

**GIRFEC Group Meeting: 1 February 2011**

**Chair Person:** Jeremy Akehurst, Performance and Strategy Manager (JA)  
**Minute Taker:** Gill McGhie, Getting it right for every child Development Officer (GM)

**Present:** Alison Work, Lead School Nurse (AW); Graeme Gordon, Inclusion Development Manager (GG); Jim Masson, Grampian Police (JM); Graham Jarvis, Community Learning and Development Manager (GJ); Gordon Sinclair, Casework Services Manager (GS); John Hammond, Area Reporter (JH); Sheila Erskine, Action for Children (SE)

1	Apologies	Not in attendance – Rona Grimmer, Grampian Police	
2	Last Minutes	<p>Matters arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi agency meeting now being held on 15 February to progress the discussion around information sharing – GS, GM and JA will be in attendance</li> <li>• Child’s plan evaluation – no comments from staff have been received</li> <li>• Resource directory – Educational Support Services have an example from another local authority which is being reviewed. GG and GJ will continue to follow this up</li> </ul> <p>Minutes agreed.</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>GM, GS and JA to update next GIRFEC Group following this meeting.</p> <p>GG and GJ will continue to review the establishment of a resource directory.</p>
3	The role of the Named Person	<p>GG was invited to feedback from his meeting with EIS staff in January 2011: GG noted that the EIS have no real objections to the implementation of the role within Education and that the paper was, in general, positively received. They did, however, feel that the role as described in Moray’s paperwork referred to, what was felt to be, administrative tasks. One of the tasks which was felt to be administrative was the responsibility of the Named Person to ensure the paperwork around information sharing was completed. GG reported that EIS felt there would be benefit in having a single agency plan. The EIS representatives had also felt it would be prudent to add the resilience matrix and the SHANARRI wellbeing indicators to the assessment and commented that teaching staff were unfamiliar with the ‘My World’ Assessment Triangle. JA informed the group that the Scottish Government was developing a toolkit for risk assessment which may further address the resilience matrix and how this should be incorporated into assessment.</p> <p>The Group discussed the implications of the above and recognised that, if there was a need for single agency training for Education, this was important to address, provided the message</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>GM to forward Education version of ‘My World’ Triangle to GG.</p> <p>GM to add the discussion around adopting the wellbeing indicators to the agenda of the next GIRFEC meeting.</p> <p>GM will work on translating the proposal into a procedural document and will provide a draft for the</p>

		<p>across services was consistent. JA informed GG that Mark Elvines had developed a version of the 'My World' Assessment Triangle a few years ago, specific to Education. GM agreed to source this for GG.</p> <p>In regard to the adoption of the wellbeing indicators, this matter brought a lot of discussion and JA briefly outlined the historical context in which decisions were made about the adoption of the practice model. It was recognised that the discussion should be taken forward as a specific agenda item for the next GIRFEC meeting.</p> <p>Given the positive response from GG's meeting with the EIS to the adoption of the Named Person role within Education, and the acceptance of the role by Health, it was agreed the GIRFEC Group would progress the implementation of this. GM will work on translating the proposal into a procedural document and will provide a draft for the next GIRFEC Group.</p>	<p>next GIRFEC Group.</p> <p>GG will raise the issue of single agency training at the next GIRFEC Training group.</p>
4	GIRFEC sub group for Training	<p>GM had provided the meeting with the last minutes, from which two main decisions had been taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A multi agency audit would be carried out to assess training needs to ensure the development of training was evidenced on practitioners' identified needs.</li> <li>2. A session for managers should be delivered, possibly consisting of a resume of developments to date, a breakdown of the aspects of LIAP and a discussion on current developments.</li> </ol> <p>Further to this, at the recent Local Integration Support Officers (LISOs) meeting, at which GS was present, it was felt that there would not be a good attendance at the above, given that there were essentially no new LIAP developments.</p> <p>GM had also met since with Susan Maclaren, Child Protection Performance Improvement Officer, and was aware that SM was designing a managers' session around the messages from multi agency audits on child protection as part of the work of the child protection self evaluation group. Both GM and SM felt this session could be developed and broadened out to take on board messages from the recent multi agency audit completed by GM on integrated child's plans and the managers present would be enabled to see the GIRFEC approach as the core approach to working with children and families, with child protection being one part of that.</p> <p>GS endorsed the idea of GM being involved in this session and the Group agreed. GM will, therefore, link with SM and keep the GIRFEC Group informed. It was agreed that, once the</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>GM to liaise with SM to develop the managers' session.</p> <p>GM to inform the GIRFEC Group of the progress of this and seek appropriate names for attendance.</p>

		<p>event had been planned further, the members of the GIRFEC Group could be approached to identify 'managers' within their service.</p> <p>In terms of representation on the sub group for training, GM informed the Group that Police representation long term was yet to be identified following the ending of Paul Smith's role as Training Sergeant, however, Hugh Mackie was addressing this and had made a commitment for Police to attend.</p>	
5	Safer and Stronger Report	<p>GM had issued a copy of the draft report for Group members' comments. JA stated this report was the first opportunity the GIRFEC Group has to report to this Group since the dissolution of the Smarter Co-ordinating Group.</p> <p>GS asked if the context of the 40+ planning processes could be expanded for clarity and GM agreed to do so.</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>GM to make agreed changes to the report before submission.</p>
6	SCRA Reports	<p>JH highlighted an issue which he has been aware of for some time: although the move is to work towards one integrated assessment report, the reporter's Department still approached agencies for single agency reports at the point at which it receives a referral. John has been reluctant to simply assume that the Lead Professional is the social worker at every investigation, however, given the statutory timescale for reports to the Reporter, is doing so the most pragmatic way? JH reported that he is aware that all other local authorities are also struggling with this and there is no clear way forward.</p> <p>GM wondered if the application of the role of the Named Person would alleviate this. The Group discussed this, however, there were issues involved around the statutory timescales required, particularly if the Named Person had to spend time integrating information and that person had difficulty in so doing.</p> <p>SE stated that, in the Western Isles, the co-ordination of assessment contributions for the integrated report to the Reporter is carried out by an Action for Children worker. This role is independent and allows contributions to be integrated by a dedicated worker whose sole role this is.</p> <p>GS raised the issue of the recent development around a protocol for the e-submission of reports between SCRA and social work and stated that it made sense for social workers to remain the recipient of report requests from the Reporter because of the timescales involved, the local authority duty to provide reports and because a protocol was agreed about e-</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p>GS to alert area team managers to this agreement.</p> <p>JH will change SCRA paperwork to reflect the agreed changes.</p> <p>GS and JH to meet to progress this further.</p>

		<p>submission of reports.</p> <p>JH will, therefore, change his paperwork to other agencies to reflect this and ask other agencies to submit their report to the social worker who is the Lead Professional at the investigation stage, within a specific timescale. These tight timescales will ensure the social work can submit the integrated report to the Reporter within the statutory 20 working days.</p> <p>GS will alert team managers to this agreement.</p> <p>JH and GS will progress this further between the two agencies.</p>	
7	Feedback from service users	<p>JA informed the Group that feedback from service users is very small in volume. When LIAP was first implemented, an agreement was reached to seek feedback from 20 – 25% of processes and this low number has not been achieved. It was recognised by the Group that feedback should be sought across the board in all cases where possible, and not randomly, to ensure the integrity of information.</p> <p>Although the number of multi agency plans which exist exceeds the number of those identified as being part of LIAP, service user feedback across the board is not sought in any comprehensive way.</p> <p>GM stated this is partly due to practitioners seeing the seeking of feedback as a administrative task, partly due to an expressed lack in confidence to seek feedback and partly due to the ways in which feedback forms are being issued to service users. Some work needs to be done to enable practitioners to have the confidence to build this in to their everyday practice.</p> <p>GG asked if an electronic feedback system could be implemented and could information on outcomes be gathered to inform feedback. It was widely agreed that, while outcomes were important, feedback on the process of getting to an agreed outcome was also important to record.</p> <p>The Group agreed that practicalities of <i>how to</i> seek feedback could be easily addressed, however, the long term need to seek feedback as a core task for all practitioners would require further work.</p> <p>JH stated this was necessary, given the requirement politically for service user feedback to be seen to be part of developing practice and processes, as well as being a core part of</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p>GM to speak to Beth Fraser about the potential use of volunteer advocates in seeking service user feedback.</p> <p>GS and GJ to further this issue with the LISOs.</p>

		<p>inspection processes.</p> <p>GS offered the example of the Co-located child protection unit which has a high response rate to feedback, due to the fact that workers embed it in to their first contact with children and families.</p> <p>GS stated that Children 1<sup>st</sup> now have volunteer advocates for children and young people and he wondered if there was potential in this role perhaps seeking feedback. The advantage of this was the independent nature of the advocates themselves. GM agreed to speak to Beth Fraser in this regard, while GS and GJ agreed to follow this up with the LISOs.</p>	
8	Grampian GIRFEC Group	<p>GM reported that her Aberdeen City colleague has been requested by her senior managers to now implement the 'Highland GIRFEC model' with immediate effect. There are huge implications from this including the need to now change procedures, paperwork, training etc in light of the change. This will not only impact on services within the Aberdeen City boundaries, but also on NHS Grampian and Grampian Police.</p> <p>GM outlined the proposed route of governance for the Grampian Group via the representatives on the NESPC. This is being progressed by Brian Yule.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p>GM to report progress at the next GIRFEC Group.</p>
9	7 Government Practice Briefings	<p>GM had circulated the hyperlink to these briefings in advance and had circulated a paper for discussion. JA noted that there were two sets of briefings from Scottish Government – one was called 'Themed Briefings', the other was entitled 'Practice Briefings'. For clarity, this item refers to the latter.</p> <p>Given the complexity of discussion, the link to the discussion at item 3 in this paper and due to time, it was agreed that this item will also be remitted to the next GIRFEC Meeting.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p>GM to add this item to the next meeting agenda.</p>
10	GIRFEC workplan	<p>GM outlined progress made against each agreed outcome.</p> <p>Re adding of child's plans to electronic databases, GM informed the Group that the child's plans will be added to Carefirst, the social work database, very shortly - as a pilot in the first instance.</p> <p>GG felt this should also be possible with the Education database, SEEMIS, and agreed to pursue this.</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>GG to pursue the addition of child's plans onto the SEEMIS database.</p>

		GM informed the Group that Edinburgh will no longer be piloting iACT, the Scottish Government eCare framework. It is unclear how this project will be progressed nationally.	
11	AOCB	<p>SE stated there may be a possibility of the Group being unable to use Winchester house as a meeting venue for future meetings. SE will inform GM if this is the case. GG offered Beechbrae as a potential future venue if required.</p> <p>SE also stated, that if meetings are to be held in Winchester House, future meetings should begin at 9.15am to ensure the Winchester House staff have opened the office.</p> <p>GS offered his apologies for the next meeting on 15 March.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p>SE to inform GM if the venue of future meetings needs to change. GM will then contact Group members.</p> <p>All Group members to note that, if future meetings are to be held at Winchester House, meetings will begin at 9.15am.</p> <p>GM to note GS' apologies for the next meeting.</p>
12	<b>Next Meeting</b>	Tuesday 15 March 2011, 9.15am – 11am, Action for Children office, Winchester House, Elgin (unless further notified).	