

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

Councillors Alexander, Engert, Reith (Chair), Stennett and Watson

Apologies Councillor Allison

Also Present: Councillor Solomon, Marion Wheeler, Tracey Hutchings, Wendy Tomlinson, Jennifer James, Denise Gandy, Chris Chalmers.

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
CPAC29	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Allison. Cllr Solomon attended the meeting in her place. Committee rules 46 and 47, Part 4 Section B of the Constitution were applied.</p>	
CPAC30	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>No items of urgent business were submitted.</p>	
CPAC31	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>There were no declarations of interests submitted.</p>	
CPAC32	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the minutes of the meeting held on the 13 September 2010 be agreed as an accurate record.</p> <p>That the word announced used to describe the recent inspection of the first response team be amended to read unannounced.</p>	AS
CPAC33	<p>MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>Progress on CRB checks for all new Councillors involved in Corporate Parenting and Safeguarding Advisory Committee. Noted that all CRB check forms had been distributed to members of the Corporate Parenting and Safeguarding Policy and Practice Panel. Some Councillors were now due to attend CRB meetings with Human Resources to complete the process. The Chair had written to both political party chief whips to request that completion of the CRB check process is prioritised by members. In considering this matter it was noted that councillors would only require one CRB check and two checks may only be applicable to some staff. Agreed that members note this information and speak with Human Resources should they be asked to complete an additional check.</p>	All to note

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

	<p>Update on the Director of Children’s Services planned meeting with the judiciary to discuss the delays in court care proceedings. Agreed that this item remain on the matters arising report until a significant update is received.</p> <p>Fostercare publicity materials – New materials had been created and were awaiting release following resolution of copyright issues and agreement from Lead member. There would also be a joint advertising campaign(dates to be confirmed) which would include the logo of the 5 boroughs working together as part of the North London Adoption and Fostering Consortium.</p> <p>LAC Events - The chair reiterated the need for officers to invite members of the Corporate Parenting and Safeguarding Policy &Practice Cabinet committees to future LAC events in good time.</p> <p>Development work on dealing with issues of isolation faced by young people leaving care -Agreed a report back to committee on this matter on the 24 January 2011.</p> <p>Change of name for Muswell House. Noted that this action was being progressed and there were no legal objections to changing the name of the Children’s Home to Coppets Road .Ofsted only required formal notification of the name change. The committee noted that the change of name would be applied when the new statement of purpose is launched this month.</p>	<p>AS</p> <p>All to note</p> <p>EC</p>
<p>CPAC34</p>	<p>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT : CHILDREN AND FAMILIES</p> <p>The committee received information on children in care national indicators together with key performance information as at the end of September 2010. The report further provided details of performance outturns for 2010 and the targets for 2010/11. The committee noted that the Government were undertaking a review of National Indicators and all statutory data returns and the committee would be kept informed of the changes agreed.</p> <p>We noted that for the month of September, 23 children became looked after and 22 children had ceased to be looked after. The number of care proceedings initiated in September 2010 was noted to be lower in comparison to September 09 figures. This indicated that early intervention practices were beginning to have an impact.</p> <p>Information was provided on neighbour comparator boroughs and the numbers of children in care. Haringey’s number of children in care was higher in comparison to statistical counterparts but the numbers were felt</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

	<p>to be stabilizing. It was important to note, when considering the lower number of LAC reported for both Hackney and Waltham Forest, that these boroughs had larger budgets for their children's service. Hackney Council had focused the majority of their budget and organisation of their service on early intervention. The committee noted that it was too early to forecast whether this strategy was successful but agreed that it would be useful to receive a presentation from Hackney Council, at a future meeting, on the focussed work of the children's service into early intervention to enable a view to be reached on its benefits and drawbacks. Further factors to note, when considering the figures of LAC in comparator boroughs, were; the level of thresholds adhered to by each borough, whether practices followed could be considered above scrutiny and whether the different strategies followed, to reduce the number of children in care, were suitable for use in Haringey. The committee learned about the work being completed by Waltham Forest on performance and asked if there was an opportunity for taking part in a cross borough initiative on service delivery.</p> <p>The Council had 20 children placed in care as a result of the Southwark Judgement (16/17 year olds declared as homeless). The committee were interested in finding out about: the case history of these children, whether they had been in past contact with services i.e. through the CAF process, if they had any siblings and their ages, if there were any other young members in their family, which part of the borough they had previously been located, their schooling history and if there were gang related issues involved. Analysis of this information would improve the Council's learning about when, where, and how these children could have been identified and supported at an earlier stage. Officers responded and agreed that there was now significant statistical information available on this group of young people to allow an analytical report to be devised and be put forward to committee addressing the above points. In considering this issue it was important to note the successful work of the Housing service in trying to get these young people home.</p> <p>Ethnic breakdown of children in care was provided and compared to the population census to provide a further understanding of the proportion of children in care according to their ethnicity and whether this correlated to the census figures. The committee noted the over representation of Black and Mixed Race children with White European children also at a disadvantage and asked how this was factored by services. Examples given were the EIA process which enables services to assess the effects of a key policy, strategy or existing service function may have on people depending on their ethnicity, disability, gender, age, religion and belief or sexual orientation and there were various community projects involving the voluntary sector which targeted support to young people and parents in the Black, Kurdish and Turkish communities. Members further questioned the ethnicity categories used in the report which, were quite broad and could encompass a number of different ethnic backgrounds in the borough and asked how information was disseminated. The committee learned that information on ethnicity from the census was interrogated to understand and meet the needs of the local population.</p>	<p>Chair/ DH</p> <p>DH/ WT</p> <p>CC</p>
--	---	--

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

Information on the ethnicity of children, supported by the C&YP service, was also provided to the DFE on a monthly basis so that, nationally, an understanding was built on the ethnicity of children most in need. The committee acknowledged the added complexities of deprivation, low aspiration, and social interaction in gangs which cut across ethnicity and was being factored by children's services and external agencies.

It was further reported that the largest proportion of children looked after were within the 10-15 age bracket and Members were informed of the age group of referrals in Haringey in comparison to the national average. Members were advised that the C&YP service would be undertaking analysis of this cohort of older children coming into care, as part of work on sufficiency, with findings to be reported to a later meeting of this committee.

AS

The committee considered the stability of placements of children in care and noted that 70% of children were placed outside of Haringey borough. A breakdown of placement types was provided to committee members. The highest number were placed with a foster carer and a significant majority of children looked after, for more than 2 years, were in out of borough placements. Members noted that 86% of children in care had received visits in their placements. The committee were assured that this was a good figure and scheduled visits were adhered to with postponements only made when there were extenuating circumstances involved. The committee learned that the Assistant Director for Children's services was completing investigatory exercise into children who had been subject to 3 placement moves. Analysis would be completed to understand the circumstances around the moves and what could have been done differently. The committee were further advised of the robust placement procedure in place which had checks in place to ensure that the carer and child were sufficiently supported and expectations about a placement set out at the start. These checks were designed to help ensure decisions made on placements were sustainable. The committee noted the typical difficult issues faced with placements such as: placing siblings together, dealing with parental interference, inexperienced carers, and housing issues. The committee agreed that a broader understanding was required by them on the location of placements termed as outside to the borough. The committee requested that a map is compiled with information on the location of all children in care placed outside of the borough by the Council and children in care placed in the borough by outside boroughs.

DH/
MW

The committee received an update on the continuing work to increase the number of in house foster carers. The committee noted that the placement service was continuing to build good relationships with agencies in order to increase placement options. A working agreement was being reached with the 4 North London boroughs of Barnet, Islington, Enfield, Camden, which was a result of this.

The committee noted that 10 children had been adopted in the year to

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

	<p>date which correlated with comparator borough figures and there was also an increase in the number of special guardianship orders being completed.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That a report on the children placed in the care of the Council, as part of the Southwark Judgement, be considered by the committee at their next meeting on the 24 January 2011. 2. That a map is compiled together with information on the location of all children in care placed outside of the borough by the Council and children in care placed in the borough by outside boroughs for consideration by the committee on 24 January 2011. 3. That the report be noted. 	<p>CC</p> <p>DH /MW</p>
<p>CPAC 35</p>	<p>OUTSIDE BOROUGH PLACEMENTS</p> <p>The committee received a report on the procedure and factors considered for placing looked after children in out of borough provisions. The committee learned that the needs of the child are assessed by the social worker and referral made to the placements team accordingly. Initially an in borough placement will be sought however if insufficient placements are available an out of borough placement will be investigated, with the school and contact with the Local Authority, a priority, as part of this search.</p> <p>The committee noted the criteria commonly referred to when an out of borough placement is a priority. Further positive reasons for placing children in out of borough placements were also set out in the report. This included providing a close ethnically matched family which was important for meeting the cultural needs of the child. The Council were recognised and commended for adherence to this policy. The committee were assured that this policy did not add delays to the placement process but was part of how the needs of a child were assessed.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the committee note the report.</p>	
<p>CPAC36</p>	<p>FORMATION OF THE CHILDREN IN CARE COUNCIL</p> <p>Following the Stocktake meeting with children and young people in care as specific Council had been established to provide a regular forum for</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

	<p>children and young people and care leavers to express their views about the issues that affect them.</p> <p>Two initial meetings had taken place with twelve young people attending. The group had agreed a name for the forum (Young and in Care) having 2 sub groups (one for children under 12 and another for older children, 13 and above), and a representative for the national forum. No younger children had attended the initial meetings and it was suggested to involve them and their foster carers in the Young and in Care council with service day activities. The children, attending these initial meetings, had expressed wanting a role in making things better for other children in care. Officers felt that the Council also had a responsibility in ensuring that, children attending these meetings, benefited by gaining skills in areas such as resilience. The next Young and in Care Council meeting was scheduled for 25th November at Compton Crescent. The children had shown a willingness to attend future meetings and also take part in a Corporate Parenting committee meeting. The children were interested in creating a magazine for their Council which the committee recommended could be electronic.</p> <p>The committee discussed providing a supporting role to the children in line with their corporate parenting role. Officers agreed to broach the idea of mentoring scheme with the Young and in Care Council.</p> <p>The committee welcomed the report and offered to attend a future meeting of the Young and in Care Council. Agreed that officers check the preference of the children at their next meeting on the 25th November.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the committee welcome and note the report.</p>	<p>JJ</p> <p>JJ</p>
<p>CPAC37</p>	<p>FOSTERCARE CONSORTIUM JOINT WORKING</p> <p>The committee considered a draft agreement which had been compiled between the London boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Haringey and Islington on forming a North London adoption and fostering consortium, NLAFC, to meet the fostering and adoption placement needs of North London children and young people. The agreement was the result of the 5 boroughs informally working together on foster care over a number of years. The agreement was not a legally binding contractual relationship between the NLAFC members but a document which set out how the five boroughs will work together on common interest areas such as training, publicity, shared placements and sharing panels on fostering and adoption. The consortium would also work in a cost effective way. The NLAFC programme manager would be employed and based in Haringey. The Council would make a reduced financial contribution to reflect the reasonable administration costs it incurs in</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

	<p>managing the finances of the NLAFC and producing annual statement of accounts. The committee noted that this agreement does not enable a joint procurement of services, this maybe a future objective, but allows the consortium to look at Independent Fostering Agency placements and the reasons why some boroughs make an increased financial contribution compared to others. It was likely that economies of scale can be developed further and more strongly in this area with the 5 boroughs working together.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the committee note the agreement. 2. That the work of the NLAFC consortium is a standing item on the matters arising report considered at each committee meeting. 3. That a follow up report be considered by the committee in 6 months time. 	<p>AS WT</p>
<p>CPAC38</p>	<p>TOTAL RESPECT TRAINING</p> <p>The committee considered the proposed dates for taking part in Total Respect training. The training would be with children and young people in care and would cover two working days with an additional half day follow up session. The committee considered the dates and requested that weekend dates are also compiled and added to this choice of dates for members to consider.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the full list of dates be circulated to members of the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee and Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee for consideration and attendance.</p>	<p>MW/ DH</p>
<p>CPAC39</p>	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That as items 12 – 15 contained exempt information (as defined in section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972(as amended by Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1985); paras 1&2: namely information relating to any individual, and information likely to reveal the identity of an individual.</p>	
<p>CPAC40</p>	<p>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT - APPENDIX 1</p> <p>The report provided information to the committee on the ethnicity of children in care, the numbers of children who had been subject to 3 or more placements in the last 12 months and the numbers of children coming into care by age and legal status.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

	<p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the committee note the report.</p>	
<p>CPAC41</p>	<p>MUSWELL HOUSE</p> <p>Further to previous meetings members received an update on staffing issues at Muswell House. The committee noted the evolving relationship between Muswell House and Tavistock and recognised that the input provided by them on mental health had been important to supporting work with the 16 and above age group.</p> <p>The committee learned that the assessment process was near formalisation but assessments were continuing and using the broad principles of the, to be agreed, assessment process.</p> <p>The updated guide to Muswell House would be launched on the 26 November 2010. Staff were exploring the idea of devising a DVD to go alongside the guide to introduce young people to the residence when they first arrive. Work was also continuing on finalising the formal procedures for Muswell house and there was support from a Council re-employee on these and record books.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the committee note the report.</p>	
<p>CPAC42</p>	<p>INDEPENDENT VISITOR REPORTS</p> <p>Regulation 33 visits were continuing with more councillors trained to participate and young people trained also to inspect the homes alongside the Placements officers and Councillors.</p> <p>The committee discussed the format of the report and agreed that it be revised to be shorter and accessible. The committee suggested a tabular format which would include the following: completed actions, outstanding issues, completed actions which required monitoring, daily and long term issues separated out, indications young people had been seen and spoken to on the visit, management response to actions and young people's reactions.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>1. That the committee note the report.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2010**

	2. That the report format be revised for the next meeting and include information as detailed in the above paragraph.	WT
CPAC43	CHILD SAFEGUARDING The committee were informed that the Children and Young People's service was preparing for the next announced Ofsted inspection of the Safeguarding service which was due in January 2011. The committee noted that, with an announced visit, the Local Authority would be given a notice period prior to the inspection.	
CPAC44	ANY OTHER BUSINESS Items for the next meeting on January 24 2011.	
	1. Progress report on the status of actions arising from participation in the London Pledge.	CC
	2. Report on the use and access of social network sites for CiC.	CC
	3. Developmental work on dealing with issues of isolation faced by young people leaving care.	EC
	4. Report on children placed in care in Haringey as a result of the Southwark Judgement. (Please see CPAC 34)	CC
	5. A map with information indicating the location of children in care placed outside of the borough by the Council and children placed in the borough by other boroughs.	MW /DH
	6. Muswell House update	WT
	7. Independent visitor reports	WT

Cllr Lorna Reith

Chair