

GIRFEC Group Meeting: 29 June 2010

Chair Person: Jeremy Akehurst, Performance and Strategy Manager, Children and Families (JA)
Minute Taker: Gill McGhie, GIRFEC Development Officer (GM)

Present: Sheila Erskine, Service Manager, Action for Children (SE); Gordon Sinclair, Casework Services Manager, Children and Families (GS)

1	Apologies Received	Mike McLafferty, Housing (MM); Graham Jarvis, CLD (GJ); Graeme Gordon, ISS (GG); Rona Grimmer, Grampian Police (RG); Alison Work, Health (AW)	Not Present: John Hammond, SCRA (JH); Jim Masson, Grampian Police (JM); Shona Stewart, Grampian Police (SS)
2	Last Minutes – 1 June 2010	<p>Two items remain outstanding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Heads of Service Memo – although it has been sent to GM to be put onto the GIRFEC website, the memo has not been issued by Heads of Service. 2. Resources Directory – JA has not yet followed up with John Ferguson the issue of receiving help from one of the Research and Information Officers (RIOs). <p>Minutes agreed. Ready to be put onto the website.</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GM to contact Richard Donald and John Carney to follow this up. 2. JA to contact J Ferguson to follow this up. 3. GM to put minutes of 1 June onto website.
3	GIRFEC Practitioners' Sub Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GS noted concern that Housing were no longer actively represented on either the main or the sub group for GIRFEC and felt it was vital that they had a seat 'at the table' for decision-making. SE suggested that, if it was only possible for Moray Council Housing Department to be involved as a link, perhaps a service such as a Housing Association could be invited to be on the GIRFEC Group to represent that Housing perspective, with contact still being maintained with the Council's Housing Services? GM will email Mike McLafferty to follow this up. • Pathways Planning exercise – GS asked where this exercise was going next and how best it could be further streamlined. GM explained that the next task of the Practitioners' Group was to map the journey of one child, based on an anonymous 'live' example. This 	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GM to email Mike McLafferty to follow up the issue of Housing representation on the GIRFEC Groups. 2. GM to report back to the main GIRFEC Group on the practitioners' group's work on mapping a child's journey. 3. GM to email RD and JC re the Named Person consultation including relevant adult services.

		<p>would try to ascertain ownership, processes, paperwork, duplication, barriers etc. Ideally, it is vital to get to the position of Local Integrated Assessment and Planning (LIAP) being understood by all workers as the 'trunk' from which only specific routes such as child protection, or those for Looked After Children (LAC) diverge before re-connecting with the main LIAP route when issues return to child in need support. The Group agreed mapping a child's journey was a very good start in doing this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One comment from the last minutes was about the links needing to be made between adults' and children's services. GS asked for clarity. This comment referred to the need for adults' services to be made aware of developments in children's services and to be included in training and developmental work. It was also acknowledged that adults' services must also be aware of how their work impacts (in)directly on children. Communication must be two-way. • The Named Person consultation paper – John Carney (JC) emailed GM recently to acknowledge receipt and stated the Smarter Theme Co-ordinating Group (STCG) would issue it for consultation shortly. There was discussion that this consultation should also include relevant adult services. GM will contact Richard Donald (RD) and JC to follow this up. • Another comment in the minute alluded to the need for there to be strategic understanding of the links between services such as the Inclusion and Support Service developments, the procedures of the Additional Resource Management Group (ARMG) and the Placement Services Group (PSG). This Group are aware of the issues and that developments are ongoing in other fora to ensure processes are inter-linked. 	
4	GIRFEC Training sub Group	As there had been a meeting of the group yesterday, GM updated the GIRFEC Group on the proposed training calendar. The Group accepted this. GM has typed this up and has sent to other group members for comment. Once	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>1. GM to issue training calendar once comments received.</p>

		<p>received, this will be published for schools by GG – hopefully by the end of this week before the schools finish, on the GIRFEC website by GG and issued as widely as possible, subject to details being confirmed later.</p> <p>GG had raised an issue within the Training Group that, during a recent meeting of the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers (LNCT), some anxiety had been expressed by the EIS representative regarding Moray’s implementation of GIRFEC compared to the Highland model. GG has been asked by RD to meet up with relevant groups to discuss this further. The GIRFEC Group noted that the Teaching Unions were represented on the GIRFEC Group for approximately 18 months during the initial development of LIAP. It was also noted that the Teaching Unions had offered comments for the LIAP consultation in 2009 towards informing 2010 developments.</p>	
5	Scottish Government Guide to GIRFEC Implementation	<p>GS brought these to the attention of the Group. The main Guide is supplemented by summaries for operational and strategic managers and practitioners. They are now published on the Scottish Government website. Given their recent publication, the decision was taken to carry over discussion of these until the next meeting.</p>	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GM to email the link to the papers to the Group. http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Young-People/childrenservices/girfec/publications All four documents can be found here: Guide to Implementing GIRFEC and the 3 supplementary reports. 2. Group members to read and prepare comments for discussion at the next meeting.
6	GIRFEC Action Plan	<p>GIRFEC is mentioned in several local planning contexts and action plans are requested in a variety of fora. JA has drawn this one up to meet the needs of the various groups above. It will enable services to see the tasks to be completed and the limitations in the action plan.</p> <p>GS commented that he and Susan MacLaren will shortly begin the review of the Child Protection procedures; and he is aware that the NESPC Guidance on Child protection will also require to be reviewed in light of developments too.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agenda for subsequent meetings to include monitoring of the action plan.

		<p>The reference to the streamlining of LAC materials: this has begun with the involvement of GM and JA in the group whose remit is to write a Permanency Manual.</p> <p>The Group agreed the workplan and that monitoring progress towards its targets will be a regular agenda item at each meeting.</p>	
7	<p>Report to Smarter Theme Co-ordinating Group (STCG)</p>	<p>GM outlined the information she will include in the report for the meeting of 8 July: Local Management Groups' quarterly LIAP audits; updates from the three GIRFEC Groups; an item about the unilateral decisions being taken by agencies about aspects of the LIAP programme.</p> <p>This issue arose from a recent decision that appears to have been made about the tool to be used at the point of handover of a case between health visitors and school nurses. In this situation, staff use the wellbeing indicators (SHANARRI) to identify and name need, despite the Moray assessment tool endorsed by all agencies, including Health, being the 'My World' Triangle. At a meeting of the Health and Wellbeing in Schools Group, which GM attended a few months ago, this had been raised, however, following discussion, the decision had been taken not to use the SHANARRI tool as it was not aligned with the Moray programme. It now appears that decision has been reversed without reference to the GIRFEC Group which is the agreed Governance route around GIRFEC development. The risks inherent in such an approach include a lack of consistency or standardisation across Moray as an area and across different agencies within Moray; divergence in assessment processes when between 4 – 500 staff have already been trained in the 'My World' Assessment model; lack of adherence to governance structures in developing GIRFEC in Moray, leading to subsequent diverse models in different areas.</p> <p>GS suggested that the STCG report should include a section on the Heads of Service memo. It has been put onto the</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <p>1. GM to complete and forward report to STCG for their comments, following additions suggested.</p>

		<p>GIRFEC website, however, has not yet been directly issued from service heads. GM agreed to add this.</p> <p>At the last STCG, that Group tasked the GIRFEC Group with completing complementary audits of LIAP from LMGs' reports and managing the quality of practice across Moray. As Local Integration Support Officers (LISOs) will not always be made aware of all multi agency plans in their areas, JA suggested this may link with the low return rates shown in previous audits. In order to try to establish the numbers of multi agency plans existing in each locality, JA suggested we seek advice of the STCG in order to progress this further – i.e. is it a task for the practitioners' group? Can the STCG members direct their service heads to establish how many multi agency plans exist in each local area? Or both routes? Once the STCG clarifies this, a template can be drawn up by the GIRFEC Group to capture the information required.</p>	
8	Pan Grampian Integrated Assessment Framework Group letter to Scottish Government	<p>The PG IAF Group decided to write a letter to Scottish Government requesting continuing and ongoing communication between Government and the three Grampian authorities to allow further developments centrally to be informed by local authorities other than the learning partners and pathfinder areas.</p> <p>The Group raised no issues about the letter.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GM awaiting two comments back then will send.
9	AOCB	<p><u>Integrated Children's Services Plan 2010</u> GM drew the Group's attention to apparent duplications in the ICSP with work carried out or being undertaken by this Group, i.e. multi agency training, LIAP leaflets and feedback processes being targets for LMGs when this has already been tasked to the GIRFEC Group.</p> <p><u>National Child Protection Guidance</u> Currently, Scottish Government has published a draft guidance for 2010, the consultation closes mid September. Group members are free to comment individually or take this back to their teams.</p>	<p><u>Action</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GM to email G Jarvis, as LISOs' manager to outline concerns. 2. Group members to decide on individual and team responses to national CP Guidance.

10	Next meeting date	This will be 27 July, 9-11am at the Action for Children office, Winchester House, 1 King street, Elgin. JA is on holiday so GS will chair, GM will prepare paperwork.	<u>Action:</u> Group members to notify GM in advance if they are unable to attend.
-----------	--------------------------	--	---