last meeting. The group was currently going through a period of change but he felt that, given the range of partnership, the agenda was not partnership wide but focussed more on health and health issues. The challenge was to get the various agencies to bring forward more business for the agenda and encourage wider participation in the Alcohol and Drugs partnership. In addition quite a lot of the ADP work is driven by the Scottish Government which deals with the national agenda and the group needs to try to deal with the Borders perspective and to target its resources at the local priorities. The coming year will be spent looking at what has been started but to try to make future actions reflect not just the health priorities but those of Social Work and the voluntary sector.</p> <p>The Group agreed that the action plan was helpful in the format which was similar in layout to the SOA. Alcohol problems had been raised as a priority. Although the Partnership itself would not be responding directly to the Government on the question of the minimum price for alcohol, they were broadly supportive of the control and supply through minimum pricing. DH advised that it had not been possible to get a collective sign off by SBC members at Council on 21 January but that if individual political groups wanted to submit their responses then Eric Baijal was ready to assist them. CC confirmed that the NHS had confirmed their stance on a minimum price and were supportive of it as alcohol is a serious challenge for them. AL confirmed that Stella sits on the AD partnership along with Isobel Nisbet, our Mental Health Manager who is currently off on adoption leave. GS will liaise with SW over future agendas in the interim.</p> <p>With regard to the diagram, it was noted that the Adult Protection Committee was omitted and</p>

	<p>GS would take these comments back to Julie Murray and ensure this is included. The CHCP is the partnership committee involving health and the voluntary sector but CC said that this committee needs reprofiling and rebranding so that it is a key conduit for areas of joint work. He intends discussing the CHCP with DH in the near future.</p> <p>Action: (i) GS to liaise with SW over agenda in absence of IN. (ii) GS to liaise with Julie Murray re inclusion of APC in diagram. (iii) CC and DH to discuss reprofiling and rebranding of CHCP at meeting on 28 January.</p>
4.	<p>Child Protection Update</p> <p>(a) Buckholm Mill – Stella Everingham reminded the group that we had been looking for premises to allow us to progress a co-located model for child protection where the various agencies could be based to replace the Paton Street premises. The new model would offer a proper facility for children with video and interviewing facilities, room for child protection case conferences, working with families, the Scottish Courts Administration, Police and Health all sharing the building. A plan to use Buckholm Mill, Galashiels was identified 2 years ago with funding of £800,000 required. The last year has been spent working the partners through Andrew Drummond-Hunt, Head of Property and Facilities Management, to get sign up to ownership and contributions. On Thursday, 22 January, we were notified that the Reporters Administration would no longer be able to participate in the project meaning a significant part of the funding package in the order of £250/300,000 was being withdrawn. Stella had so far been unable to discuss with AD-H whether the project was still viable in Buckholm Mill without the Scottish Courts Administration contribution. She was of the view that the model is still workable and that we first of all need to assess the Buckholm Mill proposal again, or proceed to find other suitable premises which can accommodate the scaled down model. CC advised that NHS, due to the current and future financial climate, would find it almost impossible to expand and that in fact they would be contracting the size of their estate. It may be that they would have premises which could therefore be suitable for the project which have not previously been available. DH and CC would discuss this matter at their meeting on Thursday.</p> <p>(b) Pauline Walker to the briefing covering Membership, Public Information, CP Awareness Raising Training, Interagency review of Practice, Training and Development Officer/CPRO Post; training; Scottish Government Review of the 1998 Child Protection Guidelines; 24 Hour Helpline; Staff Information Card; Initial Referral Discussion Review Group Meeting</p> <p>With regard to public information and the intention to cover the cost of a TV advert, DH suggested that they make contact with ELBEG about the DVD which has just been produced to see what synergies exist and report back to CSOG on their findings.</p> <p>Staff Information Card – a draft was circulated and CSOG members asked to provide Gillian Nicol with comments by 5 February. DH suggested that some external proofing might be helpful by non SBC/NHS/LBP personnel.</p> <p>(Stella left)</p> <p>Action: (a) DH & CC to discuss Buckholm Mill at meeting on 28 January. (b) (i) GN to contact ELBEG re DVD to see what synergies exist and report back to CSOG (ii) Comments on the staff information card to GN by 5 Feb and external proofing to be arranged.</p>
5.	<p>Adult Protection Update</p> <p>Brian Kerr spoke to the note which had been circulated covering the work of the APC since last reported to CSOG in June 2009 including the implementation of the Adult Support and Protection Act; Membership; Annual Report 2008/09 and the establishment of an Audit Sub-Committee.</p> <p>(a) With regard to the establishment of an Audit Sub-Committee, Brian sought the Group's views. The first meeting of the Committee had taken place in early October</p>

	<p>2009. This provides a consistent approach to critical incidents and cases. This will ensure that audit activity, and multi-agency critical incident reviews, interface efficiently with review procedures within agencies, particularly social work and health, and with other multi-agency arrangements such as ADT and Child Protection. Andrew Lowe welcomed the formation of the sub-committee and the procedures. It is important that all agencies are signed up to this procedure. NHS reps on the APC had undertaken to make sure they shared the information with appropriate colleagues and the Director of Nursing will be a member of this committee. CC indicated that he will ensure that the reporting line is appropriate in order that it reaches a senior level. Child Protection and Adult Protection need to ensure that their separate needs are dealt with now that there is a separate procedure in place for Adult Protection. DH sought the Group's agreement that they were prepared to sign this off and they confirmed that they were.</p> <p>(b) With regard to the Annual Report which went to the Council in December 2009, he was unsure as to whether this had yet gone to the CHCP.</p> <p>(c) Brian drew the Group's attention to the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007, Consultation on Secondary Legislation which follows on from the Bichard Inquiry. The APC had looked at it but did not feel that they could give a view directly. They would however make sure that other organisations knew of its existence.</p> <p>Action: (a) Establishment of Audit Sub-Committee – CSOG confirmed their sign-off.</p>
6.	<p>Data and Intelligence Sharing Covered under ELBEG data sharing item.</p>
7.	<p>Critical Cases</p> <p>(a) Andrew Lowe tabled a report and an action plan after the case review of a young man who died in 2009. CSOG were asked to note the recommendations and Action Plan; that a joint process for completing reviews is being developed by the Adult Protection Committee. The Action Plan is to be implemented by all partners and an update report on progress presented to this Group at a later date. Under the action plan it was noted that clarification was required around the phrase "recreational overdose" as this did not identify whether it was drugs or alcohol. AL advised that there was a lot of learning from this case but that he was not recommending a more detailed case review at this stage. The Group accepted the recommendations and would expect an update on progress of the Action Plan at a future meeting.</p> <p>(b) The Group then discussed the current arrangements for receiving Critical Case reviews. They discussed whether in fact they would want to hear a summary of the cases going to the CPC and APC. The Group agreed that it needed an oversight but that the onus was with the Independent Chairs to identify the appropriate business for CSOG. It was agreed that the Group should in future get a very brief summary of the serious cases dealt with by the two committees.</p> <p>Action: (a)AL would ensure a progress report on the action plan is brought to a future meeting; (b) CPC and APC Chairs to arrange for brief summaries of serious cases to be brought to future meetings of CSOG.</p>
8.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>A Lowe advised that he had received the Executive Summary of the Serious Case Review of the 'J' children provided by Doncaster Safeguarding Children Board. Recommendation 5 is that a high level matrix is created which, would alert the Board when safeguarding arrangements are at risk. It would do this by monitoring a small group of key indicators – vacancies, training, referrals etc which would provide an indication of issues for consideration. AL would want to see the recommendations and what it might mean for SBC and he would bring a report to the next meeting of CSOG.</p>
9.	<p>Date of Next Meeting 24 May 2010</p>