

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

CORPORATE PARENTING BOARD

MINUTES

of meeting held on **1 FEBRUARY 2012** at

Loxley House from 3.30 pm to 5.06 pm

- ✓ Councillor Mellen (Chair)
- ✓ Councillor Culley (minutes 31 to 33 inclusive)
- ✓ Councillor Dewinton
- ✓ Councillor Heaton
- ✓ Councillor Jenkins
- ✓ Councillor Klein (minutes 26 to 32 inclusive)
- Councillor McCulloch
- ✓ Councillor Morley
- ✓ Councillor Morris (minutes 26 to 32 inclusive)

✓ indicates present at meeting

Also in attendance

- Mr K Banfield)
- Mrs L Beedham)
- Ms D Collinson) Children and Families
- Ms N Pink)
-)
- Ms P Thompson-Omenka)
- Ms I Denton) Communities
- PC Sam Flint)
- Miss R Mottram) Resources
- Mrs E Rogers)
- Ms G Moy - Nottingham City Homes
- Mr D Richards - Business in the Community
- Ms P Brackenbury - Nottingham Citycare Partnership
- Ms C Arme - Nottingham University Hospitals
- Ms S Regel - County Health Partnerships Children in Care Service

26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor McCulloch, Heidi Watson

(Business in the Community) and Satinder Gautam, Director for Safeguarding.

27 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interests were made.

28 MINUTES

RESOLVED that, subject to an additional recommendation at minute 21 to agree that a report be submitted to the Board following the education outcomes released in March 2012, the minutes of the last meeting held on 21 November 2011, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

29 REDUCING OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR

Consideration was given to a joint report of the Corporate Director for Children and Families and Head of Vanguard Plus, copies of which had been circulated.

Natalie Pink, Case Manager, Youth Offending Team and PC Sam Flint introduced the report.

The following key information was provided:

- the rate of offending by Nottingham Children in Care (CiC) was at the same level as our statistical neighbours;
- Nottingham City Council was the only local authority in England to have a dedicated CiC Police Officer and this had been well regarded by OfSted;
- a 'Safeguarding CiC' event was being planned, facilitated by PC Sam Flint and Natalie Pink for 27 March 2012, placing further emphasis on the importance of seeing young people as neither risky or vulnerable in isolation;
- the event would be a multi agency, giving practitioners the opportunity to hear guest speakers, reflect upon practice and share developments;
- the CiC Police Officer role had assisted in the management of offending by children and young people in care by performing a preventative role in placement planning, promoting the use of alternative disposals to divert, and enabling generic police time to be used more efficiently through the development of systems;
- the CiC Police Officer role took the lead in delivering restorative interventions within residential homes and foster placements within the City.

In the discussion that followed, a number of further points were made:

- figures for Liverpool and Birmingham seemed relatively low when considering the high population of both Cities;
- restorative justice was a way of getting people together to talk about what had happened and how it had affected all parties;

- the City Council had to safeguard all the children within the City boundary;
- when a child in care was arrested, it was the responsibility of the authority to be the appropriate adult;
- work was ongoing to try and stop the criminalisation of children in care and there were many alternative actions that could be used before using the criminal justice system;
- guidance notes regarding those alternative actions could be provided to partners.

RESOLVED

- (1) that the importance of the role of the CiC Police Officer and Youth Offending Team Lead for Children in Care in the drive to reduce the criminalisation of CiC and improve their outcomes be acknowledged;**
- (2) that the need to continue annual multi agency events, and quarterly reducing offending meetings, with a view to safeguarding and reducing the criminalisation of young people in care to ensure that attendance at those forums were more inclusive;**
- (3) that continued development of quality assurance checks to allow field staff to feedback positive and negative experiences and enhance commissioning arrangements;**
- (4) that local performance measures to be developed to ensure improved monitoring of the CiC cohort, to further reduce criminalisation and to provide more local analysis;**
- (5) that using the restorative justice principles within residential units in the city.**
- (6) that a report detailing the effectiveness of restorative justice be provided to the Board at a future meeting.**

30 PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN IN CARE

Dorne Collinson, Head of Safeguarding and Quality Assurance provided a presentation of Children in Care reviews.

The following key information was provided:

- a number of measures had been put in place to address challenging figures in relation to participation figures, this included having an advocate for the child present at the review meetings;
- participation figures tended to be higher when meetings were held in residential provision that provided more flexible arrangements;
- external residential care and fostering figures were at 92% but it was anticipated that this level could increase by including maximum attendance at review meetings as part of Service Level Agreements;
- Independent Reviewing Officers were required to meet with the child before review meetings;

- team managers being aware of those children who do not participate in reviews;
- a clearer understanding of what participation meant;
- there was no statistical neighbour information to compare with as the data was not required nationally;
- participation of disabled children presented a real challenge;
- the most up to date figure for quarter 3 was 93.1%.

The following additional information was provided after questions from the Board:

- the benefit of a child's views being included within a review helped to make the plan sustainable in the long term as requests from the child would be accommodated if it was safe to do so;
- the authority had had an issue with social worker vacancies in the past but the position had been stable for around 18 months;
- it wouldn't be appropriate for all children to attend their reviews;
- the Common Assessment Framework process was good to get views of the child;
- forms had been amended to clearly mark what the child's views were and where that should be recorded.

RESOLVED that the information provided be noted.

31 PERFORMANCE

Consideration was given to a report of Director of Safeguarding, copies of which had been circulated. Due to the timing of the meeting, an updated report was tabled that had the most recent performance information as of January 2012.

The latest report was presented by Paulette Omenka Thompson, Head of Children in Care and highlighted the following indicators:

- CSS101(a) Number of children in care – as of 31 January 2012 there were 531 children in care;
- CSS101 (b) rate per 10,000 of Children in care – December 2011 figure was 97.5% compared to statistical neighbours at 101%;
- CSS115 – Number of Discharges from Looked After – if a child under 18 requested to be discharged they used to be automatically refused but now the circumstances of the child were taken into account before a decision was made;
- NI63 – Stability of placements of Children in Care: length of placement was above target at 73.3%;
- CSS158 and CSS159 – Number of Children in Care for 3 months or more with an up-to date health assessment and dental check at 74.4% and 75.3% respectively -- health indicators were variable and this was expected to improve;
- CSS160 - % of Children in Care after for 3 months or more with an up to date Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire was at 54.7%;
- CSS151 - % Care leavers with pathway plans – cumulative year end figure was 94%;

- CSS155 - % CiC allocated to a name social worker – all of Nottingham City's CiC had a named social worker;
- PAF C23 – Adoptions of CiC (including Special Guardianship Order's) was 5.4% in quarter 3, representing 25 children;
- NI62 – Stability of placements of CiC: number of moves (based on rolling 12 months) continued to be stable;
- NI147 – Care leavers in suitable accommodation – a new framework was in place from 1 November 2011, this was taking a little time to embed, higher figures were expected once this had happened;
- NI148 – Care leavers in employment, education or training – this was based on 19 year olds only and at 62.9% for quarter 3, Nottingham City were performing better than statistical neighbours but all local authorities were struggling to achieve higher rates.

The following additional information was provided after questions from the Board:

- the recording method of NI147 – Care leavers in suitable accommodation needed to be checked for accuracy as no care leavers would be placed in unsuitable accommodation;
- empty Nottingham City Homes properties could be better utilised for care leavers;
- Citycare would be able to offer care leavers apprenticeships.

RESOLVED that the figures in the performance reports for December 2011 and January 2012 be noted.

32 PERSONAL EDUCATION PLAN (PEP) OUTCOMES

Consideration was given to a report of Director of Schools and Learning, copies of which had been circulated.

Gill Ellis, Director of Schools and Learning provided an overview of the report and highlighted the following points:

- changing attitudes to CiC in schools was challenging;
- the rate of completed PEP's had improved significantly in the last 18 months;
- the quality of PEPs was variable and more work was required especially in the area of the education plan and target setting;
- the number of PEPs audited would be increased to identify gaps.

In the discussion that followed, a number of further points were made:

- sharing PEPs with foster carers could be beneficial.

RESOLVED that the improvement in PEP completion figures over time and the actions undertaken and planned to address the quality of PEPs be noted.

33 FOSTERING INSPECTION

Paulette Thompson Omenka, Head of Children in Care advised the Board that the results of the inspection could not be made public at this state as the Ofsted report had not been received as yet.

She advised the Board that an adoption inspection would be carried out later this year and it was expected to be fairly intense after this had been highlighted as an issue nationally.

RESOLVED that the update be noted.