



MINUTES of a meeting of the **DERBYSHIRE CHILDREN'S PARTNERSHIP** held at County Hall, Matlock on 14 December 2017.

PRESENT

Jane Parfremment (Derbyshire County Council)
(in the Chair)

Ann Coverley	Derbyshire County Council (Chesterfield LCP)
Councillor Alex Dale	Derbyshire County Council
Linda Dale	Derbyshire County Council (Children's Services)
Isobel Fleming	Derbyshire County Council/CCGs
Adele Glover	Derbyshire County Council (Amber Valley LCP)
Chris Greenhough	7 th LCP
Paul Hunter	High Peak and North Dales LCP
Jane Lakin	Derbyshire Safeguarding Children's Board
Tracy Marsh	Derbyshire County Council
Andrew Mott	Southern Derbyshire CCG
Ruth Peat	Derbyshire County Council (representing DYC)
Alison Pritchard	Derbyshire County Council (Public Health)
Michelle Skinner	3D (VCS) South Derbyshire
Jason Swan	Derbyshire County Council (NED and Bolsover LCP)
Andrea Throp	Derbyshire County Council (Performance Team)
Dean Wallace	Derbyshire County Council (Public Health)

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Chris Cook (Derbyshire Safeguarding Children's Board), Ann Harrison (7th LCP), Joy Hollister (Derbyshire County Council), Councillor Julie Patten (Derbyshire County Council).

		ACTION
1	Minutes and actions from 21 September 2017 meeting The Minutes were agreed as an accurate record.	
2	Minutes of LCP Meetings Individual LCP Minutes had been circulated with the agenda for information. Representatives were encouraged to ensure LCP's were receiving feedback from the DCP.	All

<p>3</p>	<p>Health Promoting Schools</p> <p>Dean Wallace invited the Partnership to consider how it could influence the promotion of healthy lifestyles in schools - evidence had shown that a healthy lifestyle benefits attainment in education.</p> <p>There was much discussion amongst the Partnership: examples included a more defined way on how schools spent the sugar tax levy by providing a 'menu'; discourage sweets as rewards; integrate the money with other health promotions within schools (sports); the Local Authority to come up with an award or standard for schools to achieve or work with/to; a county-wide Health Wellbeing Day.</p> <p>It was felt that this would be a very good opportunity to bring together what was already out there, particularly through signposting and possible links with Future in Mind to make the connection between physical and mental wellbeing which are closely linked. In particular, there would be a knock on for the future by slowing down the ever-increasing rates in obesity and diabetes and their related effects.</p> <p>It was agreed that a Working Group would be set-up, with members to be made up of DCP members and representatives from schools. Need to record who volunteered to be on this group.</p>	<p>DW</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Early Help Engagement</p> <p>Tracy Marsh and Jane Parfremment explained that the Local Authority would be starting a process of engagement about early help. The aim would be to clarify priorities and how people could access early help in the future.</p> <p>The Authority was looking to include cluster groups, health groups and sub-groups in the discussion process and, through Children's Partnerships, ensure current practices were fit for purpose.</p> <p>It would be looking at the broad range of services multi-agency teams offered (support, interventions and statutory work) but how much were they actually able to do in those areas? What's their impact, what's working best and were staff skills being properly used?</p>	

	<p>In discussion it was raised that there should be a wider strategy for early help – do families know the best way to get help? This was agreed.</p> <p>Jane Parfremment agreed to raise this with Alison Noble, Service Director for Early Help and Safeguarding.</p>	JP to develop a response (with AN)
5	<p>Feedback – First Chairs’ and Vice Chairs’ Development Session</p> <p>LD fed back on the first development session, which was predominately attended by Childrens Services. The session was very helpful and provided a toolkit around how to structure Childrens’ Partnership Boards. Practical conclusions came out of the discussions, such as how to focus agendas, the structure between DCP and LCP’s and a framework for reviewing priorities. Partnerships had to ensure the right people were involved and that they were the right people to deliver what was needed otherwise perhaps different priorities should be chosen. There should be fluidity of group members.</p> <p>The next step was to arrange a follow-up session, potentially to focus on commissioning and to explore links with Public Health Chairs. A date would be confirmed, and the topics agreed following receipt of the evaluation report.</p> <p>LD and AG to work on a common agenda for DCP and the LCPs.</p>	<p>LD</p> <p>LD/AG</p>
6	<p>Derbyshire Safeguarding Children Board</p> <p>JL advised the Partnership that an education sub-group event on serious case reviews had been organised, with emphasis on how to learn from reviews. Details would be circulated.</p> <p>Obesity and home education were areas that one serious case review was focusing on.</p> <p>The Partnership was informed that the Interim Chair of the DSCB was leaving at the end of January 2018. Recruitment of a new Chair was underway.</p>	JL
7	<p>Child Protection Review and Action Plan</p> <p>There had been a significant rise in the number of children who were the subject of child protection plans in Derbyshire over the last 24-36 months, with the number of children subject to</p>	

	<p>protection plans in excess of 900. The DSCB had commissioned an independent review to understand the reasons. The key conclusions were around how effectively multi-agency processes identify and analyse risk and the arrangements for child protection conferences. It was recommended that Child Protection Managers wider responsibilities and accountabilities be clarified and reinforced.</p> <p>An action plan had been developed and this had been circulated to the group. LCPs should be arranging for their local Child Protection Managers to attend LCPs regularly and talk about local data and processes to ensure robust practices. The LCPs should also be considering local needs and helping Child Protection Managers to understand how underlying needs within the area were impacting on child protection cases.</p> <p>Since the review, Ofsted had introduced a new inspection framework which would come into effect at the end of January 2018; The Council expected a focused inspection visit looking at child protection between February and April 2018; JP outlined what was expected of the Local Authority and partners.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>Vulnerable Young People Groups</p> <p>AG reported that work was taking place within each Locality to map the arrangements for sharing information about vulnerable young people. She gave an example of anti-social behaviour in Heanor where strategies had been put in place (writing to parents, getting youth workers involved) and which was working. This had directly improved outcomes for the young people, enabling partners to understand and respond to situations they would not have been aware of working in isolation. LCPs needed to be central to the work being undertaken.</p> <p>The mapping would inform next steps as there is to set up additional groups in each area. An update would be presented at the next meeting.</p>	<p>AG</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>SEND Needs Assessment</p> <p>AT presented an Executive Summary of the needs assessment for Children and Young People with Special Needs and Disabilities in Derbyshire (copies of the document had been circulated before the meeting). The main points were:</p>	

- The percentage of pupils with SEN (14.4%) was in line with the national average (a decrease from 19% in 2012 which mirrors the national trend). This change was put down to the change in definition criteria and Ofsted's report which had suggested there had been over-identification. The proportion of pupils with a Statement/EHCP had shown a small increase – Post 16 pupils were now included.
- The proportion of pupils with SEN was similar across localities – these figures were based on where the pupils went to school and not where they lived. Pupils with SEN were more likely to claim free schools meals than pupils with no identified SEN - this was higher than the national average. There had been a sharp drop off in the proportion of Travellers of Irish Heritage and Gypsy/Roma pupils with SEN. The figures showed variations of SEN support and pupils with an EHC Plan/Statement in differing localities.
- Most children with a Statement or EHCP were placed within maintained mainstream schools. Persistent absence rates were lower than national averages for pupils on SEN Support but higher for pupils with a Statement/ EHCP and the rate of permanent & fixed period exclusions for pupils with SEN in Derbyshire is a significant area of concern, with a significant local variation.
- Academically, there was a mixed pattern of performance for pupils with SEN. Derbyshire pupils with Statements or EHC Plans who finished Y11 in 2014-15 were in sustained education, training or employment a year later – higher than the national average. Employment rates however were the worst in the country.
- Derbyshire had a significantly high proportion of looked-after children with SEN than the rate nationally. Since 2015, both the number and proportion of young offenders with a statement or EHC plan had steadily increased. The group thought this likely to reflect better identification.
- Information about referral rates to specialist NHS services was available for Derbyshire and Derby City, however children with SEND cannot be specifically identified. There was a notable increase in referrals to both Community Paediatric Services and Speech and Language Therapy services plus an increase in referrals for ASD assessment. The increase in the number of admissions to Tier 4 Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (specialist inpatient units) mirrored a national trend. All of these young people

	<p>would be treated as having a disability and would be likely to need an EHC plan.</p> <p>Action: Partnerships would be given some further analysis based on where Children with SEND lived rather than where they went to school. They were asked to then discuss what the needs assessment meant for their locality and any significant local issues/needs. Local lead SEND Officers would attend.</p>	All
10	<p>Youth Action Grants</p> <p>A report was presented on Youth Action Grants. The Programme was to support and encourage a diverse range of youth and community activities that would improve the quality of life for local communities in Derbyshire. This would recognise the value of, and extend work with, the voluntary sector and build on the youth services already provided in Derbyshire. There would also be an Enhanced Grants programme targeted at activities which would support specific emerging issues for vulnerable young people.</p> <p>It was proposed to have one county wide pot of Youth Activities Grant funding totalling £375,000, to be allocated as 750 grants throughout the County. All grant applications would be sent to one single application point then sent to relevant Local Childrens Partnerships (LCP) for consideration. Funding would be allocated on project merit and the overall budget would be centrally managed.</p> <p>A summary of all grant applications would be sent to Elected Members for comment prior to going to the LCP. These comments would be included to inform the LCP decision making process.</p> <p>In order to apply for Youth Activities Grants, groups would have to demonstrate that they meet local needs. Projects would commence spending allocated resources within six months of receiving the funds and confirm their organisations commitment to delivery. Successful applicants would complete a monitoring report at the end of their project. Requirements would be proportionate to the amounts of money involved.</p> <p>It was recognised that this funding was to support initiatives within the 2018-19 financial period; any unallocated resources would be transferred to an earmarked reserve to enable projects to be sustained beyond March 2019.</p>	

	<p>It was agreed that the decision making process should be within the LCP's and locality youth forums. It was also agreed that any underspend in the 2017-18 financial year be held in an earmarked reserve for use in future financial years. MS advocated that LCPs should receive full details of the applications and this was agreed. MS also commented on the challenge for very small community groups in completing the applications – some support would be needed and 3D could offer this. MS to work with Bish Sharif on the detailed arrangements (Action: MS/BS). The time required by LCPs was also noted and it was agreed that one approach could be to create a specific task and finish sub-group.</p> <p>Action: Ensure this information is passed onto the LCPs.</p>	<p>MS/BS</p> <p>All</p>
11	<p>Newsletters</p> <p>The next DCP bulletin would be ready soon and uploaded onto the website.</p>	<p>LD</p>
12	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>The next meeting was scheduled to take place on Thursday 1 February 2018 at 10:00 am in Committee Room 2, County Hall, Matlock.</p>	<p>All</p>