

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 24 JANUARY 2011**

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

Apologies Councillor Peacock

Also Present: Councillor Brabazon, Attracta Craig, Denise Gandy, Wendy Tomlinson, Debbie Haith, Emma Cummergen, Arzu Kaya, Jennifer James.

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
CPAC45.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY)</p> <p>An apology for absence was received from Cllr Peacock.</p>	
CPAC46.	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no items of urgent business.</p>	
CPAC47.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
CPAC48.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the minutes of the meeting on 11 November 2010 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
CPAC49.	<p>MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>Update on Director of Children Services planned meeting with judiciary to discuss delays in court care proceedings: it was updated that this meeting was scheduled to go ahead today.</p> <p>Development work on dealing with the issues of isolation faced by young people leaving care: agreed that this be added to the agenda for the March meeting of the Committee.</p> <p>Regular update on Foster Care Consortium joint working: it was updated that the scope had been extended to a North London Fostering and Adoption consortium covering 5 boroughs. The primary focus remained recruitment of foster carers through a collective advertising approach including the use of Facebook etc to direct people to the dedicated consortium website at www.fosteringnorthlondon.co.uk for further information. Other prospective avenues being investigated were hosting coffee morning information sessions in conjunction with Starbucks and running an advert in the Metro newspaper. A series of information sessions were also scheduled to run within the boroughs within the next few months and the Communications Team at the Council was continuing work to improve the website and future</p>	Clerk

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 24 JANUARY 2011**

	<p>campaigns. Confirmation was provided that prospective carers could make contact through both the Council and the consortium websites. Members emphasised that it would be useful in the future to be able to compare expressions of interest for fostering received directly by the Council and the Consortium and also examine conversion rates from enquiries to approval.</p> <p>In response to a query, it was confirmed that an additional future area of work for the Consortium would be foster carer and agency rates, with a dedicated post in place to examine the variability of fees charged across the boroughs with a view to achieving greater parity. The Committee requested an update on this piece of work once completed.</p> <p>Assurances were sought on the commitment of boroughs to the Consortium approach. It was confirmed that a Memorandum of Understanding was in place and financial contributions provided by each borough. Work was also underway to set objectives and success criteria for the Consortium to allow progress monitoring. A business plan for improving the Council's fostering service was also being developed including identification of targets and timescales.</p> <p>Opportunities for cross borough initiative with LB Waltham Forest on service delivery: it was updated that a collective piece of work was underway with six other North/North East London boroughs on the procurement of supported lodging accommodation. A new tender would be issued as part of the project within the next few months with a view to a new contract being in place by the end of spring. The Committee emphasised the importance of quantifying the savings to be realised from this piece of work. It was confirmed that more mainstream housing procurement for Looked After Children (LACs) would be through Strategic and Community Housing service.</p> <p>Young and In Care Council: the young people on the Council had expressed interest in introducing a mentoring scheme once the body was more established. They were also interested in working with CPAC (Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee) and invited members of the Committee to attend one of their meetings at the end of the spring term.</p> <p>Total respect training: a list of dates had been circulated including a number scheduled at weekends.</p> <p>Regulation 33 reports: the new report format was now in use.</p> <p>Hackney Council presentation on early intervention work: the Chair advised that she had met with the Chair of the Safeguarding Policy and Practice Advisory Committee and had agreed that issues could be referred between the two sister bodies in accordance with their respective remits. As the Hackney Council presentation would relate to safeguarding, the Committee agreed to formally refer the item to the Safeguarding Committee with CPAC members to attend if they wished. It was also agreed that the two Committees should have at least one joint meeting a year.</p>	<p>Wendy Tomlinson</p> <p>Wendy Tomlinson</p> <p>Wendy Tomlinson</p> <p>Wendy Tomlinson</p> <p>Clerk Clerk</p>
--	---	--

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 24 JANUARY 2011**

	<p>operational group sitting below CPAC to allow arrangements to be put in place to reaffirm the collective responsibility for corporate parenting across the organisation.</p> <p>In relation to communicating with LACs on the Council's role as a corporate parent, it was confirmed that work would be undertaken with a group of young people to distil the finalised Strategy into an easily understandable format. The Committee also asked for a progress update on the development of a leaflet for LACs setting out the Council's corporate parenting role, the role of Members and of CPAC which had been requested at a previous meeting.</p>	<p>Chris Chalmers</p>
<p>CPAC51.</p>	<p>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: CHILDREN AND FAMILIES</p> <p>The Committee considered the performance management monitoring data for the Children and Families service for October and November which included Children in Care (CiC) national indicators.</p> <p>It was advised that some recent stabilisation of CiC levels had been observed, with a pattern of more children leaving care than entering over the last few months. A question was raised on the reason for the disparity shown in rates of CiC across nearest statistical neighbour boroughs, with Haringey showing a higher than average level. It was advised that feedback received from Ofsted reaffirmed that the Council were looking after the right children and that Haringey's rate had historically been higher than most statistical neighbours even pre Baby P. There was some anecdotal evidence this might be due to the placement of large families although this wasn't routinely monitored to allow benchmarking across boroughs.</p> <p>It was advised that review work was ongoing in relation to placement stability as a key factor detrimentally impacting on LACs. In order to provide the Committee with further information, it was proposed that a Senior Independent Review Officer be invited to give a presentation to a future meeting setting out their role and outlining changes to be introduced from April including the requirement to produce an annual report.</p> <p>The Committee requested an update on adoption and permanency performance at a future meeting and the reason for associated delays in the process.</p> <p>It was commented that performance in relation to young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs) appeared to have plateaued over time. It was advised that targeted work was planned in this area including a joint project with Spurs, a number of employers and other boroughs to provide a focussed, collective approach to reducing the level of NEETs. It was also noted that the Southwark Judgement had impacted on the number of young people in this cohort.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Debbie Haith</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 24 JANUARY 2011**

<p>CPAC52.</p>	<p>CHILDREN PLACED IN CARE IN HARINGEY AS A RESULT OF THE SOUTHWARK JUDGEMENT</p> <p>The Committee considered the above report outlining the impact of legal changes to the way 16/17 year olds who are in need of housing and support are managed. Duties under the Children Act 1989 now take priority over homelessness duties under housing legislation for this vulnerable group of young people.</p> <p>The Council has developed a joint protocol between Children’s and Strategic Housing services in order to clarify the roles and responsibilities for the provision of accommodation for 16/17 year olds presenting as homeless. Housing services undertake the first assessment to establish homelessness and then refer to Children’s Services for initial assessment as necessary. A Homesafe Team was established a year ago to work with and assess homeless 16/17 year olds where the Southwark Judgement applied. To date, 162 young people have been referred to the service and the rate is increasing.</p> <p>In response to a question as to whether young people received starter packs once accommodation had been found, it was confirmed that this depended on which legislation was applied – under the current tendered accommodation used by Children’s Services, providers offered starter packs although it was acknowledged quality varied. For young people where homelessness legislation applied thereby meaning the young person entered temporary accommodation, starter packs were not generally provided although they would be eligible for the floating support and Connexions services provided for mainstream temporary accommodation. The tendering exercise underway for Children’s Services supported accommodation would assist in ensuring greater consistency in service offer from providers.</p> <p>The Committee considered that work in relation to this vulnerable group of young people be included as an objective under the Corporate Parenting Strategy and a working group established to provide focussed work including development of early warning arrangements. It was proposed that this area of work would be more fitting for the Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee and that it be considered at a future joint meeting of the Committees.</p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>CPAC53.</p>	<p>SAFEGUARDING LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN , YOUNG PEOPLE, AND CARE LEAVERS WHEN SUPPORTING AND ENABLING THEM TO ACCESS INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY</p> <p>Due to time constraints, it was agreed that this item be deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<p>CPAC54.</p>	<p>ASSESSMENT OF HARINGEY’S PROGRESS WITH THE LONDON PLEDGE</p> <p>Due to time constraints, it was agreed that this item be deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<p>CPAC55.</p>	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 24 JANUARY 2011**

	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That as items 12 to 14 contained exempt information (as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government 1972; namely information likely to reveal the identity of an individual, and information relating to any individual) members of the press and public should be excluded from the remainder of the meeting.</p>	
<p>CPAC56.</p>	<p>STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR COPPETS ROAD CHILDREN'S HOME</p> <p>The Committee were advised that a statement of purpose had been drafted for the relaunched Muswell House in line with the statutory duty. The Home would transition from a generic unit to a short term assessment unit. It was intended that the Home would ultimately offer a preventative service for placements at risk and take emergency admissions.</p> <p>The Committee considered that a maximum length stay be identified within the statement of purpose to reflect the shift towards being a short term assessment centre.</p> <p>It was advised that any further comments from Committee members should be submitted by 11 February to the Head Of Service, Commissioning & Placements.</p>	<p>Wendy Tomlinson</p>
<p>CPAC57.</p>	<p>INDEPENDENT VISITOR REPORTS</p> <p>The Committee considered an update on the Regulation 33 visits carried out on the two main Children's Homes within the borough. It was noted that a new report template was being used to highlight and track ongoing recommendations from independent visitor inspections and the association management action or response.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about certain issues being highlighted on a regular basis during Regulation 33 visits, thereby not appearing to be actioned as appropriate, for example some ongoing repair issues. It was felt that staff within the homes should be taking more responsibility for escalating repair issues appropriately and it was agreed that a system of prioritisation be introduced to allow categorisation of repairs/ faults to allow the identification of reasonable timescales within which remedial work be completed. It was also requested that clear end dates be established for completion of all management action required arising from recommendations.</p> <p>It was advised a review was underway into the allowance policy for CiC centred around providing a range of allowances depending on the situation of the child. It was agreed that these proposals be submitted for future consideration by the Committee.</p> <p>The Chair expressed serious concern about the ongoing delays in obtaining the registration certificate for the manager of Muswell House. An explanation of the source of the delays was requested.</p>	<p>Wendy Tomlinson Wendy Tomlinson</p> <p>Wendy Tomlinson</p> <p>Wendy Tomlinson</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 24 JANUARY 2011**

CPAC58.	CHILD SAFEGUARDING There were no issues at the current time.	
CPAC59.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS It was agreed that the next meeting of the Committee on 3 March be, if feasible, a joint meeting with the Safeguarding Policy and Practice Committee. It was requested that half an hour be set aside at the start of the meeting to serve as a CPAC only session to cover any additional Committee business.	

Cllr Lorna Reith

Chair