



ISCB Annual Report

March 2016 – April 2017

Independent Chair
Alan Caton OBE



CONTENTS

Letter from the chair	4
Introduction	6
Purpose of this report	7
Audience of this report.....	7
Remit of this report	7
Methodology	7
Publication	7
About Islington and The Board	8
Demographics.....	9
Chairing and leadership.....	10
Agency representation and attendance of The Board	10
Board structure.....	10
Key activities of the ISCB	13
Board Priorities.....	14
Key activities of the main board.....	14
Missing and CSE sub-group	24
Quality Assurance sub-group	30
Training and Workforce Development sub-group.....	36
Case Review sub-group.....	39
Child Death Overview panel.....	40
Budget and resources	42
Conclusions and key messages	46
.....	46
Appendices	49
Appendix 1 – Private Fostering standards.....	50
Appendix 2 – ISCB attendance.....	51



LETTER FROM THE CHAIR

I am pleased to present the Islington Safeguarding Children Board (ISCB) Annual Report covering the period April 2016 to March 2017.

This report sets out the work of The Board and its understanding of the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements across Islington. The report also aims to give those people who live and work in Islington a greater understanding of the way agencies work together and individually to keep children safe from harm and abuse.

The year was challenging for all of the partner agencies who continue to work in a context of shrinking budgets and resources. However, whilst this has been the case for several years now, this report provides evidence of the commitment and determination amongst agencies and professionals to keep all of Islington's children and young people safe.

One of the roles of The Board is to influence and shape service delivery. It does this through effective multi-agency case audits and by challenge and scrutiny of existing practice.

During this reporting period audits were carried out with a focus on *powers of police protection* and *child sexual exploitation*. Learning points identified from these reviews were translated into action plans to ensure the learning was disseminated into front-line practice.

The Board challenged the effectiveness and the data collection of return home interviews conducted with children who go missing. This challenge led to a review of practice and a change in

processes which should ultimately improve performance; both in the quality and quantity of return home interviews.

In the coming year, we will give priority to ensuring that there is a continuing focus on child sexual exploitation, on the effectiveness of early help and on domestic violence. We will also monitor, and ensure improvement, in the identification and response to children's mental health and wellbeing along with cases of neglect.

Included at the rear of this report there are a number of key messages for all partner agencies and strategic partners. These messages are to ensure that safeguarding and protecting children in Islington remains a priority for all.

The Board partners have worked hard to ensure that front-line practice is as good as it can be to keep children in Islington safe from harm and abuse. The Board was delighted that following the recent Ofsted review of the effectiveness of the LSCB it was found to be *Good*¹.

Finally, may I take this opportunity to thank on behalf of ISCB all of the organisations and individuals in the public, voluntary and private sectors who work tirelessly across Islington to improve the safety and quality of life of our children and young people.

Alan C Caton OBE



**Independent Chair
Islington Safeguarding Children Board**

¹ Single Inspection of LB of Islington Children's Services



INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

Legislation² requires Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs / “The Board”) to ensure that local children are safe, and that agencies work together to promote children’s welfare. The Board has a statutory duty³ to prepare an annual report on its findings of safeguarding arrangements in its area:

“The chair of the LSCB must publish an annual report on the effectiveness of child safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the local area.

The annual report should be published in relation to the preceding financial year and should fit with local agencies' planning, commissioning and budget cycles.”

AUDIENCE OF THIS REPORT

The report should be submitted to the Chief Executive Officer of the Local Authority, the Leader of the Council, the Local Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board (H&WBB) to:

- note its findings and,
- inform the Independent Chair of actions they intend to take in relation to those findings.

REMIT OF THIS REPORT

This report follows the *ISCB Annual Report 2015/16*⁴ and covers the financial year

from April 2016 to March 2017.

METHODOLOGY

In writing this report, contributions were sought directly from board members, chairs of sub-groups and other relevant partnerships.

The report drew heavily on numerous monitoring reports presented to The Board and its sub-groups during the year, such as Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) Report, Private Fostering Report and Corporate Parenting Board report.

PUBLICATION

The report and child-friendly executive summary will be published as an [electronic document on The Board’s website](#)

² Children Act 2004

³ Apprenticeships, Skill, Children and Learning Act 2009

⁴ <http://www.islingtonscb.org.uk/Pages/default.aspx>



ABOUT ISLINGTON AND THE BOARD

DEMOGRAPHICS


London Borough of Islington has a population of about 220 100. Islington is a relatively small authority, but has the highest population density in the country.

The authority is one of stark contrasts, with high levels of deprivation and areas of significant wealth. The Index of Multiple Deprivation (2010) listed Islington as the 14th most deprived local authority in the country,

Islington has one of the highest rates of population turnover ⁵ in London. Population churn⁶ in Islington is low compared to other areas in London⁷.

Children living in Islington

- Approximately 40,500 children and young people under the age of 18 live in Islington. This is 17.4% of the total population in the area.
- Approximately 35.3% of the local authority's children are living in poverty.
- The proportion of children entitled to free school meals in primary schools is 29.1% (the national average is 14.5%). In secondary schools is 33.6% (the national average is 13.2%).
- Children and young people from minority ethnic groups account for 67% of all children living in the area, compared with 26% in the country as a whole.
- The largest minority ethnic groups of children and young people in the area are young people of *mixed ethnicity*



and from the *white-other* ethnic group.

- The proportion of children and young people who speak English as an additional language: in primary schools is 43.7% (the national average is 20.1%); in secondary schools is 45.9% (the national average is 15.7%).
- 6 out of 10 families with dependent children live in social housing (compared to 2 out of 10 nationally). 11% of households live in overcrowded conditions

Islington's population-profile in terms of relationship status is considerably different from other London boroughs and England, with 60% of residents recorded as *single* compared to 44% in London and 35% in England. The percentage of people recorded as *single* in Islington has increased from 54% in 2001. The equivalent figure was 41% in London and 30% in England in 2001.⁸

⁵ New people moving to the area and old residents leaving

⁶ Residents moving house within the borough

⁷ [Islington Evidence Hub](#)

⁸ Census 2011

CHAIRING AND LEADERSHIP

The ISCB is independently chaired by Alan Caton OBE and he's been the independent chair since September 2013.

Accountability

There are robust accountability mechanisms between The Board and chief officers in the authority with quarterly *Safe-guarding Accountability Meetings* taking place between the Chief Executive of the LB of Islington, the Lead Member Officer of the Council, the Lead Member for Children's Services⁹, Director for Children Services and the Director for Targeted and Specialist Children Services.

AGENCY REPRESENTATION AND ATTENDANCE OF THE BOARD

Islington agencies are well re-represented with a range of suitably senior officers attending the ISCB on a regular basis (**APPENDIX 2 – ISCB ATTENDANCE**). Where necessary, representative send delegates if they are unable to attend.

The Chair has been concerned that NHS (London) England is a statutory board partner but they have not yet been able to attend because of pressures from multiple LSCBs Pan-London. The ISCB Chair has raised this with the NHS England representative.

BOARD STRUCTURE

The Board structure has remained unchanged for most of the year. In February

2017 at an ISCB away-day The Board agreed that the work of the *Policy and Practice sub-group* should be continued by means of task and finish groups, as and when required.

The Board also proposed that the work of the *Harmful Practices Steering Group* should be moved under governance of the Violence Against Women and Girls Steering Group (VAWG). The current *Core Business and Improvement Group* will in due course be replaced by a group with more executive features. The hierarchy at the end of the page shows the proposed new structure.

The Board further wished that an *Education sub-group* be established to allow early years, schools and colleges to be better represented on The Board.

Sub-groups continue to be chaired by a range of senior multi-agency partners.

Training and Professional Development sub-group

Key responsibilities of the sub-group are to:

- Identify the inter-agency training and development needs of staff and volunteers.
- Develop and implement an annual training and development prospectus.
- Monitor and evaluate the quality of single and multi-agency training.

⁹ Section 19 of the Children Act 2004 requires every top tier local authority to designate one of its members as Lead Member for Children's Services. The

LMCS will be a local Councillor with delegated responsibility from the Council, through the Leader or Mayor, for children's services

- Ensure lessons from Serious Case Reviews (SCRs) are disseminated.
- Measure the impact of multi-agency training.

Quality Assurance sub-group

Key responsibilities of the sub-group are to:

- Develop agreed standards for inter-agency safeguarding work.
- Establish and maintain appropriate mechanisms and processes for measuring the quality of inter-agency safeguarding work.
- Contribute to the development of strategies to address any shortfalls in effectiveness.
- Monitor and evaluate the quality of safeguarding work within individual Board partner agencies.
- Contribute to the development of strategies for single agencies to address any shortfalls in effectiveness.

Policy and procedure sub-group

This sub-group ceased mid-way through the year. Key responsibilities of the sub-group are to:

- Continually review and monitor ISCB's policies, practices and procedures.
- Plan the piloting of and / or introduce new multi-agency working practices.
- Maintain an up-to-date knowledge of relevant research findings.
- Develop / evaluate thresholds and procedures for work with families.
- Assume editorial control over the ISCB website and Newsletter.
- Going forward into the new financial year, this sub-group will function as

a task-and finish group.

Missing and CSE sub-group

Key responsibilities of the sub-group are to:

- Agree and monitor the implementation of a child sexual exploitation strategy and action plan to minimise harm to children and young people.
- Raise awareness of sexual exploitation within agencies and communities.
- Encourage the reporting of concerns about sexual exploitation.
- Monitor, review and co-ordinate provision of missing and child sexual exploitation practice.

Case Review sub-group

Key responsibilities of the sub-group are to: Child Death Overview Panel:

- Consider all cases that may potentially meet the criteria for a serious case review.
- Appoint a suitable panel to carry out a serious case review.
- Commission a suitable independent reviewer to carry out a serious case review.
- To evaluate and monitor implementation of agencies case review action plans.

Child Death Overview Panel

Key responsibilities of the sub-group are to:

- Collect and analyse information about each unexpected death with a view to identifying any learning.
- Notify the ISCB of cases that may need

- to have a Serious Case Review (SCR).
- Review and respond to any matters of concern affecting the safety and welfare of children.
- Review and respond to any wider public health or safety concerns arising from a particular death, or from a pattern of deaths.
- Put in place procedures for ensuring that there is a co-ordinated response by the Authority and its Board partners and other relevant persons to an ‘unexpected’ child death.
- Alert The Board about professional practice concerns that may require a review.
- Develop The Board’s forward plan and set the agenda for board meetings.
- Receive and agree policies and procedures received from sub-groups.
- Review relevant national policy developments and initiatives, prepare briefing papers to The Board, and recommended actions that may be required.
- Monitor attendance and agency representation at the Islington LSCB and its Sub-groups and make recommendations as appropriate.
- Provide in-depth scrutiny around The Board priorities, including s11 duties

Core Business and Improvement Group

Key responsibilities of the sub-group are to

- Develop, implement and monitor the Islington LSCB’s Annual Report and Business Plan.
- Oversee the functions of Islington LSCB’ sub-groups.
- Oversee the Learning and Improvement Framework.
- Agree priority actions against The Board’s core business.

Islington Safeguarding Children Board

Executive Group

Case Review

Quality Assurance

Training / Workforce

Missing / CSE

Education

CDOP



KEY ACTIVITIES OF THE ISCB

In previous reports The Board set out the rationale for choosing our current priorities, and this is the second update on our three-year work plan. This is therefore an interim report on the progress we have made against our agreed objectives. The Board and sub-groups' key-activities are captured in an accompanying business plan

BOARD PRIORITIES

These priorities reflect our desire to improve the collective effectiveness of agencies in three key areas:

- Addressing the impact of neglect on children, including to help children become more resilient.
- Addressing the consequences / harm suffered as a result of domestic violence, parental mental ill-health and substance abuse.
- Identification of children who are vulnerable to sexual exploitation and holding perpetrators to account.

KEY ACTIVITIES OF THE MAIN BOARD

The Board scrutinised work in the following areas (in chronological order):

PREVENT and Radicalisation

In last year's report The Board was concerned about the absence of a strategic multi-agency action plan to protect chil-

dren and young people from harm because of radicalisation.

We were therefore pleased that the Chief Executive Officer and Leader of the Council attended The Board in May 2016 to assure the partnership that suitable arrangements are now in place.

Considering the progress that had been made, we agreed at the ISCB's away-day that it in future *Prevent* and *Radicalisation* should be progressed at the *Safer Islington Partnership*¹⁰ and that The Board would monitor its progress by means of an annual update from the SIP about the progress against the action plan.

Private Fostering arrangements

In anticipation of the annual Private Fostering report¹¹, the chair wrote to all partners asking that agencies intensify their efforts to raise the profile of Private Fostering.

Current Private Fostering Situation

The Local Authority had 12 new Private Fostering notifications during the year ending 31st March 2016, which is 5 more than the year before.

Although this is still not enough, the increase suggested that a dedicated SSWPF raised awareness of private fostering and

¹⁰ Safer Islington Partnership (SIP) coordinates work on crime reduction and community safety in Islington. The Council is a lead authority in this partnership, which also includes the Police, Islington Primary Care Trust, London Fire Brigade, the Probation Service, and representatives from the voluntary,

community, faith, and business sectors ([Safer Islington partnership](#))

¹¹ The annual Private Fostering report to the Islington Safeguarding Children Board (ISCB) is a requirement under *The Children (Private Fostering Arrangements for Fostering) Regulations 2005*.

led to more notifications.

By year end, 31st March 2016, there were fifteen Private Fostering arrangements (twelve new notifications and another three which TSCFS had already been notified of in the previous year).

Compliance with Private Fostering Standards

The Regulation (as before) requires the Local Authority to comply with the following Standards.

Standard 1 – Statement on Private Fostering

Islington Children's Services Statement of Purpose on Private Fostering was updated and meets the statutory requirements

Standard 2 – Notification

The above data shows that the majority of Private Fostering arrangements are initiated during the child's adolescence but, in contrast to last year's arrangements, most of the children were female. Data evidences that our privately fostered children are ethnically diverse and from a wide range of nationalities, which corresponds with last year's findings.

The Local Authority account for one third of Private Fostering notifications. The remainder is from a variety of sources including other Local Authorities, school, health, Youth Offending Service and self-referrals.

It is important to note that in the cases where notifications were received from agencies other than the Local Authority the

primary reason for referral was not Private Fostering - even when the child was being Privately Fostered at the time.

By July 2016 the new SSWPF has made contact with every state-funded school in Islington, children's centres, Families First, teams within TSCFS and re-established links with Arsenal Football club regarding their Host Family scheme. The SSWPF has strengthened links with community, voluntary and faith organisations.

Awareness-raising work showed that some agencies / settings still lack basic awareness of private fostering.


There continues to be routine screening for Private Fostering cases on the school's admission board, with screening questions added to all in-house admission papers. This will continue, and the SSWPF will look into whether a similar approach can be adopted with GPs.

A referral pathway tool was developed in different formats appropriate to different settings i.e. education, health, internal and external services, and distributed during training sessions, forums and meetings.

An adaptation of this tool was used for a service-wide audit on all open cases in CSC to try and find privately fostered children.

Standard 3 – Safeguarding and Promoting Welfare

Three privately fostered children became Looked After; one was due to a bereavement another because the child's mother



did not consent to her remaining with the private foster carer and the other was to secure a more permanent arrangement for the child in the form of a Special Guardianship Order.

The SSWPF undertakes DBS checks on all private foster carers and anyone else over 16 years old living in the household where the child lives. All private fostering arrangements are signed off by a senior manager at the Access to Care and Resources Panel.

Standards 4-6 – Advice and Support

The Local Authority provides advice and support to private foster carers and prospective foster carers. Children who are privately fostered are able to access information and support when required so that their welfare is safeguarded and promoted.

Privately fostered children are enabled to participate in decisions about their lives. The local authority also provides advice

and support to the parents of children who are privately fostered with in their area.


Standard 7 – Monitoring and Compliance with Duties and Functions in relation to Private Fostering

In the year ending 31st March 2016, there were two young people whose initial visits were delayed, and with such low numbers, it meant that only 83% of cases had a visit undertaken within seven working days after notification

The council maintain confidential records of all privately Fostered children, their carers and their parents on the electronic records of the child’s file (LCS). Visits, actions, decisions and information regarding the child, carers and parents are appropriately recorded and there is a performance management system in place to ensure that statutory duties are complied with.

Safer Workforce

Children and young people are occasion-



ally harmed by professional who are responsible to promote their welfare and safeguard them. This is never acceptable and The Board wants to be sure that those who work with children are carefully selected and that concerns or allegations are thoroughly investigated by the LADO, in accordance with The Board’s procedures¹².

LADO report

The Board received the LADO’s annual report on 12 July 2016 and again, with improvements, on 20 September 2016.

A multi-agency LADO steering group continues to raise awareness, share best prac-

tice and learning from serious case reviews.

Sources and nature of referrals

As in previous years a variety of agencies in made 143 referrals between them, which is 28 more than the last year. This increase continues and almost unbroken trend in referrals year on year as can be seen above.

The steepest rise has been school-based referrals which is likely due to the LADO providing more advice directly to schools following the retirement of the Safeguarding Lead in Education who had been in post for a substantial period of time.

¹² Section 7 of London Child Protection Procedures sets out roles and responsibilities in managing allegations against staff or volunteers who work with children. These procedures are applied when there is an allegation or concern that any person who works with children has: 1.) Behaved in a way that

has harmed a child, or may have harmed a child; 2. Possibly committed a criminal offence against or related to a child; 3.) Behaved towards a child or children in a way that indicates they may pose a risk of harm to children.

There was also an increase in sports-based referrals which is probably attributable to the high-profile child abuse enquiries in football in recent months.

Highlights from referrals include:

- 111 (78%) referrals were related to an allegation in the workplace (99 in 2015-16)
- 32 (22%) referrals related to issues in staff's private lives that raised concern about their suitability to work with children (16 in 2015-16)
- 13 referrals (12% of work-based referrals) concerned disabled children. The local estimated percentage of disabled children in Islington is 4%-6% of the child population. The fact agencies are considering a higher percentage of disabled children in managing allegations procedures is therefore positive.
- The gender-split of children is about even (54% boys and 46% girls).

Outcomes of investigations

As in previous years, the most frequent outcome was to give advice without the need to take further steps. A number of allegations (11), however, were substantiated and a small number were very serious:

- 8 referrals involved private-life matters (including domestic violence and sexual abuse)
- 2 physical abuse allegations
- 1 was an historic sexual abuse allegation.
- 6 members of staff were dismissed and two are pending disciplinary hearings

- 2 members of staff resigned and were referred to the Disclosure and Barring Service by the LADO.

Timescales

There has been a real improvement in terms of complying with The Board's procedures of making a referral within one working day (82%). This demonstrates good knowledge by agencies about LADO procedures and their responsibilities to report swiftly.

Like last year, the vast majority (88%) of referrals were dealt with within one month from referral. Where allegations / concerns were substantiated, it often took longer due to criminal investigations, awaiting trial and/or awaiting disciplinary investigations and hearings.

Even though it is not a requirement that the same person must investigate all referrals, The Board was nevertheless pleased that almost 70% of referrals were dealt with by the same senior manager. This provides a greater sense of overview and consistency.

Elective Home Education

The Boards Learning and Schools representative presented an annual report on elective home education to the Board on 12 July 2017.

The Board was pleased that the LA partners are doing everything possible to identify children and young people who may be home educated *and* at risk, we remained concerned that there were not sufficient national safeguards / procedures in place

to assist the Local Authority in finding children that may potentially be at risk.

The Chair wrote to the minister on 25 August 2016 to raise concerns about this. The Board was pleased that the minister responded but was disappointed that he did not outline any additional actions to address our concerns. As a board, we'll continue to look at practice locally.

Corporate Parenting Board¹³ report

The Corporate Parenting report was presented to the ISCB in March 2017. The ISCB noted strong performance around attaining suitable placements for children and young people and especially strong commitments in relations to long-term planning e.g. special guardianship orders and adoption.

It is clear that the authority takes its role as corporate parents seriously and constantly strives to promote LAC's welfare, educational attainment and health outcomes.

The Board particularly welcomed the emphasis on LAC who are missing from their placements.

CAHMS Transformation Strategy

The transformation strategy was sighted at the ISCB in March 2017 and agreed by The Board with comments.

The Pause Project

The Pause Project provides ongoing practical and emotional support to women with two or more children in care. The project is at full capacity and has seen 18 women make significant and lasting changes to their lives, and none of the women in the project had got pregnant.

The 18 women who have signed up for Pause Project have, between them, 80 children in care. The local authority currently spends over £1,100,000 per year on the care of these children in direct payments to carers alone. Given previous rates of birth, we would have expected these women to have 7 children in the next year, and 35 children over the next 5 years, if PAUSE wasn't involved. Given these projections, PAUSE has already paid for itself 7 months after the project started.

Islington has mainstreamed PAUSE into its core-offer of services, and all members of the team now have permanent jobs in Islington. Islington are the first borough to mainstream PAUSE, although other boroughs have extended their funding commitment to 2018.

Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy

The strategy was reviewed in the Autumn of 2016 and the LA updated the ISCB on progress on 22 Nov 2016. The ISCB agreed the strategy in January 2017 and will participate in its implementation. The

¹³ The Corporate Parenting Board (CPB) acts strategically to ensure that children looked after and care leavers are effectively supported to reach their potential through the provision of excellent parenting,

high quality education, and opportunities to develop their talents and skills, and effective support for their transition to adulthood

strategy will sit under the governance of the VAWG Steering Group.

Youth Crime Strategy

The strategy was reviewed in the Autumn of 2016 and the LA updated the ISCB on progress on 22 Nov 2016. The refreshed strategy came to The Board in January 2017 and will sit under the governance of the Safer Islington Partnership.

Housing Changes

Government announced significant changes in national housing policy and housing benefit. The ISCB received an update from a senior Housing Manager on 22 Nov 2016. The partnership is predicting an impact on children and families to the extent that it was placed on the ISCB's risk register at the same board meeting. It currently remains on the risk register.

Key Partnership Changes

Islington Services Review and restructuring

The Director for Children's Services¹⁴ (DCS) updated The Board (Nov 2016) on organisational changes that will affect services in the foreseeable future.

Children's Services Directorate were previously constituted of two sub-directorates:

- Schools and Learning and,
- Targeted -and Specialist Children and

Families Service¹⁵ (TCSF).

Schools and Learning will mostly continue as before.

Youth and Community Services, the *Integrated Gangs Team (IGT)*, *Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG)* and all *universal youth services* will be delivered under the auspices of a new interim Director of Youth and Communities, and she will also join the ISCB.

Work, Skills and Culture, *Getting Residents into Work*, *Adult Learning*, and *Arts and Library Services* will join the directorate and will be overseen by an Interim Director for Employment, Skill and Culture.

Elsewhere, *Community Safety* has moved from *Corporate Services* to *Environment and Regeneration* and is being headed up by Service Director Public Protection. The PREVENT agenda will also in future sit under this directorate. A new representative from the SIP / Environment and Regeneration will join the ISCB in the near future.

Domestic Violence Advocates (DVA) will sit under Children's Services Directorate as will Troubled Families.

Metropolitan Police Service

"In March 2017, a new safeguarding polic-

¹⁴Section 18 of the Children Act 2004 requires every top tier local authority to appoint a Director of Children's Services. The DCS has professional responsibility for the leadership, strategy and effectiveness of local authority children's services

¹⁵ The name of this directorate has since changed to *Safeguarding and Family Support (S&FS)*.

ing model was introduced on Islington Borough, which ensures that every investigation has renewed focus around the individual needs of the victim and how best they can be supported by police and partner agencies. The safeguarding strand now comes under the leadership of one Detective Superintendent and services that were delivered separately by Islington Borough officers and the Sexual Offences Exploitation and Child Abuse Command have now been integrated. This means that the investigation of domestic abuse, sexual offences and child abuse is now delivered locally by omni-competent teams, ensuring that there is one lead investigator who is the sole point of contact for the victim, avoiding unnecessary duplication and ultimately improved victim care. To support this, a new performance framework is being developed that centres around all positive outcomes for victims, not just sanctioned detections, so that we may fully understand how their lives have improved as a result of police and partnership intervention.

The deployment of an immediate safeguarding response car to all serious and complex safeguarding offences allows for specialist detectives to own the investigation from the outset so that they can maximise evidential recovery and ensure that the wellbeing of any child connected to the crime or offender is at the forefront of our response and intervention.

The aim over the coming year is to train as many officers as possible from the safeguarding strand in the specialist child and domestic abuse training programmes so that we enhance our response to victims

by developing a wider pool of omni-competent officers who possess the necessary skills and acumen to investigate all forms of abuse and neglect where a child is at risk. This training will be completed in conjunction with our partners so that we maximise the opportunities to learn from one another and augment the excellent partnership arrangements that already exist within Islington Borough.

MPS Single Front Door

The new safeguarding model has created a single front door for all referrals involving vulnerable children, aiming to merge the Child Abuse Investigation Team (CAIT) referrals desk with the Public Protection Desk already situated in the Islington Local Authority Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). The CAIT referrals desk and the Police Conference Liaison Team, who attend case conferences for children on a Child Protection Plan, will shortly be co-located with partners in the MASH to support timely strategy discussions, enhanced information sharing and overall improved case management.

The Board continues to monitor the effectiveness of the new model to ensure that its priorities in respect of safeguarding children are being met.

Presentation from Duncombe Primary School

In September 2016, the ISCB met at *Duncombe Primary School* whose debate team prepared a challenging presentation for the ISCB about safeguarding in their area. The Board heard that:

Young people and their families appreciate:

- Local libraries
- Their after school club SWES
- Local parks and sporting facilities

They also had concerns, and asked the partnership to address the following:

- They want to see more police and community support officers on the street
- Better street lighting on key roads
- More police patrolling key roads and they are concerned over young people riding mopeds and stealing mobiles.
- Enough funding for After School Club, SWES and local libraries so they are not forced to close
- More staff helping out at foodbanks
- Better housing for poorer members of the community
- Noisy neighbours keeping children awake at night
- Concerned about gun- and knife crime causing them to be scared about using local parks.

The ISCB chair has since met with the young people again to feedback the actions the partnership had undertaken. Actions have been added to the ISCB action-tracker.

Strategic Direction of ISCB – away day.

In February 2017, The Board met to consider its Business Plan. We also:

- Reviewed the ISCB Terms of Reference, ISCB membership and ISCB sub-groups
- Scrutinised the ISCB self-assessment

and effectiveness of ISCB that was prepared by the ISCB Chair and Business Unit.

- Considered further ISCB priorities, including: County Lines, Serious Youth Violence, Knife Crime and Early Help.

Knife-Crime Review

The Assistant Director Public Health and chair of CDOP presented the key findings of the *Islington Knife Crime Review* that was jointly commissioned between the ISCB and The Youth Justice Management Board (YJMB). The review made the following recommendations:

1. Ensure our early intervention gets earlier.
2. Strive for better engagement and supporting protective relationships.
3. Make trauma informed approaches more widespread.
4. Support better education journeys for young people.
5. Break down silos of working.
6. Consider how we support boys' journeys through adolescence and peer relations.
7. Take a stronger focus on intervention and impact.
8. Adapt and learn as we try to improve our response to adolescent risk and safeguarding practice.
9. Effectively support professionals across

the public system

Co-operation with other strategic boards.

The Board continues to improve its working relationship with other strategic boards i.e. the Health and Wellbeing Board, Islington Children and Families Board, SIP, Corporate Parenting Board and Adult Safeguarding Board. The Chair (or ISCB representative) attends all these boards in order to facilitate co-operation. This report will also be shared with the chairs of those boards.

ISCB Risk register

The Board maintains a risk register to ensure risks are identified and plans formulated to mitigate risks.

The Board carried over several risk from the previous year:

- “Vacancies in key-staffing areas (Whittington Health) – now removed.
- “Vacancies in key staffing area (CSC) – now removed
- “Children waiting more than a year to see perpetrators charged.”- current risk.
- “Staff not meeting ISCB training requirements because of staff job-role being reclassified.” – removed.

The following risks were added to the risk register in 2016/17:

- “Absence of LBI multi-agency Prevent Action Plan to identify, prioritise and facilitate delivery of projects, activities or specific interventions to reduce the risk of children / young people being drawn

into terrorism in LA area” – now removed.

- “Long term staff sickness impacting on Early Years ability to provide staff with Safeguarding Training” – now removed.
- “Whittington Health concerns that MASH was not functioning optimally and that only a very small number of cases are coming through MASH. Health staff have been withdrawn due to underutilisation”. – now removed.
- “CP-IS has gone live in the Borough but Whittington Health is not yet online.” – current risk.
- “Concerns about young people running drugs across county lines” – current risk.
- “Potential Impact of changes in housing and welfare legislation.” – current risk.
- “Early Years Services are going through transformation; there may be some disruption to services. Services to be maintained as best possible”- current risk.

In most instances e.g. staff vacancies and training, arrangements are in place to manage the risk. All risks have ownership of a board member as well as action plan to reduce / remove the risk.

Escalation procedures

In line with Working Together to safeguard Children and The Board’s Child Protection Procedures, The Board published a procedure to resolve professional disagreements or concerns between professionals.

In 2016/17 the procedure was used on several occasions, with an update given by

the Head of safeguarding at each board meeting. Matters were most frequently escalated by schools and escalations related to the application of the threshold criteria.

All escalated matters were satisfactorily resolved before reaching The Board for resolution.

Lay Members

The Board continues to benefit from having two lay members that actively contribute to the work of The Board.

They have consistently challenged the work of The Board where appropriate, and continue to bringing a fresh perspective from Islington residents.

MISSING AND CSE SUB-GROUP

The Board, through the work of its Missing and CSE sub-group, continues to challenge all member agencies to identify, address and respond to children who were at risk of going missing or who are at risk of sexual exploitation.

The sub-group is well attended and has developed a strategy and an overarching action plan based on a *Victim, Offender, Location* and *Time* profile.

Since 2011, there has been a year on year increase in referrals to CSC (2011/12 – 3, 2012/13 - 68, 96 in 2013/14 - 96 and 2014/15 – 125).

This year, however, saw a reduction in referrals (98) similar to 2013/14. It's postulated that as identification and risk assessment processes becoming more embedded and accurate number will slow down. The Board will continue to seek evidence for this hypotheses.

The Board believes the partnership's efforts, training, CSE awareness, prevention work targeting potential offenders have also reduced the number of potential CSE victims.

Multi-Agency Sexual Exploitation Panel (MASE)

The sub-group continues to work closely with the police, CSC and key partner agencies in the development of Multi-Agency Sexual Exploitation meetings (MASE). In 2016/17, in line with Pan-London guidance, the MASE was reviewed and developed to be more strategic. This has resulted in themes now being identified and followed up via the sub-group and / or MASE.

The CSE and Gangs Analyst developed a CSE Profile that is regularly shared with the MPS and CSC. Profiling is an on-going process of linking, charting, mapping MASE subjects to identify those at risk, themes, trends and locations/friendships etc. that provide the basis for discussion at the MASE panel.

Return to home Interviews¹⁶

Ensuring that Return to Home Interviews

¹⁶ the data in relation to this section runs September 2016 – end of March 2017

are offered on time (i.e. within 72 hours) remains a developmental area. A small proportion of RHIs are refused by either the parent or the child or because the young person cannot be contacted. In other cases, the young person remains missing and the RHI cannot be completed.

There has been some system-difficulties during this reporting year, where teams did not receive system notification and this has now been rectified.

RHIs for CLA Missing

There have been a total of 502 missing episodes for 45 young people (averages 9 episodes each). Of the 502 missing episodes:

- 141 RHI's were offered out of a possible 152 opportunities (93% and an increase of 59% on the same time period last year).
- 67 RHI's were completed (44% and a decrease of 9% on the same time period last year).
- 90% were offered a RHI within 72 hours.

RHIs for CLA away from their placement

There have been a total of 202 recorded missing episodes for 30 CLA who have been away from placement. Of the 202 missing episodes:

- 55 RHI's were offered out of a possible 55 opportunities (100%).
- 24 RHIs were completed (44%). 94% were offered a RHI within 72 hours.
- There is no comparative data for the

previous year.

RHIs for children going missing from home

There have been a total of 200 recorded missing episodes for 99 young people. Of the 200 missing episodes:

- 96 RHI's were offered out of a possible 121 opportunities (79% and an increase of 24% on the same time period last year).
- 25 RHIs were completed (21% and a 54% decrease on the same time period last year).
- 89% were offered a RHI within 72 hours.

CSE policy

The group has seen over the last year considerable activity, oversight and influence on the development of:

- Several key policies, including the *Islington Strategy to Prevent Child Sexual Exploitation* (ISCB, 2016), *Islington Child Sexual Exploitation Profile 2016* (Missing and CSE sub-group, 2016).
- *Islington Safeguarding Children Affected by Gang Activity and /or gang-related Serious Youth Violence Multi-Agency Protocol and Practice Guidance 2016* (ISCB, 2016).

Staffing and resources

London Borough of Islington

Has demonstrated a commitment to this area with the recruitment to a number of posts to support children at risk of going missing or becoming sexual exploited;

Missing and CSE Project Officer who supports, among others, Missing and Trafficking Coordinator, Gangs and Safeguarding Coordinator and the MASE.

Funding has also been continued for the Gangs and Safeguarding Coordinator Post.

A Specialist Interventions Pilot Project (SIPP) has been launched in September 2016.

The Local Authority has also put in place the role of the Return Safe Manager in March 2017.

Metropolitan Police Service

As part of the new Safeguarding model of policing on Islington Borough, there is now a dedicated CSE team consisting of three Detective Constables to investigate offences, engage and support victims and pursue offenders.

CSE Training and Awareness Raising events

Over the past 2 years Safeguarding and Family Support practitioners have developed and delivered the following training and awareness:

LB of Islington

- AIM2 Assessment and Intervention training for Social Workers.
- Direct Work with Adolescents training for practitioners across Safeguarding and Family Support and Targeted Youth Support (TYS).
- Young men and Gender Perspectives
- Gangs and Safeguarding (mandatory training delivered to 349 front-line

practitioners

- Mandatory CSE training for all S&FS staff.
- Specialist indication training is now provided
- Mandatory missing briefings were delivered to all social workers
- Serious Case Review Learning Practitioners Forum.

The partnership

Over the last two years S&FS practitioners have delivered numerous training and awareness courses across the partnership to a wide range of professionals. Some of this training include:

- The Islington Safeguarding Children's Board (ISCB) combined CSE-and Gangs training for the partnership.
- CSE and Gangs training has been delivered to approx. 50 British Transport Police Officers in 2017 and is ongoing.
- Targeted training for health staff, housing and estate management officers.
- Development of the *Adolescents at Risk Update* and the first issue distributed in September 2016 to disseminate key information and updates on relevant issues affecting the adolescents at risk in the borough.

Children, Young People and Families

Since the SIPP project started in September 2016 they have delivered awareness raising and socio-educational sessions to approx. 300 children and parents. This includes:

- 2 x sessions on healthy relationships (consent, CSE) delivered to all year 9

- pupils at a Secondary Schools.
- Secondary school year 7 induction sessions for parents and children on staying safe online and CSE. This was co-delivered with Islington Safer Schools Officers
- Specialist CSE and children with disabilities training and awareness session for a Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Secondary School
- Chelsea's Choice: As part of the lead up to National CSE day SIPP facilitated and supported the delivery of Alter Ego's Chelsea's Choice performances to all Islington schools including the PRU, an independent performing arts school and a special school (LD). SIPP also organised a community showing of the play for parents/ carers and young people out of school or attending college. In total approximately 1200 young people were able to see the performance.

SIPP supported several disclosures following the performances and we have supported schools to follow up the messages. In total 10 young people were supported via 1-1 discussions and individual follow up sessions.

CSE Awareness Raising Events

CSE Awareness Day (March 2017) included joined up working with Camden Children's Social Care (CSC), Borough Police, Sexual Exploitation Team (SET) police, Islington Council Licencing and the ISCB; where an awareness raising stall was held at Kings Cross station and local premises such as hotels, pubs, licensed premises and massage parlours were visited to raise awareness.

- CSE and HSB stall was facilitated at the recent Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) strategy launch community event.
- SIPP presented at the Islington Youth Health Forum.

CSE Children's Home

The Board has oversight of the first CSE children's home in London. The sub-group identified a need for safeguarding training to staff, and the ISCB Workforce Development sub-group has ensured that most staff have now received training at the appropriate level, including senior managers and designated safeguarding leads.

Missing Children

Children Missing from Education.

Reasons why children are not in education include:

- Failing to start appropriate provision i.e. not entering the system at all;
- Stop attending, due to exclusion (e.g. illegal unofficial exclusions) or withdrawal from educational placement;
- Failing to complete a transition between providers (e.g. being unable to find a suitable school place after moving to a new local authority).

The sub-group receives assurance at each meeting that a range of robust procedures are in place to preventing pupils from going missing from education at these key transition points.

The partnership has agreed that after exhausting all avenues of investigation through the LA's *Pupil Services Children*

Missing Education process, a child is still not found, the case will be escalated to MASH, and reporting the child to the Metropolitan Police as a missing child.

The sub-group has been effective in ensuring that local processes are effective. There have been (between 1/04/2016 & 31/03/2017):

- 109 Missing Pupil Alerts received by Pupil Services
- Of these, 87 children were found and returned to school while
- 17 were not found and registered to s2s (DfE secure site), 14 due to an unconfirmed school destination abroad and 3 with an unknown location.
- 5 were under investigation at that time

The Board was satisfied that for the 17 children who were not found, a full multi-agency investigation was carried out

Missing from Care and Away from Placement without Authorisation

The following analysis covers both looked after children that go missing from care and children considered to be away from placement without authorisation.

Away from placement without authorisation is where the young person’s whereabouts are known but they are not at their placement or place where they are expected to be. Some children may stay out later with family or friends as a boundary testing activity, others may go to stay with their family members and stay for longer than agreed with the carer. These children are considered to be absent rather than missing by the police and they would not

usually be involved in trying to locate them. The Local Authority’s response will depend on an ongoing assessment of risk and particular attention is paid to repeat episodes.

In total over the course of the year, 98 children were reported as missing from care and 63 were reported as away from their placement without authorisation.

55 of these 161 children were recorded as both missing from care and away from placement without authorisation, which leaves a total of 106 children overall.

The total of 161 children went missing from care or away from placement on 1000 episodes, with 736 episodes being recorded as missing from care and 264 being away from placement without authorisation.

Duration of absence	N of episodes
< 24 hours	440
1 day / overnight	129
2 days	58
3 days	30
4 days	15
5 days	11
6 days	12
1 wk. to 2 wks.	27
2 wks. to 1 month	7
One month +	7
Total	736

Table 1- Duration and number of missing from care episode

Boys are more likely to go missing from care than girls (60 boys and 38 girls). Boys are also more likely to be away from placement without authorisation as boys (35 boys and 28 girls).

Those aged 17 years were significantly more likely to go both missing from care and away from placement without authorisation (with 48 children aged 17 years accounting for 49% of the total children missing from care, and 38 children aged 17 years accounting for 60% of the total children away from placement without authorisation).

All children that are reported missing from care and away from placement are cross matched with CSE, Gangs and radicalisation risk markers to ensure necessary oversight:

- Out of the 161 Children missing from care/away from placement 30 were considered to be at risk of CSE. These 30 children went missing from care/away from placement a total of 184 episodes over the course of the year.
- 16 children were considered to be at risk of gangs or identified as a gang nominal. These 16 children went missing from care/away from placement a total of 123 episodes over the course of the year.

Children Missing from home

Over the course of the year 177 children were reported as missing from home.

The 177 children went missing from home on 372 missing episodes.

Boys are more likely to go missing than girls (100 boys and 77 girls going missing from home).

Those aged 15, 16 and 17 years were significantly more likely to go missing 102 of the 177 children missing were in this age range).

Missing from Home Duration	N of Episodes
< 24 hours	142
One day / overnight	70
2 days	43
3 days	29
4 days	12
5 days	8
6 days	9
1 wk to 2 wks	35
2 wks to 1 month	16
One month +	8
Total	372

Table 2 - Duration for children missing from home

All children that are reported missing from home are cross matched with CSE, Gangs and radicalisation risk markers to ensure necessary oversight:

- Out of the 177 Children missing from home 16 were considered to be at risk of CSE. These 16 children went missing a total of 64 episodes.
- 8 children were considered to be at risk of gangs or identified as a gang nominal. These 8 children went missing a total of 15 episodes.

No children recorded as missing from home were referred to PREVENT in response to radicalisation risks.

Other missing children

Over the course of 2016/17 there were 128 Looked After Children placed in Isling-

ton by other boroughs. Their 'home' borough remains responsible for their well-being and care planning. However, as the borough in which these children are placed, Islington can challenge the home authority if there are concerns about these children's safety. Islington Children's Services Contact Team receives notifications from the police of missing children in Islington and this includes Looked After Children placed in Islington by other Local Authorities. The team contact the home authority to ensure they are aware of the missing episode. The home authority is responsible for responding and ensuring the child's safety.

14 of the 128 children recorded as other borough's Looked After Children went missing from care or were away from placement without authorisation during the year 2016/17 and only one went missing on more than one occasion. There were no challenges needed to home authorities about the suitability for the placements for these children.

All Local Authorities are written to quarterly and asked to provide an update as to whether their children are still placed and whether they have placed any new children in Islington.

We request that an "Arrangement for the Placement of Children" form is completed which requires the risk to be clarified in terms of missing, CSE, gangs and offending behaviour. The CSE, Missing and Trafficking Co-ordinator cross checks these children quarterly with the Missing contact code. The purpose of this is to provide sup-

port and challenge to the home Local Authority about whether the care plan keeps the child safe.

QUALITY ASSURANCE SUB-GROUP

Attendance at the sub-group is good, and commitment is strong. Due to the volume of the work programme, the sub-group has met 5 times during the year and is now chaired by the Head of Safeguarding and Quality Assurance in the Local Authority.

Performance data – Core Business Report

The sub-group scrutinises the performance report prior to it being presented to The Board. The members assist in the analysis that gets written into an accompanying commentary report for each Board. During the year the ISCB requested that the data included other areas that would assist The Board in a better understanding of children's safeguarding and therefore the report changed to include further data. Other data was removed.

Learning from the multi and single agency audits.

Repeat Child Protection Plans

2015/16 saw a substantial increase in children who were made the subject of a CP plan who had been previously subjected to a CP plan (22% of all the children made the subject of CP plans within the year). All 42 children (24 families) were audited and a number of recommendations were made.

This year (2016/17) this figure has dropped dramatically and only 12% of all children made the subject to a CP Plan

had previously been on a plan, this is within the target.

Children on CP plans for 15+ months

Some boroughs have a multi-agency panel to consider children who have been the subject of a CP plan for 15 months or more (i.e 4 Child Protection Conferences have taken place).

Analysis showed that 14 children met the criteria this year. An audit concluded that 11 of the 14 children who were subject to a CP Plan for this length of time were also in Court Proceedings where a judge had made the decision for the child/ren to remain at home.

Due to the small number of cases and their status, in court, a decision was made that a multi-agency panel was not necessary but that the Service Manager for Child Protection would consider all cases prior to the 4th Child Protection Conference to ensure there was no drift in implementing the plan and detriment to the child's welfare.

Re-referrals

There had been a steady increase in re-referral rates, 2014/15, 12.4%; 2015/2016, 17% and 2016/2017 23%.

The increase was above that of statistical neighbours. An intensive audit within the Children in Need Service had taken place of the 58 cases where there had been a re-referral in the previous 6 months. The following themes were found:

- DVA incident which reached the threshold for a further assessment,
- adolescence/behaviour
- concerns/gangs and
- closing case too quickly.

The national average for re-referrals is 22%. Further work is planned in this area.

Timeliness of allocation

Via a school inspection, a matter was raised with the CIN service that there was a delay in responding to a contact from the school for 7 days. On looking at the case in depth it was ascertained that CSCT progressed the school's contact to the CIN service the same day and the content of the referral required swift action. This precipitated the need for a further exploration of cases within the CIN service and whether there were delays within the CIN Service in allocating cases for assessment.

Data showed that 18% of cases were allocated on the same day of the contact. 21% were allocated the next day, 11% in 2 days, 78% in 3 days, 11% in 4 days and 7% in 5 days.

This equates to 75% being allocated to a worker with 5 days. Several recommendations were made and there is ongoing weekly quality assurance of timeliness of allocation resulting in all cases being allocated within 2 days and where they are not, there is good reason recorded by a manager.

Increases of referrals

The data for the year showed that there had been 500 more referrals to Children's

Social Care this year, mainly from the police.

The HMIC inspection in child protection may account for the increase and given the referrals are assessed as needing statutory intervention this is a positive.

The increase in referrals, however, was mirrored in the system as whole with increases in the Number of Child and Family Assessments and the Number of Children Made the Subject to a CP Plan.

This year ended with over 200 children subject to CP plans, compared with the year before at 130.

There has also been a rise in the number of court proceedings. The sub-group postulated that this may be due to deprivation as there was not one specific characteristic that the increase could be attributed to.

There has not been a change in threshold and the increase in Child Protection Plans are needs-led.

All London Local Authorities have seen a rise in referrals in Court Proceedings during this reporting year.

Health Involvement in Strategy Meetings

In 2015/16 audits showed that most strategy meetings did not include a contribution by health.

The Named Nurse and the Head of Safeguarding worked together to address this concern and a re-audit demonstrated that in 75% of cases health contributed to the

strategy meeting; where they hadn't, cases were mainly in the Children Looked After Service or the Disabled Children's Service and further action will need to be taken to develop the practice in these service areas.

Early Help Review

An external consultant had undertaken a review of early help. The findings were that:

- the ISCB should have more oversight of Early help services,
- that the migration onto the Early Help Module (EHM) system was positive,
- the work of early help services was variable and most cases viewed required improvement.

An Improvement Plan was put in place and has resulted in the Early Help services being graded as *Good* in the recent Ofsted inspection.

Other Local Authority's children in Islington

The subgroup receives figures on other LA's children who are Looked After and placed in Islington or who are subject to a Child Protection Plan and are temporarily in Islington.

An overview of these cases did not highlight any concerns.

Child Participation in Child Protection Conferences

Last year highlighted concerns about the lack of involvement of children in their Conferences.

Work was undertaken with agencies to consider all types of participation ranging from attendance, to advocacy, to completing a *Have Your Say* booklet as well as Child Protection Co-ordinators specifically recording the wishes and feelings of a child and their experiences.

A further audit was presented to the sub-group which noted that in 85% of cases children over 5 years old now participated in their conference.

Children Vulnerable to Extremism

All cases that were presented over a 6-month period were audited, but numbers were too small to make thematic conclusions; however, the sub-group were pleased to note that referrals were being made from different agencies and young people's welfare were considered in relation to this area. Ofsted found this area of practice effective.

Children at risk from Harmful Traditional Practices

In response to agency concerns at the Harmful Practices Sub-group, all cases that related to FGM presenting over a 6-month period were audited. Numbers were too small to make thematic conclusions however the response of the referring agency in all but one case was appropriate as was the response from Children's Social Care. Ofsted found this area of practice effective and strong.

Children coming into care for a subsequent time

All cases presenting over the last year

were examined and equated to 20 children, 7 of whom were remanded into LA care. The audit showed improved management oversight was noted but improvements were required to strengthen the child's voice and to better use (mental health) assessment to inform the planning for the young person

HMIC inspection of MPS

The inspection was presented which highlighted the need for improvements in the police force to safeguard children. Islington's practice in relation to Section 47 investigations was highlighted as a positive.

A restructure of services has since taken place, and there will be a further HMIC inspection in Autumn 2017.

FGM Midwifery Audit

This was the 4th report from audits which initially started in 2014. The audits in 2014/15 and 2015/6 highlighted that the existing systems were not effective and breached recommended national and local guidance.

The current audit monitored compliance of the 13 standards contained within the FGM audit tool and had produced 100% compliance. In future audits would now be heard yearly instead on six monthly because of the good progress made for identifying and responding to future risk for these children born to mothers who had undergone FGM.







Agency Participation in Child Protection Conferences


Agency participation is examined at every

meeting and reported to the QA sub-group to challenge non-attendance or non-reporting.

The sub-group on behalf of the ISCB held agencies to account against the standard required in its safeguarding procedures i.e. to produce a report and attend; the ISCB is no longer satisfied solely with attendance and verbal reporting.

All agencies participated to a high standard. The Board was, however, concerned about the lack of school-nurse attendance at Review Child protection Conferences but noted this was due to the shortage of School Nurses. It appears they are unable to attend case conference because they are required to meet the demands of the immunisation programme.





TRAINING AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SUB-GROUP

The ISCB sub-group is chaired by the Named Nurse for Safeguarding in Whittington NHS and attended by a wide variety of agencies, including representatives from the private and voluntary sector.

Once again, the ISCB has commissioned a comprehensive training offer in line with its training strategy, *Competence Still Matters*.

ISCB Training Offer

The core training offer to multi-agency staff included:

- Child Sexual Exploitation (all groups)
- Designated Safeguarding Lead - Role and Responsibilities (group 5)
- Female Genital Mutilation
- Neglect and Attachment in the Early Years (All Groups)
- Neglect in the Adolescent Years (All Groups)
- Neglect in the Middle Years (All Groups)
- Parental Conflict and Domestic Violence / Abuse Conference (in partnership with LBI Early Help) (Groups 205)
- Safeguarding and Child Protection Refresher/Update (Groups 2-5)
- Safeguarding and Information Sharing Foundation (Group 2)
- Safeguarding Disabled Children (Groups 2-5)
- Serious Case Review Briefing (All Groups)

- Working Together to Safeguard Children Induction (Group 1, voluntary sector)
- Working Together: from referral to child protection conference - Part One (Group 1)
- Working Together: core group to child protection planning - Part Two

Key Training Data


This year, the ISCB offered in excess of 1300 training places, 85% of which were taken up by the work force. The most popular courses were: *Safeguarding Training for Designated Safeguarding Professionals*, *Safeguarding Foundation* and *Safeguarding Refresher Course*.

The least popular courses were the suite of *Neglect* training courses and *Working Together Parts 1 and 2*. The sub-group will need to do more work to understand why these course were not popular, especially because child Neglect continues to be the most prevalent form of child abuse in Islington.

Working Together to Safeguard Children courses specifically covers the role, policy and procedures around child protection enquiries and Child Protection planning and it is disappointing that more professionals did not make use of the learning offered by the ISCB.


Quality Assurance reports show that more could be done to ensure that procedures are followed, e.g. quality of referrals, quality of CP reports to conferences and ensuring that parents and young people routinely see reports before they are presented at professional meetings and that

their wishes and views are consistently reported.



Education establishments, in particular, are prone to send staff directly to more advance courses e.g. *Designated Safeguarding Lead* training while neglecting the foundation courses: Group 2 and especially Groups 3.

Training evaluations had shown that staff attending Group 5 courses often lack sufficient experience and understanding of quite basic concepts such as thresholds, referrals procedures child protection roles and responsibilities. Next year, The Board will ask agencies to carry out self-audits against The Board's workforce development strategy.



Non-attendance

The ISCB training portal has introduced a good level of management oversight to ensure that the correct courses are selected and managers are notified if staff cancel courses.

Even though this has increased course attendance, 17% of learners did not arrive for courses. It costs The Board just of over £33¹⁷ per head to provide a course translating into an opportunity cost loss in excess of £6000 per year. Although The Board has not yet charged agencies for failed attendance, it plans to introduce charging which will equate to an unnecessary expenditure of £9500 to partners.

Training audience

There is an excellent variety of staff from all sectors (table below) attending ISCB training, representing more than 290 individual settings. Attendance from schools

Training attendance by sector	N
Academy - Primary	4
Academy - Secondary	12
Adventure Playground	33
Alternative Provision	9
Chaperone Service	5
Charity	106
Childcare on Domestic Premises	1
Childminder	28
Children's Centre	69
Children's home / residential	15
Church, Temple, Mosque etc.	4
College Nursery	12
Company	7
Criminal Justice	4
Family Justice	1
Free School	9
GP Practice	12
Independent (PVI)	10
Independent School	17
Leisure Centre	1
Local Authority	238
NHS Trust	59
Other	2
Out of School Club	17
Primary Health Care	1
Primary School	127
Private (PVI)	70
PRU	10
Secondary School	28
SEN School	18
Supplementary school	6
Tertiary education	24
Voluntary (PVI)	51
Voluntary Children's Centre	28
Voluntary Sector	50
Youth Service	2
Not specified	9
Grand Total	1099

¹⁷ DSG Review.

(notably Primary Schools), early years, children's centres, child minders and the local authority is very good. The Board is pleased that school settings are much better represented compared to the first annual report in this Business Planning Period.

There has been a steady increase in attendance from Health Partners, albeit not as high as it could be. Islington GP practices have been diligent in attending training which is attributable to the active involvement of the Named GP on the LSCB.

Quality Assurance and impact

ISCB training is very well regarded, with more than 80% of training rated *Excellent* and the remainder *Good*. One course by an external provider was rated *Poor*. That course wasn't recommissioned and subsequent courses were rated as *Excellent*.

As in previous years, the ISCB Business Unit randomly selected learners from every ISCB course and asked a secret shopper to enquire about the quality and impact of ISCB training. All ISCB courses received excellent feedback with 100% respondents saying they will definitely recommend the course to a colleague.

The majority (95%) of respondents were able to give examples of how training had improved their safeguarding practice / enhances their role. Those who were not able to give examples cited that they attended the course before and they hadn't expected their practice to change.

A number of attendees continue to re-at-

tend the same course as a means of updating their safeguarding knowledge. In most cases this is not appropriate; it is almost always preferable to attend the *Refresher Safeguarding Course* that provides and update on a wider range of local and national learning and developments.

CASE REVIEW SUB-GROUP

During this year, The Board agreed the Serious Case Review and action plan for Child F and it was published on the ISCB website in June 2016.

Multi-agency briefing took place to disseminate learning and the sub-group is tracking implementation of agency action plans.

The knife-crime review recommended by the CDOP chair was also published and the action plan has been incorporated in the Youth Crime Plan.

Draft PACE Concordat Review.

The ISCB chair had previously raised the matter of young people remaining in custody overnight.

Sparked by a Judicial Review (LBI) The Board agreed to commission an Independent Management Review to examine a set of relevant cases to understand what can be learned from children remaining in custody overnight and to recommend best practice.

The review found that the Draft-Concordat applied to very few instances of young people being custody overnight. By far the majority of instances related to young people who were in breach of bail condition, the latter being an explicit exception to the

Concordat.

The independent author had made recommendations for both the Police and the Local Authority in relation to case management recording.

He also recommended that the Practice Protocol between LBI and the Police be updated / re-developed and that it should include the role of agency champions to act as advisors of best practice.

SCRs

There had been two Serious Incident Notification in this reporting year. One of these incidents did potentially fit the criteria for a serious case review, but the decision was delayed pending forensic evidence.

The chair agreed in May 2017 that there should be an SCR in relation to Child K and the final report is expected in November 2017.

CHILD DEATH OVERVIEW PANEL

In its 9th year of working, the Child Death Overview Panel continues to be well attended by a core group of professionals from health, social care and the police. Additional members from other services are invited to attend depending on the cases being discussed. We also held our first joint Islington and Camden neonatal CDOP. This was attended by a specialist obstetrician and neonatologist from UCLH. We will continue to review neonatal deaths in this way as the additional specialist input added great value to the review.

In 2016/17 there were 11 deaths of Islington residents under the age of 18 years;

compared to the long term average of 14 deaths per year, since the CDOP process began.

The vast majority of deaths reviewed in 2016-7 had no modifiable factors identified.

Concerning one case, where CDOP has not completed its review, we recommended to the Safeguarding Board that they undertake a SCR. In addition, we have written to a local NHS Trust asking them to review their involvement. This case should also be considered by the Adult Safeguarding board and local primary care as part of the SCR or alongside it.

The panel intend to follow up regarding concerns regarding urgent access to tertiary care for with complex congenital cardiac disease.

The panel continues to engage with partners with respect to maximising approaches to prevent youth violence. The ISCB and partners are working on an action to plan to raise awareness about knife and weapon crime in school.

Since the last annual report

- All families are now offered the opportunity to be involved in the CDOP process. This is by writing to them to offer to meet with the CDOP chair and Designated Doctor.
- Information for families and professionals regarding the ICDOP can now be found on the ISCB website.
- We have been engaging in the Healthy London Partnership Children and

Young People's Programme – London CDOP Project.

- We have commenced an Audit through the NCL maternity network (better births) on how non-obstetric risk factors (such as Domestic violence, smoking and mental illness) are addressed in antenatal care.
- The Designated Doctor for Child Death and CDOP SPOC have met with the Islington coroner and have agreed processes to access post mortem and Inquest findings, as well as how to meet the requirements locally of the new guideline into Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy (SUDI) guidelines for care and investigation.
- The designated doctor for child death in Islington, Dr Tracy Ellenbogen has attended Warwick Training Programme in Unexpected Child Deaths and has shared her learning with the panel and the HLP programme

Over the coming year we intend to:

- Review family feedback.
- Seek to improve contributions from primary care into CDOP process.
- Continue to engage with HLP to develop practice in line with changes to CDOP process in London.



BUDGET AND RESOURCES

Funding of LSCBs continues to be challenging, and collectively the London LSCB chairs are disappointed that the MPS continues to choose to fund partnership safeguarding in London at a level which is 45% less than all the other large urban Metropolitan Police Forces in England.

Safeguarding is a complicated and demanding partnership arrangement that needs appropriate resourcing if it is to be effective. If the ISCB is to carry out its statutory duties, it needs to be properly supported.

The guidelines which we adhere to (*Working Together to Safeguard Children (2015)*) makes it clear that funding arrangements for Safeguarding should not fall disproportionately and unfairly on one or more partner to the benefit of others.

In London this burden does fall unfairly on Local Authorities and MOPAC are being approached to provide reasonable and proportionate levels of funding to the Local

Safeguarding Boards.

Historically, The Board understood that NHS (England) London should contribute financially to The Board and the contribution from the Islington CCG has been reduced as a result. It appears that the total funding should be provided by local CCGs. This matter still needs to be clarified as a matter of urgency.

The Safeguarding structures in London are due to change in a year or two. When they do, there will still be a need to resource whatever arrangements are put in place. The police are a key partner in the future arrangements for safeguarding and we ask that the MPS and The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime increase their funding to a level which is fair to the other partners and which will assist in keeping London's children safe.

ISCB Annual Report 2016-2017

	2015/16	2015/16	2016/17	2016/17
INCOME	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual
Balance brought forward				
Balance 2013/14	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Agency contributions				
London Borough of Islington	£118,754.00	£74,100.00	£132,200.00	£132,200.00
DSG Grant	£50,000.00	£50,000.00	£50,000.00	£50,000.00
Islington CCG	£10,000.00	£10,000.00	£10,000.00	£0.00
NHS England (London)	£10,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Camden & Islington NHS Trust	£7,500.00	£7,500.00	£7,500.00	£7,500.00
Whittington NHS Trust	£15,000.00	£15,000.00	£15,000.00	£15,000.00
Moorfields NHS Trust	£7,500.00	£7,500.00	£7,500.00	£7,500.00
National Probation Trust	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£1,500.00	£1,500.00
Community Rehabilitation Company	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00
MPS (MOPAC)	£5,000.00	£5,000.00	£5,000.00	£5,000.00
Cafcass	£550.00	£550.00	£550.00	£550.00
Fire Brigade	£550.00	£550.00	£550.00	£550.00
Subtotal	£226,854.00	£172,200.00	£230,800.00	£220,800.00
Other income				
None	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Subtotal	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Total income	£226,854.00	£172,200.00	£230,800.00	£217,354.00

EXPENDITURE	Difference	Difference	Difference	Difference
Staff				
Salaries, 2.5 staff	£134,663.90	£134,663.90	£134,663.90	£131,572.04
Chair	£23,316.88	£23,316.88	£23,316.88	£28,789.61
Agency (training)	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Sessional worker	£8,824.11	£6,716.63	£5,000.00	£7,522.51

ISCB Annual Report 2016-2017

Subtotal	£166,804.89	£164,697.41	£162,980.78	£167,884.16
-----------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Board training

Facilities & refreshments	£2,262.50	£2,262.50	£2,262.50	£4,281.75
ISCB Conference	£0.00	£0.00	£2,500.00	£0.00
Trainers	£0.00	£1,818.00	£2,000.00	£0.00
Subtotal	£2,262.50	£4,080.50	£6,762.50	£4,281.75

Other expenses

SCRs	£13,432.75	£13,432.75	£12,000.00	£23,436.09
Training portal license	£0.00	£0.00	£12,000.00	£15,517.00
Legal costs	£9,389.69	£9,389.69	£1,500.00	£0.00
Board development	£599.75	£599.75	£2,000.00	£2,108.25
Stationary + phones	£880.76	£880.76	£880.76	£898.92
Printing	£0.00	£0.00	£1500.00	£1,350
Travel	£203.00	£203.00	£203.00	£162.00
Subtotal	£24,505.95	£24,505.95	£30,083.76	£43,472.26

Total expenditure	£193,573.34	£193,283.86	£199,927.04	£215,638.17
--------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Income	£226,854.00	£172,200.00	£230,800.00	£220,800.00
Expenses	£193,573.34	£193,283.86	£199,927.04	£215,638.17
Balance	£33,280.66	-£21,083.86	£30,872.96	£5,161.83



CONCLUSIONS AND KEY MESSAGES

Our aim year on year is to make sure that children in Islington are best protected from harm. This can only be achieved through ensuring the right systems are in place, that agencies work well together for each individual child and family and we develop our learning culture.

We need to be constantly reflecting whether children in Islington are safe and, if not, what more can be done to reduce incidents of child maltreatment and intervene when children are at risk of suffering significant harm. We will continue to raise awareness within our local community that safeguarding children is everybody's business.

Key Messages for all partner agencies and strategic partners.

Partner agencies and strategic partners should:

- Support and champion staff to share and record information at the earliest opportunity, and proactively challenge decisions that fail to adequately address the needs of children and young people and their parents or carers.
- Make sure that help for parents and children is provided early in life and as soon as problems emerge so that children get the right help, at the right time.
- Ensure that the priority given to child sexual exploitation by the Safeguarding Board is reflected in organisational plans, and that partners play their part in the work of The Board's sub-groups.
- Ensure that work continues to address domestic abuse and that the evaluation of the local approach recognises the needs and risks to children and young people.
- Ensure work being undertaken to tackle neglect is evaluated and evidence of its impact on children and young people informs both strategic planning and service delivery.
- Ensure that substance misuse services continue to develop their role in respect of safeguarding children and young people and that greater evaluation is undertaken in regard to the links between parents and carers' substance misuse and the high number of children and young people at risk of significant harm.
- Focus on young people who may be at risk and vulnerable as a result of disabilities, caring responsibilities, radicalisation and female genital mutilation.
- Make sure that young people going into Adult Services for the first time get the help they need and that there is clarity about the different processes and timescales involved.
- Ensure that agencies commissioning and delivering services to adults with mental health issues need to ensure mechanisms are in place for the moni-

toring and reporting of their performance in respect of safeguarding children and young people.

- Ensure that performance information is developed, collected and monitored and that this is provided with a narrative that helps everyone understand how effective safeguarding services are.

Key Messages for Politicians, Chief Executives, Directors

Politicians, Chief executives and Directors should:

- Ensure their agency is contributing to the work of the Safeguarding Children Board and that it is given a high priority that is evident in the allocation of time and resources.
- Ensure that the protection of children and young people is consistently considered in developing and implementing key plans and strategies.
- Ensure the workforce is aware of their individual safeguarding responsibilities and that they can access LSCB safeguarding training and learning events as well as appropriate agency safeguarding learning.
- Ask how the voice of children and young people is shaping services and what evidence they have in relation to the impact it is having.
- Ensure the agency is meeting its duties under Sections 10 and 11 of the Children Act 2004 and that these duties are clearly understood and evaluated.
- Keep the Safeguarding Children Board

informed of any organisational restructures so that partners can understand the impacts on their capacity to safeguard children and young people in Islington.

- Ask questions about ethnicity, disability, gender to ensure strategic planning and that commissioning arrangements are sensitive to these issues.

Key Messages for the children and adult's workforce

Everyone who works with children, in a paid or voluntary capacity, should:

- Use safeguarding courses and learning events to keep themselves up to date with lessons learnt from research and serious case reviews to improve their practice.
- Should familiarise themselves with the role of the ISCB and *London's Child Protection Procedures*.
- Should subscribe to the Islington Safeguarding Board website and visit it regularly to keep up to date at www.islingtonscb.org.uk
- Ensure that they are familiar with and routinely refer to The Board's Threshold document and assessment procedures so that the right help and support is provided and that children and young people are kept safe.
- Should be clear about who their representative is on the Islington Safeguarding Children Board and use them to make sure the voices of children and young people and front-line practitioners are heard at The Board.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 – PRIVATE FOSTERING STANDARDS

Regulations above requires the Local Authority to comply with the following Standards.

Standard 1 – Statement on Private Fostering

- The Local authority has a written statement or plan, which sets out its duties and functions in relation to Private Fostering and the ways in which they will be carried out.

Standard 2 – Notification

- Promotes awareness of the notification requirements and ensures that those professionals who may come into contact with privately fostered children understand their role in notification;
- Responds effectively to notification; and
- Deals with situations where an arrangement comes to their attention, which has not been notified.

Standard 3 – Safeguarding and Promoting Welfare

- The local authority determines effectively the suitability of all aspects of the Private Fostering arrangement in accordance with the regulations.

Standard 4-6 – Advice and Support

- The Local Authority provides such ad-

vice and support to private foster carers and prospective foster carers as appears to the authority to be needed.

- Children who are privately fostered are able to access information and support when required so that their welfare is safeguarded and promoted. Privately fostered children are enabled to participate in decisions about their lives.
- The local authority provides advice and support to the parents of children who are privately fostered with in their area as appears to the authority to be needed.

Standard 7 – Monitoring and Compliance with Duties and Functions in relation to Private Fostering

- The local authority has in place and implements effectively a system for monitoring the way in which it discharges its duties and functions in relation to private fostering. It improves practice where this is indicated as necessary by the monitoring system

APPENDIX 2 – ISCB ATTENDANCE

Designation	Agency	May-16	Jul-16	Sep-16	Nov-16	Jan-17	Mar-17
ISCB Chair	ISCB						
ISCB Coordinator	ISCB						
ISCB Board Manager	ISCB			A			
Lay Member	Lay Member	A		A			
Lay Member	Lay Member						
Leader of Council	London Borough of Islington		Not expected				
Lead Member for Children's Services	London Borough of Islington	A				A	
Director, Children's Services	London Borough of Islington						
Director Youth and Community Services	London Borough of Islington						
Head of Community Safety	London Borough of Islington						
Head of Service, Early Help for Families	London Borough of Islington						D
Chief Executive	London Borough of Islington		A	A	A	A	A
Director TSCFS	London Borough of Islington						
Dir of Operations HASS	London Borough of Islington		A	A	A		
Ass Director Public Health	London Borough of Islington	A		A			A
Head of Pupil Services	London Borough of Islington				A	A	A
Safeguarding Q&A	London Borough of Islington	A					
Head of Early Years Service	London Borough of Islington			D	D		
Head Safeguarding Adults	London Borough of Islington			A	A		A
CCG Representative	Islington CCG	A		A	A		
Designated Nurse CP	Islington CCG						
Designated Paediatrician	Islington CCG					A	A
Named GP	Islington CCG						
Dir Nursing	NHS (London) England						
Chief Operating Officer	C&I Mental Health NHS			A			D
Deputy Director of Nursing	Whittington Health NHS	A	A	A		A	
Head of Nursing	Whittington Health NHS						
Head of Safeguarding	Whittington Health NHS	A		D	D	D	D
Director of Nursing	Moorfields Hospital NHS			A	A		D
London Ambulance Service	London Ambulance NHS						
Det. Superintendent	Metropolitan Police		D	A			
DCI	Metropolitan Police			D			
Head of Islington NPS	National Probation Service		A	A			A
Service Manager	CAFCASS				A		A
Voluntary Representative	Voluntary Representative						
Voluntary Representative	Voluntary Representative						
Deputy Headteacher	Secondary School Rep			A		A	A
Headteacher	Primary School Rep			A			
North London LIT	UK Border Agency	Attend as necessary					

