

Helen Jones

020 8489 2615

020 8489 2660

Helen.jones@haringey.gov.uk

16 February 2009

**Special Overview & Scrutiny Committee, 17 February 2009**

Please find attached the answers to advance submitted questions relating to the following agenda item:

- 6. ACTION PLAN IN RESPONSE TO THE JOINT AREA REVIEW OF SAFEGUARDING IN HARINGEY (PAGES 1 - 18)**

Yours sincerely

Helen Jones  
Principal Committee Coordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

Page no. in full agenda pack	Question	Response
<p>Page 3</p>	<p><b>Questions from Cllr David Winskill</b></p> <p>Please list the membership of the project board.</p>	<p><b>Haringey Council</b></p> <p>Peter Lewis – Director, Children &amp; Young People’s Service            Janette Karikins – Deputy Director, Standards and Inclusion            Ian Bailey – Deputy Director, Business Support and Development            Jan Doust – Head of Children’s Networks            Rachel Oakley – Service Manager, Children and Families            Tim Dauncey – Interim Director, Special Projects            Haydee Nunes de Souza - Acting Senior Lawyer, Social Care Team            Jean Croot – Head of Safer Communities            Linda James – YOS Strategic Manager            Tom Fletcher – Children’s Networks Development Officer</p> <p><b>Health Services</b></p> <p>Penny Thompson – Interim Deputy Chief Executive, Haringey PCT            Prof. Judith Ellis - Director of Nursing, Education &amp; Workforce Development, GOSH            Jane Elias – Director of Operations, GOSH Partnership Services            Jane Lithgow – Director of CAMHS, BEH Mental Health Trust</p> <p><b>Police</b></p> <p>Chief Superintendent Dave Grant – Haringey Borough Commander            Detective Superintendent Reg Hooke – CAIT, MPS            Detective Chief Inspector Richard Henson – CAIT, MPS            Ian Kibblewhite - Acting Chief Inspector for Partnership and Youth</p>

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

		<p><b>Schools</b> James Lane – Headteacher, Welbourne Primary School Keith Horrell – Headteacher, Blanche Neville School Tony Hartney – Headteacher, Gladesmore Community School Peter Catling – Head of Centre, Woodlands Park Children’s Centre</p> <p>Many of the above are also members of the LSCB and its SCR Sub-Group and have been able to link back into those groups as the work has developed.</p>
Page 3	On the director’s arrival, was he happy with the membership, modus operandi and work in progress of the Board? If not what changes were made?	Yes, he was.
Page 4	“Thresholds for intervention”: how will these be modified and on what basis (national, professional guidance?).	Work is taking place to compare our thresholds with those of similar Las and referenced against the Pan-London Child Protection Procedures.
	Criticism has been made that the existing system is too process driven with “output” being secondary. Has this concern been addressed in the report?	Issues about the processes and securing effective outcomes are addressed throughout Theme 2 “Delivering best Practice”. Systems are being re-designed to ensure that social workers have the maximum time to work directly with families.
Page 5	Reference is made to “volatile public finances”. Please expand on this.	This expression is not used in the Action Plan.
Page 5	While acknowledging the “virtuous circle” described in the paragraph, does the lead member acknowledge that there is	High quality workers, properly supported, managed and supervised are the best chance of delivering the best outcomes for our children. That is what we seek to put in place.

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	<p>a “chicken and egg” problem to be overcome first! For performance to improve, high quality workers must be in place.</p>	
<p>Page 9</p>	<p>Reference is made to “relevant” elected members: we are all corporate parents, what is a relevant member?</p>	<p>The Criminal Records Bureau administers the disclosure of information to employers in accordance with the terms of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974. The Council is permitted to apply for disclosure of information only if the position is specified in the categories provided by the Act. The CRB have advised the Council that a blanket approach to elected Members is not within the terms of the legislation. It is therefore proposed to conduct a risk assessment of all elected Members against the categories provided by the CRB. A short questionnaire has been developed and will be distributed to all Members. The responses to the questions will be assessed by the Council’s lead Counter signatory, the Assistant Chief Executive (People &amp; OD) against the categories to assess applicability. Applications for disclosure will be made thereafter.</p>
<p>Page 9</p>	<p>“Promote a culture of openness”. Are there other models of good practice that have been considered?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Page 10</p>	<p>Please give details of the Children in Care council: how are members selected, how often does it meet etc?</p>	<p>Children in Care Councils (CICC) were originally proposed in the White Paper ‘Care Matters: Time for Change’ (July 2007) since when a number of LAs have done work to develop them. We have looked at some of the examples to see what would be most appropriate for Haringey. The Government suggests that the Director and Lead Member should be part of the CICC with no more than 2 members of the Senior Management Team. The White Paper also suggests that</p>

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –**  
**17 FEBRUARY 2009**

		<p>children in care from across the whole range of categories by which they come to be in care should be represented. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unaccompanied asylum seeking children</li><li>• Disabled children</li><li>• Fostered children</li><li>• Those in residential units</li><li>• Those on semi-independent schemes</li><li>• An ex-care leaver</li><li>• Children placed out of borough; and covering...</li><li>• All age groups (including young children)</li></ul> <p>These young people should be voted onto the CICC. As can be seen, this will be a complex and sensitive matter to deal with and we will take time and care to make sure we get it right. Meetings in other places are generally on a quarterly basis, but we can decide for ourselves. We will also need to be clear about how this CICC will link in with other groups and partners and consult properly with the young people themselves on how they wish to proceed.</p>
--	--	---

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –**  
**17 FEBRUARY 2009**

<p>Page 20</p>	<p>The quality of GP practices in the Borough varies enormously: will training be made mandatory for all GPs? Will train extend to nurseries in the private sector?</p>	<p>General Practitioners &amp; their staff are subject to the same requirement to train &amp; comply with local &amp; national safeguarding procedures as staff employed by the Council or Local Authority. That requirement is reflected in both individual GP terms &amp; conditions &amp; the NHS practice contracts. The PCT provides in-house training for GPs &amp; practice staff. To date, the PCT has monitored compliance by GPs through annual appraisal and by practices through the contract review &amp; “Annual Health Check” processes.</p> <p>The Action Plan includes a recommendation to define &amp; implement the role of the General Practitioner. In addition, the PCT proposes to establish a separate process of annual accreditation of all practices against safeguarding standards. Failure to achieve that accreditation will be regarded as a breach of terms &amp; conditions. This proposal will be implemented through the leadership of GP members of the PCT’s Clinical Executive and by the establishment of local GP leads for safeguarding. It has been fully supported by the Local Medical Committee (GP’s representative association)</p> <p>Training is provided to all OFSTED registered childcare settings, including child-minders.</p>
----------------	---	--

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

Page 22	Identify how social workers can be supported to spend more time doing “social work”. Please expand on this and tell the Committee of any initial ideas how this might be achieved.	The section on ‘Delivering Best Practice’ addresses many aspects of the processes and procedures in use in order to improve workflow and reduce the bureaucratic burden on social workers. We have already recruited additional admin, staff to help with the more routine tasks that do not require a social worker’s professional skills or perspective and will continue to refine those supports to give social workers the space to do what they do best – work with families.
Page 28	Irrespective of the notional “establishment number of staff” what would the new director consider to be an adequate number of staff that would allow them to deliver a professional service with realistic caseloads and enough “slack” to cope with unforeseen spikes in demand.	Work to determine the number of social workers we need is on-going. This requires that we complete a detailed analysis of cases and their relative complexity – obviously, not all cases require the same amount of time to be spent on them. Therefore, a social worker with the most complex cases will inevitably have fewer of them.
Page 41	Has Haringey considered paying Inner London weighting to Social workers?	Yes.



**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –**  
**17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	<p>There is a wealth of new ideas, revised practices and other interventions listed in the report, the vast bulk of which are scheduled to be in place or adopted by the end of 2009. What day to day challenges will the process of change bring to the provision of an effective and timely CP regime and how will those challenges be met?</p>	<p>We have already started with some of the changes and are determined that we will deliver what is set out in the Plan. The challenges are significant and demanding. However, with new political and officer leadership, with additional senior management capacity and better systems in place, we will do what we say in the Plan.</p>
<p><b>Questions from Cllr Ron Aitken</b></p>		
<p>Page 3</p>	<p>What will be the annual cost of the new Children’s Trust and how much money will each of the participating agencies contribute?</p>	<p>Since the Children’s Trust will replace the Children and Young People Strategic Partnership Board, there are no additional costs attached to the support and meeting costs. As the Trust develops, there may be some different costs that will be shared between the partners.</p>
	<p>In the light of the failings identified by both Lord Laming and the Serious Case Review of the Baby P case, and the findings of the JAR ordered by the Secretary of State does the Cabinet Member/Leader of the Council accept that Haringey Children’s Services is institutionally incompetent?</p>	<p>No.</p>

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	<p>Will there be a review of the policy of placing children at risk with “informal carers” rather than recognised foster carers?</p>	<p>All policy will be reviewed as we develop the Children’s Trust and related services. The whole area of policy and practice around informal and kinship carers is under review.</p>
	<p>How many foster carers does Haringey employ? How much are they paid? How many foster carers in Haringey foster children for other Boroughs and can the committee have a breakdown of the number employed by each Borough and how much they are paid by each London Borough?</p>	<p>Haringey has 141 of our own foster-carers. At the time of writing, we have 171 children with in-house foster carers and 143 placed with agency carers. We pay our own foster carers between £364 and £422 a week. We do not know the precise number of children placed with foster carers in Haringey by other Boroughs but have been notified of 172 children placed by other authorities. It is not possible to be more precise in the context of this answer since new placements are being made all the time and placements are either terminated or breakdown – there is always some time-lag in being notified by the other Boroughs.</p>
	<p>The Action Plan emphasises “Partnership Working”. When the Police and Social Workers disagree about whether to take a child into care, which agencies and individuals and by what mechanism will such disputes be resolved.</p>	<p>There are escalation procedures in every agency for when disagreement occurs. The lead ultimately to the Director (or equivalent) of each agency who will ultimately decide. However, where the multi-agency meetings are effective and gather full information, robustly analyse and reach sound decisions effectively, escalation will be unnecessary.</p>
<p><b>Questions from Cllr Karen Alexander</b></p>		
	<p>Have Haringey Council looked at other Children’s’ Services around the country and other London Boroughs to see who have achieved best practice and on which best practice models could be</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –**  
**17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	based?	
	How are Haringey addressing the problem of the shortage of social workers? Is the cabinet member for the Children’s’ Service having discussions with the govt to pay Haringey social workers inner London weighting allowance which they don’t currently get? Which other measures can be used to attract social workers to the service in Haringey?	The current vacancy rate (number of posts unfilled) is 3%. That is not unusual for a London Borough. However, a large number of posts are populated by Agency staff. It is to these posts that we want to recruit – and retain – permanent staff. Our best chance of doing so is to create the best possible working environment for those social workers – which is what Themes 2 and 3 address.
Page 2	I appreciate that the financial plan is still under development but where will the additional resources/funding to support this plan come from? Is it likely that they will they come from the DCSF or will Haringey have to find the additional resources from their own budget?	The Director of CYPs is responsible for bringing forward a budget proposal to the Lead Member who will present that to Council. When that is ready, the Council will determine how any costs will be met. There is already financial support (and other support) from the DCSF and discussions continue with all parties and partners on the way forward.
Page 5	“As performance improves.....” What sort of timescale is anticipated to get to the point where this has been achieved?	Performance improvement starts now. The Plan states our ambition to be an exemplar of good practice within 3 years and the performance improvements to get us there will be significant. We are committed to make them. Improvements must be well embedded in a confident and authoritative practice culture across all agencies if they are to be sustainable and enduring.
Page 8	To what extent has Haringey Council	Haringey complied with all the Laming requirements in implementation

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	<p>failed to comply with the Laming recommendations and what strategies are in place to ensure that these recommendations are complied with in the future?</p>	<p>of the Laming Report. The November 2008 Urgent JAR found that some had not been maintained and these are addressed in the Plan.</p>
<p>Page 12</p>	<p>Please provide a brief summary of the proposals for a model for a Children's Trust including where best practice is drawn from?</p>	<p>Section 10 of the Children's Act 2004 sets out the duty to co-operate to improve the well being of children by local authorities and their partners. The term Children's Trust applies to the whole system of children's services covering the work of partner agencies at every level, from the development of overall strategy to the delivery of front line services. It is not a separate organisation in its own right. Each partner retains its own responsibilities while working together to join up services.</p> <p>Key Issues to be considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are two models being used in local government for strategic interagency governance of a Children's Trust :</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaboration between partners, defined as governance and policy enacted by the various statutory bodies with the council and Health as the accountable bodies based upon a duty to cooperate using section 31 of the Health Act 1999.</li> <li>2. Partnership governed by legal agreement defined as governance and policy enacted through a children's trust board through a legal agreement.</li> </ol> <p>What are the proposed key roles undertaken by the Trust?</p>

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 17 FEBRUARY 2009**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The key leadership roles include the managing of pilot initiatives, joint commissioning, co-ordinating and managing changes in delivery mechanisms. There is a critical role in building and strengthening working relationships between agencies which meet the objectives of the Trust</li> <li>• The need for joint planning requires the identification of budgets available for children’s services from social care, education, health and other agencies. These can be pooled through legal agreements or aligned through sharing information on resources and spending to aid the development of fully costed plans.</li> <li>• Joint commissioning of children’s services is a key factor in strengthening the integrated working of agencies and redesigning services for children.</li> </ul> <p>Where is best practice drawn from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research into other LA’s children trusts</li> <li>• Evaluation of Children Trusts Pathfinders Report March 2007 – DCSF</li> <li>• Statutory Guidance on inter agency co-operation - DCSF</li> </ul>
Page 12	How will the membership of the Children’s’ Trust be made up?	This is still under consideration as it will depend upon the model agreed for the Children’s Trust. The collaborative model may probably have a wider membership than the partnership through legal entity as this latter option will identify key responsibilities and accountabilities and decision making powers for members agreed via legal documents.

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 17 FEBRUARY 2009**

Page 14	How will the council identify best practice and where will it draw this information from?	Best practice is identified by reference to proven best practice models gathered by organisations such as the IDeA, GOL, OFSTED, Audit Commission, C4EO, CSCI (as was) and other researchers. We will continue to look at these as new research and reports emerge to make sure we keep pace with the improvements being made across the country.
Page 19	Please define “dangerous” housing.	The word “dangerous” does not appear in the Plan at all.
Page 20	Can you provide a brief explanation of the MACIE methodology please?	<p>Yes. Multi Agency Critical Incident (MACIE) Training is an immersive learning package devised by the Leadership Academy of the Metropolitan Police and delivered to Child Protection Professionals from the Police and key partner agencies.</p> <p>The course was originally devised after the death of Victoria Climbié and has subsequently been revised and updated with the help of safeguarding partners. It addresses the recommendations from the first Laming enquiry, the Bichard report and Every Child Matters.</p> <p>Training is delivered over two days, using the “Hydra” system of linked computers to work through a scenario which addresses the abuse of a number of children and calls for “real time” decision making and partnership work. Whilst creating a “safe learning environment”, it also seeks to stretch and challenge those attending and provides the opportunity for them to demonstrate the skills and experience brought from their respective professions.</p> <p>Delegates are drawn from Child Social Care, Police, Education and Health and throughout the course are given the opportunity to work in “single profession” and in “joint working” teams in order to maximise</p>

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

		opportunities for learning and the exchange of experience and perspective.
Page 33	3 yearly evaluation of provision in schools – why as long as 3 years? Is this often enough?	A 3-yearly cycle mirrors the cycle for inspection of schools by OFSTED. It also reflects the statutory timescale for training for different categories of school staff - some have to be trained on induction, others 2-yearly and others 3-yearly.
Page 47	Please outline the proposed membership of this cross-party expert member panel.	3 Majority Party Members, 2 Minority Party Members and an independent member with safeguarding expertise and experience.
Page 47	Will Ofsted undertake more regular monitoring visits bearing in mind the events of the past few months?	OFSTED will return in June 2009 to monitor progress against the Plan and to make sure that all urgent issues have been addressed.
Page 49	Please give brief details of how hard to reach groups/diverse communities are to be made aware of the partnership's safeguarding policies.	We will communicate to everyone in the Borough the work of our safeguarding services by any and all means available or necessary. Through meetings, publications and consultation events, we aim to make sure everyone knows what is going on. We also liaise with the Voluntary & Community Sector via Community Links to reach all sections of the community. The publicity attached to this Scrutiny is an important part of raising the profile of safeguarding.
<b>Questions from Cllr Gail Engert</b>		
	There are 142 actions in our response to the JAR. a) How will all of these be effectively monitored and how will progress be communicated to members? b) Considering the number of actions,	a) Each of the actions is part of an implementation plan either in its own right or grouped along with related actions. Monitoring of progress is built into that implementation plan. The NHS Haringey Board will have procedures in place to monitor the effectiveness of its own services, as will the LSCB for its area of responsibility. The Council's Scrutiny

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	<p>how will these be prioritized to ensure the most vital failings are addressed first? c) Is the service able to cope with the extra workload these actions will create and what extra resources will be needed? d) I understand that over £1 million extra has been earmarked for children's services in the budget - is this enough? e) When will the core children's services budget be confirmed?</p>	<p>function will monitor overall effectiveness. These will need to be carefully constructed so that there is no unnecessary overlap or duplication. Progress will be communicated to all Members through published reports.</p> <p>b) Prioritisation has taken place and is reflected in the timescales alongside each action in the Plan. Urgent items have already been actioned and are either dealt with or being dealt with.</p> <p>c) The Services (not just the Councils) are tackling the workload and related issues. The amount of extra resources is yet to be determined and is contingent on the Secretary of State confirming the Plan. If changes need to be made, then the costings may also change.</p> <p>d) As above, until costings are finalised we will not know the answer to that question.</p> <p>e) As above</p>
<p>Pages 7 and 10</p>	<p>Who is writing the terms of reference for the Children's Trust Executive Performance Monitoring Group, the Corporate Parenting Group and the Safeguarding Policy and Practice Panel? Will there be member discussion of these terms of reference before they are finalised?</p>	<p>Terms of Reference are being drafted by Officers across all organisations, including the LSCB, for consideration by Members.</p>



**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	<p>How will we continue to scrutinize our external partners' role in safeguarding to ensure all are working together effectively?</p>	<p>There will be collective scrutiny by all partners within the Children's Trust. The LSCB is part of the Children's Trust arrangements and has responsibility for ensuring the effectiveness of all agencies in discharging their safeguarding duties. Further to that, the Safeguarding Policy and Practice Panel will scrutinise the quality of work on a regular basis and make comments and/or recommendations to the Lead Member and Director of CYPS. The Director has statutory powers that may be used, if necessary, to secure the cooperation of partners in delivering appropriate safeguarding services. However, the commitment of partners is evident in the work to produce this Plan and bodes well for the future. All will be involved in monitoring and scrutinising progress and the HSP will be instrumental in agreeing shared values and commitment.</p>
<p>Page 9</p>	<p>Who will decide which members are relevant to be CRB checked given that all members are corporate parents?</p>	<p>The Criminal Records Bureau administers the disclosure of information to employers in accordance with the terms of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974. The Council is permitted to apply for disclosure of information only if the position is specified in the categories provided by the Act. The CRB have advised the Council that a blanket approach to elected Members is not within the terms of the legislation. It is therefore proposed to conduct a risk assessment of all elected Members against the categories provided by the CRB. A short questionnaire has been developed and will be distributed to all Members. The responses to the questions will be assessed by the Council's lead Counter signatory, the Assistant Chief Executive (People &amp; OD) against the categories to assess applicability. Applications for disclosure will be made thereafter.</p>
<p>Page 18</p>	<p>Will the use of Contact Point mean more time is spent by Social Workers inputting</p>	<p>No.</p>

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –  
17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	data rather than out in the field?	
Page 19	If the revision of thresholds is not complete until December 2009, what happens in the meantime? Who will be informed about the thresholds outside of the specialist services?	We continue to use the agreed thresholds pending completion of the review. The review of thresholds is one of the first actions the Director took on taking up his post and we expect that this review will be complete by the end of May. The new thresholds will be considered by all partners in the Children’s Trust and the LSCB.
Page 27	If Screening Officers are being used to filter referrals instead of a Duty Officer, what training will they receive and what qualifications will they have to make sure they make the right decisions?	Screening Officers are trained and are recruited on the basis of having the appropriate skill set to be able to do the job effectively and safely. They are managed by highly trained and experienced social workers.
<b>Questions from Cllr Robert Gorrie – although submitted within the timeframe for an oral response only, written answers have been provided as follows:</b>		
Page 2	5.1 Of the covering report refers to consultation... and suggests the plan has been prepared without talking to any of children in care, children at risk, parents of either, or the residents or Haringey... or as far as I am aware the elected Members of the Council. Why not?	In the time available, it has not been possible to undertake the usual pattern of consultation that we would have hoped. Development of the Plan by the Project Board has taken 7 weeks to get it to a point where it can be published for discussion by the Scrutiny Panel. For a document of such importance and complexity, this is very rapid. As it moves beyond this Scrutiny, it will continue to develop as issues change and we identify even more opportunity for improvement. There will be ongoing discussion and consultation with a broad range of stakeholders.
	When will there be clarity on the proposed additional staff and therefore resources that will be necessary to	April 2009.

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	deliver this plan?	
	What determines the timescale of the plan? Where are the bottlenecks and pinch points in delivering the resourcing and actions....? Easy to say it is resources but is the Directors diary a constraint or the schedule of Council meetings or...	The timescales in the Plan are determined by the professional judgements of the authors who come from all partners across the Borough. The timescales are all verified in the much more detailed project plan(s) and schedules that sit underneath this Plan. Work is still taking place to ensure that the tasks allocated to each individual or team are/will be properly resourced and are achievable. All of the actions have signed up commitment from all partners.
Page 3	What sanctions will the Executive Performance Monitoring Group have on the organisations whose performance they are monitoring? Who will determine and be responsible for the level and deployment of the resources needed to improve performance where it is below target?	The Director of CYPs is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all services cooperate in the delivery of safeguarding across the Borough. He has the power to require any partner to cooperate in that endeavour.
	Who proof read the covering document? 10.1.4 "comes together". 10.3.2 "freeze social workers" 10.7.1 Last sentence missing a "we".	This is a minor and inconsequential issue since the proof-reading before transmission to the Secretary of State is yet to happen.
Page 4	Given the extent of all the actions necessary and improvements that the plan is intended to deliver how would you, as the new Director coming in from outside, describe the current state of	Coming new to the Borough, my observation is of a Children's Service where many things are done well and some in need of urgent and lasting improvement. This Plan addresses the latter point.

**ADVANCE WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –**  
**17 FEBRUARY 2009**

	<p>Children’s Services in the Borough?          Presumably 10.3.1 indicates you currently have the wrong people in the wrong place at the wrong time?</p>	
<p>Page 5</p>	<p>10.5.1 "shared budgets" which will then be set overall by who.... and whose value for money will be determined by who.... and whose effective delivery will be the responsibility of which named and identified individual?</p>	<p>Arrangements around shared budgets are carefully negotiated to ensure that they are sufficient, effectively managed and provide good value for money. VFM is usually taken to be on the basis that we get a better service (or more of a high quality service) than we would have done by spending the money separately. Shared budget arrangements identify who is responsible for them. The Children’s Trust will be the principal; vehicle for setting up and managing these. Ultimately, it is the Lead Member and Director of CYPs who have to be satisfied that the arrangements are acceptable.</p>