

GIRFEC Group Meeting: 16 November 2010

Chair Person: Jeremy Akehurst JA (Performance and Strategy Manager, Children and Families Division)
Minute Taker: Gill McGhie GM (GIRFEC Development Officer)

Present: Alison Scarffe AS (Specialist Nurse – Child Protection); Bill Lundie BL (Inclusion Development Manager ASN);
 Graham Jarvis GJ (Community Learning and Development Manager); Jim Masson JM (Inspector, Grampian Police);
 Sheila Erskine SE (Service Manager, Action for Children)

1	Apologies	Alison Work (AS attended in place) Graeme Gordon (BL attended in place) Rona Grimmer John Hammond Gordon Sinclair	
2	Last Minutes	<p>These were agreed for accuracy.</p> <p>Matters arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Directory – JA will raise this issue again at the next Safer and Stronger Theme Group (which will not occur until March 2011). JA asked what the group could do meantime to progress this. Moira Downie completed one for the Inclusion File a few years ago – GM will attempt to establish where this is. GM will also design a template for a working group to take this forward – any working group should include practitioners, Local Integration Support Officers (LISOs) and the GIRFEC Group members. AS said she thought there was one done for the first HMIE inspection and she agreed to follow this up. GJ said he thought that Voluntary Action Moray VAM (an amalgamation of the Moray Voluntary services Organisations MVSO and the Volunteer Centre) held a resource directory for voluntary services and GM will try to access that • Parenting Plan/Strategy 2010-2012 – GJ believes this has not been formally signed off but is on the Moray Council website. • Corporate Parenting Plan – the Group understands that there is none in existence in Moray despite the launch approximately 2 years ago. SE felt that, with the implementation of new regulations for Looked After Children, Fostering and Adoption etc, HMIE and other inspectorates will be looking to see the implementation of a Corporate Parenting Plan in every local authority. SE also felt that, under GIRFEC, the development of separate plans was at odds with the ‘one-child, one process’ approach. The Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GM to find resource directory from Inclusion File • GM to design a template for practitioners to complete to establish the directory • AS to source the directory done for the first HMIE inspection • GM to try to source the VAM resource directory for voluntary sector services for children and families • GM to contact JC re the status of the Corporate Parenting Plan in Moray • GM/JA to provide feedback from the meeting with the national GIRFEC Team on 25th November.

		<p>agreed. It was agreed that GM would contact John Carney to establish the status of this in Moray.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JA informed the Group about a forthcoming meeting initiated by the national Government GIRFEC Group on 25th to which he and GM would attend. The purpose appears to be to extend their dialogue with the Grampian area. The discussion from this meeting may well inform further developments from this Group. <p>All other matters arising appear in the agenda.</p> <p>Last minutes agreed.</p>	
3	LIAP Training Update	<p>GM had issued an update on twilight training to date (paper included with agenda). Attendance has averaged 10 people per session (it was originally hoped to be 30 people per session) and representatives from some agencies have attended more than others. An average of 80% of participants reported an increase in confidence to use the various aspects of the process. This led to a discussion around attendance and BL questioned how best we could measure the impact of training on the service delivered to service users. JA informed the group about the exercise GM is currently carrying out re evaluating a random sample of child's plans which will assist in informing this; as will knowledge gained from other forums such as strategic meetings, quarterly LISO audits etc. Indications from conversations held in a variety of settings appear to assert that professionals are still over-complicating processes by holding additional meetings etc.</p> <p>The question was raised about how best to progress training. GJ felt it should be part of a basic induction programme for all staff working with children and families; BL thought it would be appropriate for GM to be involved in Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) training and will pursue this; AS stated that Health staff also have induction processes in which GM could be involved and will look into dates for Public Health Staff meetings to which GM could be invited; GJ and BL put forward the idea of in-service days but recognised the difficulty in getting onto the agenda as it is set far in advance.</p> <p>Re analysis of current training – GM will complete this following the final two sessions this week and bring it to the next meeting.</p> <p>The conversation progressed to a question of the marketing of GIRFEC: AS asked if a leaflet had gone into schoolbags. BL and GJ explained that would entail a</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BL to pursue the possibility of GM delivering LIAP presentation at NQT events • AS to look into Public Health Team meetings to which GM can be invited • GM to finish analysis of current training and bring this to the next GIRFEC Group • All Group members to think over ways in which GIRFEC and LIAP can be effectively marketed across Moray for discussion at the next GIRFEC Group.

		<p>consultation with Education. JA explained that any marketing of GIRFEC to date has simply been about developing leaflets which professionals give out to children and families at the point of involvement. The Group began to make suggestions for future marketing. JA requested that Group members think this through and we can discuss this at the next meeting. The Group agreed.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Multi agency meetings and information sharing</p>	<p>This item has been introduced in light of the several conversations which have taken place both in this Group and in other fora across Moray and relates to multi agency meetings, their adherence to the law regarding information sharing; their purpose and their ‘fit’ with the LIAP procedures. AS asked for clarification of what these meetings look like. GM informed the Group that information about them broadly outlined the remit as follows (although variations will exist across Moray):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular (perhaps monthly) meetings involving 10-15 professionals who are asked to send children’s names in advance to an administrator. At the meeting, professionals’ concerns for several children are discussed without these being minuted, recorded or often consent being sought • Legal advice is clear that, if these meetings occur, professionals can only share information on the child’s name, his/her address and the school he/she attends. Beyond this, the protocol around seeking consent to share information must be adhered to. <p>AS stated that consent must be informed, not implied nor ‘blanket’ and GJ agreed that, if only the above named points can be shared, what would be the purpose of these meetings? GM pointed out that professionals, when raising a concern about any child, have clear guidance to follow via the LIAP procedures without waiting for a monthly meeting. JA stressed that, should these meetings continue, the question to be answered is ‘what is their added value?’. SE stated that good practice in information sharing cannot be down to individuals but must be embedded in processes. JA stated that, in terms of where ownership and governance of lawful practice sits, we are, as yet, unclear.</p> <p>In terms of progressing this, GM/JA informed the Group that Richard Donald is pulling together a working group to discuss the issue of multi agency meetings, information sharing and meetings’ protocol; as well as the preparation of a statement to be inserted in school handbooks about information sharing. GJ stated that the deadline for school handbooks to be completed is 14 December. As yet, GM/JA have not been informed of a date but they will keep the GIRFEC Group informed of this.</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GM/JA to inform the Group of developments in regard to the meeting about multi agency meetings • GM will contact Richard Donald to ascertain the date and time of the meeting to progress this

5	Named Person report	<p>GM outlined the decisions taken at the last GIRFEC Group about issues to be clarified following the consultation. AW had emailed to state that Health staff are fully supportive of the proposal as it stood; Joe Bodman has agreed to progress the issue of a Named Person for 16+ Learning Choices and will discuss this with Skills Development Scotland and Careers Scotland.</p> <p>GM had circulated an emailed response from GG raising some concerns about this proposal within Education, as well as her response and information from the Highland Pathfinder. BL outlined the concerns from Education about the progression of this without further clarification. GM updated the Group of a conversation she had with GG yesterday: GG felt that re-wording and clarification of the proposal, followed by a working group from within Education would address the issues. GM stressed that such a working group would not be a further consultation, but members should come committed to find ways to implement the proposal within Education. GG had agreed to identify individuals who could/should attend. BL felt that members should be chosen from guidance staff, primary head teachers and secondary deputies. GM will ask GG to identify the Group following the revision to the proposal.</p> <p>The Group agreed that all partner agencies must be behind the implementation of the role in order to progress good partnership working.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GM to re-visit the wording within the proposal and produce a clearer report which would be more accessible for Education staff, to bring to the next GIRFEC Group • GG to then identify a working group with whom GM can engage which will progress this further
6	National GIRFEC Developments	<p>Chief Executives across Grampian have been invited to a meeting on 25th November in Aberdeen with the national Government GIRFEC Team. The purpose of this appears to be about support for engagement and support for the process in Grampian. It appears a national GIRFEC Development Fund is available to support this. Moray's Chief Executive is unable to attend and JA and GM have been asked to attend in his place. JA/GM will report back to the GIRFEC Group and will write a report for the Chief Executive following this meeting.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GM/JA to provide feedback to the next GIRFEC Group and write a report for Moray's Chief Executive following the meeting
7	Child's Plan Evaluations	<p>GM has begun this exercise and has randomly sampled child's plans from across the four social work area teams. Currently 6 out of 8 files have been analysed against SWIA and HMIE quality indicators. GM will complete this analysis and provide a report for the next GIRFEC Group.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GM to report on the evaluation of child's plans for the next GIRFEC Group
8	AOCB	<p>Housing and Education – the issue was raised about attendance of the above two agencies at the GIRFEC Group. Housing – JA reported that Mike McLafferty has stated that Housing do not have the capacity to provide an individual to</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GM to issue Police memo to LISOs, GIRFEC Group

		<p>commit to attendance at these meetings, however, will attend short term working groups to support the development of GIRFEC in Moray. Education – No Education representative has attended the last 3 GIRFEC Group meetings and it was felt this was vital to ensure that all partners were represented when decisions were being made about multi agency working. All Group members agreed the importance of commitment to this.</p> <p>Police memo – JM has drafted a memo in consultation with GM which outlines the process to be followed when professionals are requesting Police attendance at meetings in the LIAP process. GM will issue this for dissemination via the LISOs, the GIRFEC Group and will put this on the GIRFEC website.</p> <p>Young Persons’ Addiction Counselling – GM met with YPAC’s Director (Lynn Geddes), Susan MacLaren (Child Protection Performance Improvement Officer) and GS to discuss the process of referrals to YPAC and specific issues relating to confidentiality within this counselling service. In the course of the discussion, YPAC were keen to be part of local LIAP processes. Currently they accept young people self referring (which they will continue to do) but they also have an arrangement with Education whereby individual schools can refer young people directly. Lynn would prefer that referrals now follow the LIAP process. GM is to contact RD to progress this further.</p> <p>ICT – GM brought to the attention of Group members that, currently, The Moray Council’s ICT department is upgrading ICT systems across the Council. This may create difficulties for services receiving/sending information to the Council (as has happened recently with documents issued to Police). Staff should be aware of this.</p> <p>No other AOCB items were raised.</p>	<p>members and to add to the GIRFEC website as part of the LIAP procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GM to contact RD re YPAC’s referral process
9	<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>This will take place on Tuesday 14 December 2010, 9-11am, in the Action for Children office,</p> <p>AS – who will take over representation for Health from April 2011 in place of AW – would like to attend all future meetings with AW to ensure she is up to speed, however, cannot attend on 14th December. Apologies tendered.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group members to inform GM in advance of next meeting if they are unable to attend • Group members to forward any items for the agenda to GM in advance