

Shadow Dorset Council

Committee: Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date: Monday, 4 February 2019
Time: 9.30 am
Venue: Committee Rooms A/B, South Walks House,
South Walks Road, Dorchester, DT1 1EE

Membership:

T Jones (Chairman), C Brooks (Vice-Chair), S Bartlett, K Brookes, R Bryan, M Byatt, S Christopher, C Finch, S Gibson, B Goringe, N Lacey-Clarke, R Nowak, J Sewell, J Somper, J Tanner and M Wiggins

Chief Executive (Designate) for the Dorset Council: Matt Prosser

For more information about this agenda please telephone Democratic Services on 01305 252209 or email lwatson@dorset.gov.uk

For more information about the scrutiny items please telephone Lee Ellis (Scrutiny Officer) 01202 795251 or email lellis@christchurchandeastdorset.gov.uk

This agenda and reports are also available on the Council's website at www.dorsetareacouncils.co.uk

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting with the exception of any items listed in the exempt part of this agenda. **Please note** that if you attend a committee meeting and make oral representations to the committee your name, together with a summary of your comments will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The minutes, which are the formal record of the meeting, will be available to view in electronic and paper format, as a matter of public record, for a minimum of 6 years following the date of the meeting.

Disabled access is available for all of the council's committee rooms. Hearing loop facilities are available. Please speak to a Democratic Services Officer for assistance in using this facility.

Recording, photographing and using social media at meetings

The council is committed to being open and transparent in the way it carries out its business whenever possible. Anyone can film, audio-record, take photographs, and use social media such as tweeting and blogging to report the meeting when it is open to the public, so long as they conform to the Council's protocol, a copy of which can be obtained from the Democratic Services Team.

A G E N D A

Page No.

1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors are required to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 regarding disclosable pecuniary interests.

3 MINUTES

5 - 22

To confirm and sign the minutes of the meetings held on 3 January, 8 January and 21 January 2019.

4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

To receive any public questions or statements on the business of the Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee in accordance with the procedure rules as set out in the Shadow Dorset Council Constitution.

5 NEW SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

23 - 58

To consider a report with regard to 'New Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangements' to be considered by the Shadow Executive Committee at the meeting on 11 March 2019.

6 COMMUNICATIONS

A presentation and discussion with regard to current communications in the Shadow Dorset Council and future communications in the Dorset Council.

7 PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHT REPORT

To review the latest Programme Highlight Report to be considered by the Shadow Executive Committee on 11 February 2019.

The report will be published within the agenda for the Shadow

Executive Committee for the meeting on 11 February 2019 and will be available to be viewed using the link below when the Shadow Executive Committee agenda has been published:

<http://shadowcouncil.dorset.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=136&MId=130&Ver=4>

A copy of the report will be added to this agenda as a supplement when it is published with the Shadow Executive Committee agenda.

8 SHADOW OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

59 - 66

To review the work programme for the committee for 2018/19.

To review the Shadow Executive Committee Forward Plan.

All members of the Shadow Dorset Council receive notification when Shadow Executive Committee agendas are published on Mod.Gov and the Shadow Dorset Council website. Members of the Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee can review the items to be considered on each agenda and raise issues for review or comment to the Shadow Executive Committee as appropriate.

9 URGENT ITEMS

To consider any items of business which the Chairman has had prior notification and considers to be urgent pursuant to section 100B (4) b) of the Local Government Act 1972. The reason for the urgency shall be specified in the minutes.

This page is intentionally left blank

Shadow Dorset Council

SHADOW OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 3 JANUARY 2019

Present: Cllrs T Jones, C Brooks (Chairman), S Bartlett, K Brookes, R Bryan, S Christopher, C Finch, S Gibson, B Goringe, N Lacey-Clarke, J Sewell and J Tanner

Apologies: Cllrs M Byatt, R Nowak, J Somper and M Wiggins

Also present: Cllr J Cant, Cllr T Ferrari, Cllr D Harris, Cllr S Hosford, Cllr R Knox, Cllr M Rennie, Cllr C Reynolds, Cllr D Rickard and Cllr A Thacker

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Jonathan Mair (Corporate Director - Legal & Democratic Service Monitoring Officer, Designate), Jim McManus (Interim Deputy 151 Officer), Stuart Caundle (Head of Paid Service - Dorset Councils Partnership), Lee Ellis (Scrutiny Officer), Mark Taylor (Group Manager - Governance and Assurance) and Lillian Broad (Democratic Services Officer)

66. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

67. Public participation

There were no representations from members of the public.

68. Call to Account - Transfer of Assets

A brief introduction was provided by Councillor C Brooks, Vice-Chairman (in the Chair), as the Chairman Councillor T Jones indicated that he would not chair the meeting as he wished to take a full part in the meeting.

Members were informed that written statements had been received from:

- Councillor Keith Day
- Councillor David Rickard
- Councillor David Harris
- Verwood Town Council
- Bridport Town Council

The following councillors had informed the Scrutiny Officer, prior to the meeting, that they wished to speak to the item.

Councillor C Reynolds, representing West Dorset District Council (WDDC), stated her belief that the same standards for transferring assets had not been

upheld across the county, using the proposals WDDC had put forward to the Shadow Executive Committee as an example of this.

Councillor D Rickard, WDDC, stated that he believed the benefits of transferring assets in West Dorset had been ignored by the Shadow Council. He informed members that much of what had been proposed would have returned assets to their communities and be funded at a local level.

Councillor M Rennie stated that Dorchester Market was not an asset as it had been described in transfer documents, and that it was important historically for the town. Councillor Rennie believed that discussion should continue with Dorchester Town Council, so that not only the market continued beyond April 2019, but also so that relations with the current operator could continue.

Councillor Susie Hosford represented Dorchester Town Council and wished to express support for the previous statements.

Councillor D Harris stated he was representing Weymouth and Portland. Councillor Harris also stated he believed that initial discussions over transfer of assets had been clear that the Unitary Authority would not be taking on assets that did not contribute to its statutory functions. Councillor Harris stated that whilst he understood why an asset such as the crematorium in Weymouth should be run by the new authority, he did not understand why the seafront hotels owned by Weymouth and Portland Borough Council should be under the control of the new Dorset Council. Councillor Harris also stated that he believed the transferring of the car parks in Weymouth to the Town Council could also encourage its relationship of working with the Unitary Authority.

Will Austin, Clerk of Bridport Town Council, stated that he believed the Shadow Executive Committee had exceeded its powers by considering matters beyond physical assets and that the Shadow Council should not have a say in the £1.3 million reserve WDDC had earmarked for service/asset transfers. Mr Austin also stated that he did not believe the minutes of the meeting of the Shadow Executive Committee were accurate and that the actual debate was also inadequate, as there was no discussion of assets or revenue savings. Mr Austin also did not believe that Town/Parish Councils had been given any input into the Shadow Executive's initial decision, or the Call to Account.

Councillor Alan Thacker expressed support for the statements that had already been given, and also wished to thank officers who had contributed to the proposals.

For clarity Councillor S Bartlett informed the committee he was also a member of Wimborne Minster Town Council.

Some members expressed concern that the same standards for the transfer of assets had not been upheld across the county.

Members suggested that some Town and Parish Councils may need some reassurance the asset transfers would proceed as expected.

The Call to Account also included the panel of the following members and officers, who were involved in the decision making process:

- Councillor Rebecca Knox – Leader of Shadow Dorset Council
- Councillor Tony Ferrari – Executive Lead, Finance
- Councillor Jeff Cant – Executive Lead, Property and Assets
- Jonathan Mair – Monitoring Officer
- Jim McManus – Chief Accountant, Deputy Section 151 Officer DCC

Stuart Caundle, Head of Paid Service, Dorset Councils Partnership had also been invited to the meeting.

In reference to the first line of enquiry, the Monitoring Officer informed members that they had received information from Rebecca Kirk, General Manager (PDC) on how these principles had been developed. The General Manager (PDC) had stated that they were asked by the Chief Executives to provide an update to themselves and the programme board relating to asset transfers from predecessor councils. This report was drafted and circulated to the Chief Executives, who then asked for a set of principles to be drafted. The report was presented to the programme board, who gave their feedback and amendments. The report was then presented at the Shadow Executive Committee on 20 July 2018, where the principles were amended further.

Members asked the panel if the structural change order was considered by officers when creating these principles. The Monitoring Officer replied that during meetings between MHCLG and Chief Finance Officers it had been discussed whether it would be necessary to impose Article 24, which would limit the ability of predecessor Councils to transfer assets of a certain value. However, it was decided that this would not be necessary. The Monitoring Officer informed members that the decision of the threshold value had been decided locally, although in previous Local Government Reorganisations this had also been set at £100,000.

The Leader of the Shadow Dorset Council confirmed that whilst they had been working with advice from MHCLG, the formulation of these principles had been a local decision. She explained the principles were developed in line with previous experiences of officers and also by the judgement of the Section 151 Officer.

In reference to the second line of enquiry, the Leader of the Dorset Shadow Council stated that the principles did not only apply to asset transfers. She informed members that each proposal for a transfer of assets was looked at individually, therefore the principles were needed to make sure decisions were consistent.

The Executive Lead for Property and Assets recognised that this process could be seen as confusing to those not on the committee. He informed members their main focus had been to look at whether there had been the chance of substantial or valuable assets being transferred, to the detriment of residents.

Members questioned the consistency of the Shadow Executive Committee, as the proposed asset transfers by West Dorset District Council were not approved as they had exceeded £100,000. However the committee had then approved Weymouth and Portland Borough Council (WPBC) securing an £11 million loan. The Executive Lead for Property and Assets explained to members that the two proposals were not comparable, as WPBC were not borrowing from the unitary tax base and would not have any impact on the new authority.

Some members stated concerns as to whether the Lead Member for Property and Assets may have had a conflict in interest in promoting the £11 million loan that had been proposed by WPBC, as they were also the Leader of WPBC. The Leader of the Shadow Dorset Council stated that there was not a conflict, as all members of the Shadow Executive Committee were leaders of the sovereign Councils, or had been nominated by their leader. The Lead Members were then decided based on who would be most appropriate for the role. The Monitoring Officer also added that the Lead Members had not been agreed when the set of principles had been agreed. The Monitoring Officer informed members that the Lead Member for Property and Assets had no pecuniary interest. The officer also informed the committee the structural change order allowed all members to participate, as nothing ruled out members from participating and decision making if it affected their predecessor Council.

Councillor R Bryan left the meeting at 10.46 am.

In reference to the third line of enquiry, members were informed that the report that went to the 18 June 2018 meeting of the Shadow Executive Committee stated that each asset would be considered individually.

Members asked how the values of some assets were determined and if their marriage value was considered. The example of Kiosks in Lyme Regis was given, if they would be considered in isolation or together. The Monitoring Officer replied that this would depend on the proposal. The Lead Member for Property and Assets agreed, stating that they had worked with a list of potential assets but could only work out their value under certain circumstances.

In reference to the fourth line of enquiry, the Lead Member for Property and Assets informed the committee that the Weymouth Town Council had been considered to have 'unique circumstances' as it was a brand new Council still being created.

Members asked the panel if the loan secured by WPBC could have been delayed and considered by the new Unitary Authority. The Lead Member for Property and Assets stated that a lot of work had already gone into securing the loan, and that they were aware the new authority would probably not be able to carry on this work during its initial set up.

In reference to the fifth line of enquiry, the Monitoring Officer informed members that principle (vii) and principle (viii) were separate and did not have a relationship. They explained that principle (vii) ensured that all transfers were cost neutral, whereas principle (viii) set out that ongoing revenue support of an asset should not be provided.

Members asked if that where a Town or Parish Council carried out a statutory service on behalf of the Unitary Authority, would there be a contribution for this? The Monitoring Officer replied that Town or Parish Councils had been contracted on behalf of the Unitary Authority.

Following questions from members, the Monitoring Officer confirmed that principle (vii) would mean there would be no negative effect on Dorset Council.

In reference to the sixth line of enquiry, the Leader of the Shadow Dorset Council stated that this presumed how the new authority would proceed. By creating these principles, the Shadow Executive Committee was instead trying to establish ways of working and what the new Dorset Council should be looking at. The Leader of the Dorset Shadow Council also informed members that through the constitutional structure of the new Unitary Authority, there would be a forum for these discussions to take place.

In reference to the seventh line of enquiry, the Monitoring Officer stated that under the current circumstances the Secretary of State would not do this, as there was not enough time left. The Monitoring Officer also informed members that the Shadow Council could also use a direction to restrict a predecessor Council from transferring assets, as this was a provision of the structural change order.

In reference to the eighth line of enquiry, the Leader of the Shadow Dorset Authority stated that they could not speak as to the reasons for individual members of the committee. However as Chairman, after questioning they felt that the proposal went against the agreed principles. The Shadow Executive Committee felt these proposals could be considered in the future, but that it was not currently appropriate to consider these at present.

Members asked if the Shadow Executive Committee had considered the Wednesbury Principles when deciding on proposals, as some members felt that other Market Towns should have also been looked at under 'unique circumstances'. The Monitoring Officer informed members that this didn't apply to the decision surrounding Weymouth Town Council.

Members expressed concern at the first principle as they felt the wording was vague. However, they stated that clarification from the panel had addressed these concerns.

In reference to the ninth line of enquiry, the Leader of the Shadow Dorset Council stated that she believed previous answers had revealed where these parameters had been set, after new members had been elected.

Members expressed the view that whilst great efforts had been made into communication, this had not reached the Town and Parish Councils in enough detail. Members also hoped this would be corrected under the new authority. The Leader of the Shadow Dorset Council agreed that a discussion in further depth would have been of great benefit, but due to time constraints this was not able to take place.

Members also stated that there was also a reliance on Shadow Executive members to filter information back to the members of their sovereign Councils.

Recommendation A, that the Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee agree with the evidence provided by members and officers during the Call to Account, was proposed.

Decision

That the Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- (a) Agree with the evidence provided by members and officers during the Call to Account;
- (b) That this decision be forwarded to the Shadow Executive Committee, for their information.

69. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

Duration of meeting: 9.30 - 11.49 am

Chairman

.....

Shadow Dorset Council

SHADOW OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 8 JANUARY 2019

Present: Cllrs T Jones (Chairman), R Bryan, M Byatt, S Christopher, B Goringe, N Lacey-Clarke, J Sewell, J Somper and J Tanner

Apologies: Cllrs C Brooks, S Bartlett, K Brookes, S Gibson, R Nowak and M Wiggins

Also present: Cllr P Wharf

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Matt Prosser (Chief Executive Designate), Jonathan Mair (Corporate Director - Legal & Democratic Service Monitoring Officer, Designate), Keith Cheesman (LGR Programme Director), Kate Critchel (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Mike Harries (Chief Executive - Dorset County Council), Nick Jarman (Interim Director for Children's Services), Lee Ellis (Scrutiny Officer), Mark Taylor (Group Manager - Governance and Assurance), Helen Coombes (Interim Transformation Programme Lead), Bridget Downton (General Manager, Planning & Community Services PDC) and Stuart C Dawson (Head of Revenues and Benefit DCP)

70. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations to report.

71. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

72. Public participation

There was no public participation to report.

73. Programme Highlight Report

The committee considered the latest Programme Highlight Report which set out progress since the last meeting of the Shadow Executive Committee on 17 December 2018. The Programme Director noted that overall progress remained at Amber. Work on the implementation plans continued, with theme boards making significant progress on developing the detailed service continuity plans.

The Programme Director reported the following key achievements since the last meeting of the committee.

- Draft constitution nearing completion following Member review, pending final minor outstanding items
- Finance Order now 'made' in law from 2/1/2019
- Transitional Structures plan ready to be launched into consultation in January
- A balanced budget proposal reviewed by Budget Working Group
- Council Tax Harmonisation approach agreed by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
- Branding ready to launch
- Service delivery approach for eastern Dorset agreed
- 'Master list' of Dorset Council policies complete

And the senior leadership recruitment process was nearing completion.

The Programme Director also reported that there were challenges around the Data Disaggregation work which sought to identify, prepare and pass the case data and associated files from Dorset Council (DC) to Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (BCP). Work in this area was increasing in intensity to agree plans and approaches with the BCP Programme, but there was an issue with the availability of the detailed plans required by Dorset Council. This was being escalated within the programme structure in order that it was resolved urgently.

The committee noted that service delivery approach, accommodation arrangements and recruitment processes were all on track. In response to questions regarding data disaggregation, the Interim Transformation Programme Lead confirmed that if cases were not able to be transferred to BCP there would be an agreement between with two authorities that the DC would continue to hold that information until such time that it could be transferred. However there were many options and methodology available in order that disaggregation takes place in a timely manner. The Interim Transformation Programme Lead confirmed that on Day 1 information would be available in order that statutory responsibilities could continue to be fulfilled.

In response to a question about the use of Capita to deliver a fully connected set of financial systems, the Chief Executive confirmed that he was comfortable and content with the current proposals.

Members thanked the Programme Director for his comprehensive report and update.

74. **Readiness of critical/key services**

The Chairman welcomed officers who attended to respond to members key lines of enquiry regarding readiness of critical and key services. The Chairman highlighted the following key lines of enquiry:-

- (1) Clearly there was a risk during a period of significant stress that all will not go according to best hopes and plans.

- (2) Some services will be more affected than others by staff issues
 - a. Which are affected, and maybe have been for some time?
 - b. Which are affected by national issues e.g. shortages of staff with the required skills?
 - c. Which services are regarded as “at risk” because of the above?
 - d. Are there concerns about competition for staff between the two new Unitaries?
 - e. Are there any emerging signs of increased problems with recruitment and retention?
 - f. Are there any key time periods when they might emerge?
- (3) Apart from personnel are there any other areas which pose a risk to seamless service delivery?

In response to a question, the Chairman confirmed that these points of enquiry were circulated to members over the Christmas period. However they were not set in stone, but a prompt to enable and start a conversation.

The Chairman invited Cllr P Wharf to address the committee as the Lead of the HR Work stream. Cllr Wharf asked members to be content that the work stream and highlighted that officers had taken these matters seriously. He reported on progress of the process, but could not necessarily share staff structural or functional details at this time.

In discussions with key officers the following information was shared or comments were made:-

- That many staff were doing the day job as well as preparation work for Day 1
- The HR work stream was working closely and constructively with Unions
- Although this was a challenging time, it was also exciting and opportune for individuals.
- In respect of Place; there were difficulties in recruiting Environmental Health officers, however nationally there were shortages in this area and this included Building Control, Planning plus some housing posts. This was not an exclusive Day 1 issue, but a common challenge for many local authorities.
- There was also a local training programme and a healthy apprenticeship scheme in place.
- In respect of People; for Children and Adults, it was expected that Adult Social Care for Day 1 Dorset would be in a stronger position than many of the surrounding areas. Vacancies would be at a manageable number.
- There was a clear transition plan in place for the TUPE arrangements for staff to transfer to the BCP Council.
- Dorset and neighbouring councils working were together to ensure that no employment destabilising took place.
- In respect of Children services; Dorset was in a better position compared to other local authorities, in relation to vacancies.

- Children services would have a stable workforce in place as the job was attractive, not just financial but offered manageable caseloads compared to the national average.
- Members recognised that this was an uncertain time and that officers were busy in preparation for Day 1 to be safe and legal.
- It was agreed that the committee needed not to put unnecessary pressure on officers at this time.
- In response to a comment, Graduate training schemes were being considered for the new Council
- Cllr P Wharf advised that he was meeting with the LGA to learn more about accelerated graduate schemes.
- It was noted that arrangements were not perfect but on track for Day 1
- In respect of IT, there were some issues, but these were not concerns for being Day 1 ready.
- Multiple IT systems would continue for Day 1 to ensure the systems and processes did not fall down
- Payroll – would be ready, but any risk had been anticipated and prepared for.

In summing up the debate, members noted the following:-

- It was important to consider how the new authority would retain staff in the future to ensure that it was an employer of choice for the 21st Century
- Ensure that staff continued to grow and develop within the organisation
- Current shortages of staff primarily reflected the national position
- Ensure that staff were not poached by neighbouring councils
- Must ensure that critical services did not fall down
- That a short benchmark report be presented to the Shadow Executive Committee to ensure the committee's comments and concerns were highlighted.

Members took the opportunity to thank officers for their attendance at the meeting.

Decision

- (a) That Cllr P Wharf prepare a short report setting out the committee concerns and comments regarding readiness of critical/key services to be presented to the March meeting of the Shadow Executive Committee.

75. **Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

The Head of Revenue & Benefits (DCP) presented a report setting proposals for Local Council Tax Support scheme (LCTS) for Dorset Council.

As part of the LGR discussions with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) it was agreed that the Council would be allowed up to two years to agree an aligned LCTS scheme. This was in recognition

that significant resources would be utilised to successfully implement the new Unitary Council and that there may not, initially, be the capacity to support the creation of an aligned scheme.

However, members were advised that officers were of the view that there was the capacity within existing resources to create an aligned LCTS scheme from 1 April 2019. The report considered the benefits of having an aligned scheme for 2019/20 and the opportunities that this would bring to help reduce customer confusion and local authority administration. A consultation exercise had taken place with customers and stakeholders.

In presenting his report and in response to comments from Councillors outside of the meeting, the Head of Revenue & Benefits reported the following amendments to his report.

1. Appendix 2- Existing LCTS schemes (pages 25 and 26 of the agenda) needed to be amended for EDDC and NDDC so that the section headed "*Who is protected under the scheme?*" Reads:-

Pensioners

Those receiving:

Disability Premium, Enhanced Disability Premium, Severe Disability Premium, Carer Premium, Disabled Child Premium, The Support Component within their Employment Support Allowance

Those in receipt of War Disablement Pension, War Widows Pension or War Widows Disablement Pension

Universal Credit recipients, who are not pensioners, but the applicant or their partner is in receipt of an income or premium listed above.

2. Appendix 3 – LCTS Options (pages 27 and 28 of the agenda) needed to be amended for Option B so that part was amended to:-

Option B - aligned scheme with a maximum support for those of working age (not protected) limited to 90%

Under this option, the Dorset Council CTS would be aligned as follows:

- The scheme would be means tested and similar to the old Council Tax Benefit scheme (where appropriate)
- Protection would be provided to the following types of claimant:
 - Pensioners
 - Those where the applicant (or partner) are receiving:
 - Disability Premium, Enhanced Disability Premium, Severe Disability Premium, Carer Premium, Disabled Child Premium or the Support Component within their Employment Support Allowance

- Disability Living Allowance or Personal Independence Payment but are not in receipt of one of the premiums mentioned above
 - Those in receipt of War Disablement Pension, War Widows Pension or War Widows Disablement Pension
 - Universal Credit recipients, who are not pensioners, but the applicant or their partner is in receipt of an income or premium listed above.
- The maximum entitlement for protected claimants would be 100%
- The maximum entitlement for those claimants who are not protected would be 90% (based on Council Tax liability)
- The scheme would provide support for those that have a second adult living with them who is on low income (Second Adult Rebate)
- The scheme would not include a limit on the lowest amount given
- The maximum period of backdating that can be awarded is 1 month. (This links with the rules relating to Housing Benefit and should help reduce customer confusion)
- A Family Premium will not be applied in the award calculation if it relates to a new claim or a new family from 1 April 2017. (Also links to the rules relating to Housing Benefit and should help reduce customer confusion)
- If the claimant is temporary absent from the UK up to 4 weeks would be awarded (subject to conditions). However, up to 52 weeks would be awarded if the absence relates to a bereavement, or the claimant receiving medical care, etc. (Again, this links with the rules relating to Housing Benefit and should help reduce customer confusion).
- If the claimant is receiving Universal Credit (UC), CTS would be awarded for a period of 6 months and calculated on an estimated UC average income for that period. The period would come to an end if UC was no longer in payment. Additionally, the claimant would be entitled to ask for a review of their entitlement, during that period, if their circumstances had significantly changed.

The committee was asked to consider 3 options set out within the report Option A, the status quo, Option C, aligned scheme with a maximum support for those of working age (not protected) limited to 85% and Option B, aligned scheme with a maximum support for those of working age (not protected) limited to 90%.

Members were advised that Option B was an aligned scheme where everyone would be treated consistently regardless of where they lived in the Council area and help those on UC to budget more easily. Although these amendments addressed some of the committees concerns, members sought further assurance regarding the following:-

Foster Carers allowance
Impact on Kinship Carers
Effect on Seasonal workers, for example tenant farmers
Separated couples

It was suggested that any councillor that had detailed concerns should report them to the Scrutiny Officer by 16 January 2019 in order that these issues could be considered by the Chairman of the Finance Work Stream and Section 151 Officers prior to the report and recommendation being considered by the Shadow Executive Committee on 11 February 2019. The final decision would be made by the Shadow Dorset Council at its meeting on 20 February 2019.

Overall, subject to those detailed concerns set out above being addressed most members of the committee supported Option B as the fairest scheme proposed, however it was recognised that the council needed to ensure that the most vulnerable members of the community were protected and supported.

Cllr N Lacey-Clarke proposed that Option B be adopted as the LCTS scheme for Dorset Council but **with a maximum support for those of working age (not protected) limited to 91.5%**. This was seconded by Cllr J Somper.

In making the recommendation Cllr Lacey-Clarke felt unable to support a reduction in support whilst council tax was likely to increase in some areas.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was carried.

Recommendation to Shadow Executive Committee

That the Shadow Overview & Scrutiny Committee supports Option B be adopted as the LCTS scheme for Dorset Council but **with a maximum support for those of working age (not protected) limited to 91.5%**.

76. Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

The Scrutiny Officer advised members that a special meeting of the committee would be held on 21 January 2019 to consider the Budget for 2019/20. The next scheduled meeting of the committee was due to be held on 4 February 2019; the recommendation regarding the committee's "Call to Account" would be reported the Shadow Executive Committee in due course.

77. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

Duration of meeting: 6.30 - 8.20 pm

Chairman

.....

Shadow Dorset Council

SHADOW OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 21 JANUARY 2019

Present: Cllrs T Jones (Chairman), S Bartlett, K Brookes, R Bryan, S Christopher, S Gibson, B Goringe and J Tanner

Apologies: Cllrs C Brooks, M Byatt, C Finch, N Lacey-Clarke, R Nowak, J Sewell, J Somper and M Wiggins

Also present: Cllr P Brown, Cllr J Ellis, Cllr T Ferrari and Cllr M Rennie

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Jason Vaughan (Interim Section 151 Officer), Julie Strange (Head of Financial Services), Keith Cheesman (LGR Programme Director), Lee Ellis (Scrutiny Officer), Mark Taylor (Group Manager - Governance and Assurance) and Lindsey Watson (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

78. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

79. Public participation

There were no questions or statements from members of the public.

80. Dorset Council Budget 2019/20

The committee received and considered a report of the Lead member for Finance and Interim Section 151 Officer, which provided an update on the finance of Dorset Council and how a balanced budget for 2019/20 had been developed. The Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee was invited to consider any comments that they wished to make on the 2019/20 budget to be forwarded for consideration by the Shadow Executive Committee on 11 February 2019. The 2019/20 budget would be set by the Shadow Council on 20 February 2019.

The Lead Member for Finance, Councillor Ferrari introduced the report and provided an overview of the work that had been undertaken. He noted that a key element of the work had been about bringing together financial efficiencies and was not about reducing services. Transformation was not within the scope of the work that had been undertaken, but the budget ensured a stable position for the new Council to progress this work.

In addition to the report, the Interim Section 151 Officer provided a presentation for the committee which covered:

- The headlines from the budget proposals

- What had been done to make sure that the budget process and proposals were robust
- The risks in the budget
- The future challenges
- What would happen next including the timetable for approval of the budget

Members considered the issues arising from the report and presentation and during discussion the following points were raised:

- In response to a question, members noted the financial impact of the Dorset Waste Partnership not being able to use low quality recycling. It was also noted that fuel costs had been higher in the current financial year and the impact of maintenance costs
- Car parking charges would not be changed for the next financial year
- Where charges were being aligned across the area it was noted that this had been driven by advice from service experts. It was not a common policy to always align charges at the highest level. There was a request for information on new charging structures to be included in the briefing to be provided to members
- The position with Negative RSG was seen as good news within the financial settlement
- Reference was made to work undertaken to harmonise Council Tax across the area of the Dorset Council from day 1 and it was noted that the change in Council Tax level would vary across the different existing council areas depending on the current Council Tax base for each existing council
- In response to a question it was noted that further work would be undertaken on the asset strategy
- LGR implementation costs were an estimate at the current time
- In response to a question it was noted that all councils were bringing in investments and reserves to the new Council. During the work in bringing the budget together there was a focus on the end point. A request was made for the relevant figures from each existing council to be provided to members at the briefing on the budget
- The bringing together of pensions was not part of this work
- In response to a question with regard to vacancies in some areas, it was noted that this was a current risk for all of the councils. This was a risk for the new council and would need to be monitored
- A discussion was held with regard to the position with Dorset schools funding and the impact of schools changing into academies
- In response to a question it was noted that expenditure was a greater risk for the new council than income, and this was reflected in the contingency that had been put in place. A base budget review would be undertaken when managers had been appointed

- An ongoing transformation programme would be undertaken by the new council who would also decide on priorities for transformation moving forward
- A base budget review would be undertaken by the newly appointed directors and managers working with the accountancy team. There would also be involvement from the South West Audit Partnership (SWAP) and CIPFA
- There was a request for information to be included in the member budget briefing on bids available from the government
- It was noted that proposals for new 75% Business Rates Pilots in 2019/20 had been approved. Dorset had not been included in the pilot as local government reorganisation was ongoing
- Reference was made to New Homes Bonus which had been built into the budget
- A point was made that the report and presentation had been very useful and that there could be a level of satisfaction that there was a stable budget and that risks had been covered. However, the point was made that the information presented was at a very high level which presented some issues for the committee in undertaking its overview and scrutiny role

The Interim S151 Officer noted that an updated presentation would be provided at the forthcoming budget briefing for all members. The committee had made some requests for additional information and these would be included. A copy of the presentation provided at this meeting would be circulated to members of the committee.

81. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

Duration of meeting: 6.30 - 7.54 pm

Chairman

.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Shadow Dorset Council

Date of Meeting	Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 4 February 2019
Lead Member	Councillor Steve Butler
Officer	Nick Jarman – Director for Children’s Services
Subject of Report	New Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangements
Executive Summary	<p>Significant changes have recently been made to multi-agency working as part of the Children and Social Work Act 2017. The Act abolishes Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs) and creates new duties and a system of collective accountability for Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), local authorities and police to make arrangements locally to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in their area.</p> <p>Senior leaders from Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), the 3 current Local Authorities and Dorset Police have overseen and engaged in an option appraisal to consider potential models for future safeguarding children partnership arrangements to meet the new requirements of <i>Working Together 2018</i>.</p> <p>The outcome of the option appraisal was that a Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership would provide the most effective mechanism for addressing current and emerging safeguarding children challenges.</p> <p>The proposal is for a new Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangement which complies with the new legislation and guidance and improves the impact and effectiveness of multi-agency safeguarding of children in Dorset.</p>
Impact Assessment:	Equalities Impact Assessment: Completed and attached
	<p>Use of Evidence:</p> <p>The proposed changes in Safeguarding Partnership Arrangements are a legal requirement under the Children and Social Work Act 2017 and the Working Together to Safeguard Children Guidance 2018.</p>

New Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangements

	<p>Budget: The funding level for the current LSCB arrangements will be continued at the same level into 2019/20, this means that there will be no change in funding for the coming year.</p>
	<p>Risk Assessment:</p> <p>Having considered the risks associated with this decision using the LGR approved risk management methodology, the level of risk has been identified as: Current Risk: LOW Residual Risk LOW</p>
	<p>Other Implications:</p> <p>There is a clear timetable for the proposed new arrangements to be published and submitted to the Secretary of State for Education (29.06.19) Implementation must take place within 3 months of publication and by 29th September at the latest.</p>
Recommendation	<p>That the Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee support the following recommendations to be considered by the Shadow Executive Committee on 11 March 2019:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Shadow Executive is requested to approve the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership plan. 2. The Shadow Executive is requested to provide delegated authority to the Executive Director – People (Children) for the plan to receive independent scrutiny ahead of submission to the Secretary of State for Education by 29th June 2019.
Reason for Recommendation	<p>To ensure that the Local Authority and their key partner agencies are compliant with the Children and Social Work Act 2017 and the associated guidance.</p>
Appendices	<p>EqIA</p>
Background Papers	<p>None</p>
Officer Contact	<p>Name: Mary Taylor Tel:01305228384 Email: Mary.Taylor@dorsetcc.gov.uk</p>

Nick Jarman
Joint Director for Children, Adults & Communities

New Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangements

1. Introduction.

- 1.1 Following Lord Laming's inquiry into the death of Victoria Climbié, the Children Act 2004 required all Local Authorities in England and Wales to set up a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) whose function would be to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people in their area, through collective accountability across agencies and organisations.
- 1.2 The role of the LSCB has been to coordinate work by individual agencies and ensure that each organisation acts effectively when they are doing this. The LSCB publishes multi-agency policies and procedures for child protection in their area, which should be responsive to local and national concerns and provide assurance that multi-agency working is effective.
- 1.3 Statutory guidance was provided setting out how Local Safeguarding Children Boards should work in accordance with the Children Act 1989 and the Children Act 2004. This guidance, called "Working Together to safeguard children" has been regularly updated in line with changes in legislation and new thinking around child protection.
- 1.4 The most recent revision of the guidance was published in July 2018 following the passage of the Children and Social Work Act 2017 and taking account of the Wood report into the effectiveness of LSCBs. The Wood report concludes in summary that LSCBs were not effective. The Act creates new duties and a system of collective accountability for Police, health and Local Authorities (the "key safeguarding partners") to make arrangements locally to promote and safeguard the welfare of children in their area.

2 Timetable for change.

- 2.1 It is important that plans are in place within the timescales for the new framework as it is the government's intention that Local Safeguarding Children's Boards will end in 2019 to be replaced by Safeguarding Partnership Arrangements.
- 2.2 Safeguarding partners must publish their arrangements and submit them to the Secretary of State for Education by 29 June 2019. Prior to submission, the arrangements must have been subject to independent scrutiny.
- 2.3 Following publication of their arrangements, safeguarding partners have up to three months from the date of publication to implement the arrangements. The implementation date must be made clear in the published arrangements. All new local arrangements must have been implemented by 29 September 2019.

3 Finance.

- 3.1 In line with Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018, the safeguarding partners have reviewed the financial contributions from each partner to ensure that there is sufficient budget to cover all elements of the service. This analysis found that 98.3% of the funding has come from Local Authorities, the Police and the CCG, with a total contribution from these agencies of £270106.
- 3.2 It has been agreed that this sum and the current contributions will be maintained in 2019/20 to enable a smooth transition from the former LSCBs and enable an appropriate infrastructure is established for the new arrangements.

New Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangements

4 **Purpose of this report.**

- 4.1 Following the publication of Working Together 2018, senior leaders across the current 3 Local Authorities, Police and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) have been considering future partnership arrangements in line with the new requirements.
- 4.2 The attached report is the culmination of the work of the senior leadership group and engagement with other relevant partners. It sets out the proposal for a future Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership, which provides a larger population of children and will enable a single, more joined up approach to safeguarding vulnerable children.
- 4.3 The plan needs now to be approved through the governance arrangements of the partner agencies (3 Local Authorities, CCG and Police). This will be followed by the engagement of an independent scrutineer who will provide a critical analysis of the plan prior to it being submitted to the Secretary of State by the end of June 2019.

5. **Recommendation**

- 5.1 The Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and support the following recommendations which will be made to the Shadow Executive Committee on 11 March 2019:
- 5.2 The Shadow Executive is requested to approve the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership plan.
- 5.3. The Shadow Executive is requested to provide delegated authority to the Executive Director – People (Children) for the plan to receive independent scrutiny ahead of submission to the Secretary of State for Education by 29th June 2019.



PAN DORSET SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN PARTNERSHIP PLAN

Changes to safeguarding children partnership arrangements in line with Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Background</i>	3
<i>Developing vision and priorities</i>	3
<i>Process for developing Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership</i>	4
<i>Safeguarding children partners</i>	5
<i>Geographical boundaries</i>	6
<i>“Relevant agencies”</i>	7
<i>Role of early years’ settings, schools and other educational establishments</i>	8
<i>Voice of children and young people</i>	8
<i>Learning hub incorporating quality assurance</i>	9
<i>Local Practice Review</i>	9
<i>Child Death Review Partners</i>	10
<i>Themed task and finish groups – working with the wider safeguarding partnership</i>	10
<i>Learning, training and development</i>	10
<i>Funding</i>	11
<i>Dispute resolution</i>	11
<i>Independent scrutiny</i>	12
<i>Infrastructure</i>	12
<i>Transitional arrangements</i>	13
<i>Summary</i>	14
<i>App 1</i>	16
<i>App 2</i>	17

Introduction

Over the past few months, senior leaders from Dorset CCG, the 3 current local authorities and Dorset Police have overseen and engaged on an option appraisal to consider potential models for future safeguarding children partnership arrangements to meet the new requirements of *Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018*.

The outcome of the option appraisal was that a pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership would provide the most effective mechanism for addressing current and emerging safeguarding risks and vulnerabilities of children.

This paper sets out a summary of the option appraisal process along with the key elements required to establish the new arrangements and seeks organisational approval from the statutory partners of the CCG, local authorities and police. This will need to be followed by independent scrutiny of the plan prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Education (see timeline at App 1).

Background

Significant changes have recently been made to multi agency working as part of the Children and Social Work Act 2017. The Act abolishes local safeguarding children boards and creates new duties and a system of collective accountability for CCGs, local authorities and police to make arrangements locally to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in their area. Safeguarding children partners must have published their new arrangements before **29th June 2019** and have **up to three months** from the date of publication to implement the arrangements.

The development of a new safeguarding children partnership comes at a time of significant change locally for the key agencies of CCGs, local authorities and police.

In May 2018, parliament authorised the creation of a new unitary council for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole along with a separate unitary council for Dorset. Recruitment to new senior leadership roles for the new councils is nearing completion. Dorset CCG is one of eight first wave integrated care systems with strategic programmes for prevention at scale, integrated community services and a single acute network. Dorset Police has a collaborative partnership with Devon and Cornwall Police and had volunteered for merger although this is not now going ahead.

Developing vision and priorities

The current vision and priorities for children and young people across Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset is expressed within the strategic plans of the existing children's trusts, the integrated care system local transformation plan and the police and crime plan. These plans include common themes of:

- Children feeling cared for, safe and secure
- Enabling children and young people to fulfil their full potential

- Children feeling prepared for adulthood
- Promotion of mental health, early identification and intervention to address mental illness in children and young people
- Protecting children and young people from risks such as exploitation
- Addressing the needs of children in care and care leavers

Once established, the new safeguarding children partnership will develop its vision and priorities for safeguarding children on a pan Dorset basis. This will enable new leaders to the local system and current partners to develop a shared ambition for improving impact and outcomes for safeguarding children and young people.

Process for developing the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership

Over the summer of 2018, senior leaders from across the CCG, 3 local authorities and the police oversaw an option appraisal process for the development of future safeguarding children partnership arrangements.

The process followed National Audit Office endorsed guidelines and included the development of an initial long list then a detailed assessment of a short list of potential models against the following criteria:

1. Ensures excellent practice is the norm
2. Ensures learning is promoted and embedded
3. Enables the public to feel confident that children are protected from harm
4. Enables partner agencies to hold one another to account effectively
5. Enables new safeguarding issues to be identified
6. Enables information to be shared effectively
7. Opportunity to reduce business support costs
8. Maximises leadership and staff capacity

Learning and experience from “early adopter” sites elsewhere in the country provided valuable ideas and insight to provide the most effective arrangements.

Following assessment of the options against the appraisal criteria, a pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership was identified as the preferred model to enable a single, more joined up approach in addressing vulnerability and risk for children and young people across Bournemouth, Christchurch, Dorset and Poole.

The following diagram summarises the key elements of the proposed structure for the new safeguarding children partnership and is described in further detail within this paper.



There has been wide scale engagement on the proposal for a pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership including discussion with LSCB/DSCB board members, other strategic partnership groups and via networks including early years and education providers.

This had provided endorsement for the proposal with helpful suggestions on how the new safeguarding children partnership should continue to engage with the wider safeguarding network. Comments received during the engagement period along with responses to these are detailed at App 2.

Safeguarding children partners

The pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership will be led by the 4 statutory partners of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council, Dorset Council, Dorset CCG and Dorset Police. The partnership arrangements will cover 2 local authority areas.

Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018 names the lead representatives from each of the safeguarding partners “the local authority chief executive, the accountable officer of a clinical commissioning group, and a chief officer of police”.

For the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership, the lead representatives are:

Graham Farrant	Chief Executive	Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council
Matt Prosser	Chief Executive	Dorset Council
Tim Goodson	Chief Officer	Dorset CCG
James Vaughan	Chief Constable	Dorset Police

As set out in *Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018*, the lead representatives are able to delegate their functions although they retain accountability for any actions or decisions taken on behalf of their agency. The lead representatives have identified the

following senior officers in their respective agencies who have responsibility and authority for ensuring full participation with these arrangements:

TBC	Director of Children Services	Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council
Sarah Parker	Executive Director – People (Children)	Dorset Council
Vanessa Read	Director of Nursing and Quality	Dorset CCG
Paul Kessell	Head of Crime and Criminal Justice	Dorset Police

These named senior officers have delegated authority to speak on behalf of the safeguarding partner they represent, make decisions on behalf of their organisation or agency, commit them on policy, resourcing and practice matters, and hold their own organisation or agency to account on how effectively they participate in and implement the local arrangements. The accountability arrangement will include responsibility for the named senior officers and the lead representatives to develop relevant scrutiny arrangements for safeguarding within their own individual agencies.

It is recognized that the Children Acts of 1989 and 2004 which underpins *Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018*, set out specific duties including a duty on the local authority to provide services to children in need in their area, regardless of where they are found and requires local authorities to undertake enquiries if they believe a child has suffered or is likely to suffer significant harm. The Director of Children’s Services and Lead Member for Children’s Services in local authorities are the key points of professional and political accountability, with responsibility for the effective delivery of these functions.

As the portfolios for Directors of Children’s Services and relevant elected and lead members of the new councils are developed, further consideration will be given to how they will discharge the accountability detailed above within the context of the new pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership arrangements.

In order to bring transparency for children, families and all practitioners about the activity undertaken, the safeguarding partners will publish a report in line with *Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018* requirements at least once in every 12-month period which will set out what they have done as a result of the arrangements, including child safeguarding practice reviews, and how effective these arrangements have been in practice.

Geographical boundaries

The pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership will cover the geographical boundaries of the 2 new unitary authorities with a combined children and young people population of 142800. This includes children in the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership area who have gone missing and who have been found in another area.

The area includes the relatively densely populated conurbation of Bournemouth and Poole, whilst Dorset county is more sparsely populated with inhabitants living in a number of seaside/market towns including Dorchester and Christchurch along with more isolated rural villages.

Relevant agencies

Senior leaders for the proposed pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership have identified the following organisations as “relevant agencies” whose involvement the safeguarding partners consider is required to safeguard and promote the welfare of local children.

However, in line with statutory guidance, safeguarding partners note the option to request representatives from other agencies/organisations as the partnership develops or the need arises from particular areas of partnership work.

NHS organisations and independent healthcare providers	Youth Offending Service	Probation	Adult services
Primary Care	Schools, Colleges and other Education providers	Early Years and Childcare providers	Public Health
Local Council services inc Licencing and Tourism	British Transport Police	Community Rehabilitation Company	Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Services
Sports Organisations/Groups /Associations	Relevant housing providers	Voluntary, Charity, Faith based organisations and hard to reach community groups	UK Visa, Immigration Enforcement and Border Force
Children’s Homes, Independent Fostering Agencies and Supported Housing for Young People	Prisons	Coroner	Secure Training Centres and Secure Estate
Armed forces			

The safeguarding children partnership will engage with “relevant partners” on a regular basis to identify emerging safeguarding priorities and review impact of safeguarding arrangements including information sharing. A range of approaches will be used to maintain engagement including links via existing networks such as the Designated Safeguarding Leads network in education, planning events and webinars.

The safeguarding children partnership will promote via its website information on how to escalate concerns, how any disputes will be resolved along with details of the independent scrutiny and whistleblowing procedures.

Holding agencies to account for co operating and integrating their services to safeguard and promote the welfare of children is an important element of the new arrangements and will be formalised through an accountability framework to evidence that relevant agencies have appropriate, robust safeguarding policies and procedures in place and how information will be shared amongst all relevant agencies and the safeguarding partners.

Those agencies not under a statutory duty, should nevertheless cooperate and collaborate with the safeguarding partners and this will be assessed through periodic audits including section 11 audit and participation in local case reviews.

The Chairs of the sub groups including the local practice review group will account directly to the safeguarding children partnership.

Role of early years' settings, schools and other educational establishments

Ensuring support is in place to enable early years, schools and other education institutions to continue to fulfil their safeguarding children responsibilities will remain a key priority for the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership.

Strong links will be maintained through the Education Safeguarding Advisors/their equivalent to Designated Safeguarding Leads within child minding, pre-school/nurse provision, children centres, out of school provision, schools, colleges and other education institutions.

Working through these networks will provide a rich source of intelligence about emerging safeguarding needs and risks so that training, policies/procedures can meet the needs of this diverse group of front line staff.

The pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership will seek assurance on schools safeguarding practice through feedback on *Keeping Children Safe in Education* audits/findings from OFSTED inspections and effective engagement in relevant local practice reviews.

Voice of children, young people and families

Capturing the voice of children, young people and their families will enable the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership to hear about the experience and impact of multi-agency support, improve understanding about the safeguarding context in the local area and shape priorities to help keep children and young people safe.

The pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership will seek assurance on how individual agencies regularly seek and act upon feedback from children and young people including feedback through corporate parenting panels and youth parliament participants. Where possible, the partnership will involve families in local learning reviews and strengthen links with local voluntary and community groups working with children and young people.

Resource has built in to the proposed infrastructure to develop engagement and participation activities to explore new ideas for directly and indirectly involving children and young people in the work of the partnership.

Learning hub incorporating quality assurance mechanism

Learning and improvement is fundamental to effective safeguarding arrangements and a pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership should lead to a larger pool of knowledge, benchmarking to drive improvement and enable commissioning of high quality evidence based learning.

This will be represented in a “learning hub” that brings together learning from a variety of sources including audit, outcomes based performance data, feedback from children/young people and their families, feedback from staff and peer review.

The learning hub will be one of the key ways in which the partnership engages directly with staff so that the partnership has line of sight to front line multi agency practice and can hear first hand of emerging concerns and opportunities to build excellent practice.

It will provide the quality assurance function of the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership, ensuring consistently high quality safeguarding practice is the norm across all agencies and co-ordinate statutory audits such as Section 11 and Section 175 audits.

The learning hub will be based on the well regarded model at Bexley Safeguarding Children Partnership and operate on a 4 monthly cycle. This will include:

- Month 1 initial problem identification/scoping
- Month 2 multi agency audit
- Month 3 collating feedback from children, young people, families and staff
- Month 4 analysis, recommendations for improving practice/service improvement

Re audit to enable analysis of impact will be built into the cycle.

There will be a close link to the work of the local practice review group reflecting learning and improvement as the central tenet of the partnership.

Local practice review

The pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership will identify and oversee the review of serious child safeguarding incidents. This includes undertaking initial “rapid review” and liaison with the national Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel to agree the most appropriate level and form of investigation.

This should ensure robust, proportionate investigation of cases when things go wrong and ensure the timely sharing of learning at a local and national level. There is a particular opportunity to align the learning from safeguarding adult reviews, domestic homicide reviews, mental health homicide reviews and other relevant statutory investigations.

Child death review partners

The responsibility for ensuring child death reviews are carried out is held by “child death review partners” who are defined as the local authority for the area and any clinical commissioning group operating in the local authority area.

Child death review partners for 2 or more local authorities may combine and agree their area may be treated as a single area for the purpose of undertaking child death reviews.

Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018 requires child death review partners to cover a geography that could expect at least 60 child deaths per annum. The present pan Dorset child death review panel reviews circa 40 deaths per year. As such, discussions have taken place with Somerset for a proposed partnership covering Bournemouth, Christchurch, Dorset, Poole and Somerset.

Themed task and finish groups - working with the wider safeguarding partnership

The pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership will use a problem solving approach to address safeguarding children priorities and improve outcomes on the safety and welfare of children and young people. This will be progressed through a small number of task and finish groups and where possible co ordinated with the work of other relevant pan Dorset strategic partnerships which have a role in safeguarding such as:

- Safeguarding Adults Boards
- Community Safety Partnerships
- Pan Dorset Community Safety and Criminal Justice board
- Pan Dorset Domestic Abuse Strategic Group
- Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA)
- Health and Wellbeing Boards

Through a shared sense of responsibility, joint and aligned priorities partners should be able to achieve greater impact in addressing vulnerabilities and risks to children and young people in areas such as sexual abuse, sexual violence, exploitation and domestic abuse. The model should also enable efficiencies in use of resource and specialist skills such as data analysis.

Learning, training and development

The safeguarding children partnership will maintain the current training unit hosted by Dorset Council which operates as a self-funding training function and offers a comprehensive programme of face to face multi agency and on line training for statutory, voluntary and independent workers.

This includes the following:

- Two-day Safeguarding Children course and one day follow up,
- Serious Case Review Workshops,
- Child Sexual Exploitation
- Courses on neglect, emotional abuse and sexually harmful behaviour.
- Safer Recruitment
- Managing Allegations
- Supervising to Safeguard and Working with Resistant Families.

All training programmes are commissioned and delivered within a quality assurance framework to ensure high standards of learning which are evaluated immediately on completion of the course, at 8 weeks and 6 months.

The new learning hub will ensure future training is skills based and commissioned based on learning needs from the 4 monthly learning and improvement cycle along with learning from local practice reviews, national reviews and evidence informed practice published through the improvement bodies such as the What Works Centres, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and the College of Policing.

Funding

In line with *Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018*, safeguarding partners have reviewed the financial contribution from each partner to ensure this is sufficient to cover all elements of the arrangements, including the cost of local child safeguarding practice reviews.

Analysis of historic contributions has highlighted that 98.3% of financial contribution has come from local authorities, the CCG and police with a pan Dorset baseline contribution from these agencies of £270106.

It has been agreed that this sum and the current agency split of contributions will be maintained in 2019/20 to enable a smooth transition of responsibilities from the former LSCBs and ensure an appropriate infrastructure can be established for the new safeguarding children partnership.

It is recognised that the level of funding secured from each partner should be equitable and proportionate which will require some adjustment between agency contributions going forward. To enable appropriate budget planning and business case development it has been agreed that when a new budget is set for 2020/21 onwards, the 2 local authorities, CCG and police will each contribute 25% of this funding.

Dispute resolution

The pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership and its relevant agencies must act in accordance with the arrangements for their area, and will be expected to work together to resolve any disputes locally. These arrangements will be formalised in a dispute resolution

policy including appropriate escalation from senior officers to lead representatives of the partnership. Public bodies that fail to comply with their obligations under law are held to account through a variety of regulatory and inspection activity. In extremis, any non-compliance will be referred to the Secretary of State.

Independent Scrutiny

The role of independent scrutiny is to provide assurance in judging the effectiveness of multi-agency arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of all children in a local area. This is undertaken through objective scrutiny, acting as a constructive critical friend, promoting reflection to drive improvement and considering how well the safeguarding partners are providing strong leadership to fulfil their safeguarding children role.

As detailed on page 6, named senior officers and the lead representatives will ensure relevant scrutiny arrangements for safeguarding within their own individual agencies.

Further consideration will also be given to how relevant elected and lead members of the new councils will discharge their accountability within the context of the new pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership arrangements.

The independent scrutiny will form part of a wider system which includes the independent inspectorates' single assessment of the individual safeguarding partners and the Joint Targeted Area Inspections (JTAs).

Local senior leaders have agreed that in the first instance they will establish an independent chair role which in due course may change to other means of accessing independent scrutiny.

Infrastructure

The new pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership plans to facilitate and drive action beyond usual agency constraints and boundaries to improve safeguarding outcomes for children and young people. To do this, the partnership needs a dynamic and flexible infrastructure which engages with children, young people, families, practitioners and managers to put learning and improvement at the centre of its work and plans to do this through the development of a learning hub.

This will be coupled with a multi agency problem solving approach, linking with other strategic partnership groups to pre-empt and address the greatest challenges and needs.

At the same time, there is still a need to hold agencies to account for their safeguarding work and build public confidence in local safeguarding arrangements so the safeguarding children partnership will need robust systems to manage its business including preparation of annual reports for independent scrutiny.

As such, the proposed infrastructure places particular emphasis on the following skills – some of which will be reflected in dedicated roles whilst others such as data analysis, engagement and communication will be brought in under a service level agreement.

- practice review and learning
- project management
- data analysis, audit and operational research
- business support including budget management
- engagement and communication
- relationship management

Transitional arrangements

Business continuity

Bournemouth and Poole Local Safeguarding Children Board(LSCB) and Dorset Safeguarding Children Board (DSCB) will formally handover any outstanding actions or ongoing priorities from their business plans for 2019/20. This process has already begun and was discussed at a planning event held in December 2018 when it was agreed that the following Dorset priorities could now become business as usual:

- Reducing the number of children experiencing significant harm
- Reducing the number of children and young people who come into care

At present, it is anticipated that actions for the following priorities will be ongoing at the time of handover:

- Child exploitation including actions from the JTAI that took place in Dorset in May 2018.
- Child sexual abuse
- Neglect

In addition, there is ongoing work on a joint basis with the adult safeguarding boards on whole family working.

The LSCB/DSCB maintain a risk register with the highest risks at present relating to insufficient management capacity across partner organisations to support the delivery of LSCB/DSCB work streams and the risk of loss of LSCB/DSCB business team capacity due to uncertainty from the changes to safeguarding children arrangements. Mitigations are in place to address these risks and any outstanding risks at the time of formal handover will be notified to senior leaders within the new safeguarding children partnership.

Serious case reviews

At the time of writing, the LSCB and DSCB will be handing over the following cases:

Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole:
No current SCRs
Multi agency learning event planned for 1 case
Single agency case audit in out of area placement

Dorset:
SCR 31 due to be published April 2019
Multi agency case audit 28, 30, 32 learning events held or planned for April 2019
Advice awaited from national child safeguarding review panel on 1 further case

In addition, the archive of historical reports from serious case reviews and action plans is accessible via the relevant local authority hosted databases.

Training and development

It has been agreed that the existing training business unit will continue to be hosted for at least the first year of operation of the new safeguarding children partnership by Dorset Council. A full programme of courses has been commissioned for 2019/20 and staff will continue to be able to book these via the Nexus system.

Policies and Procedures

The Pan-Dorset Multi-Agency Safeguarding Policies and Procedures Manual which is an online resource provided by tri.x has recently been updated. The contract with tri.x remains in place and will ensure continuity of access to the wide range of procedures required by the multi agency workforce.

Summary

Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018 introduces significant changes to multi agency safeguarding children arrangements and in particular bringing to an end LSCBs and replacing these with new safeguarding children partnerships.

This comes at a time of significant organisational change locally with 2 new unitary councils being formed and major strategic developments within the CCG and police. As such, work to develop a vision and priorities for safeguarding children will be an early activity for new and existing senior leaders of the pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership.

Local senior leaders have been proactive in considering potential safeguarding children partnership models including information from “early adopter “sites elsewhere in the country and overseeing an option appraisal to ensure optimum arrangements locally.

This has led to a proposal to develop a pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership which should enable a single more, joined up approach in addressing vulnerability and risk for children and young people across Bournemouth, Christchurch, Dorset and Poole.

Engagement on the proposals has endorsed the plan as an effective means of strengthening multi agency safeguarding work to further improve the safety and welfare of children and young people locally.

The enclosed plan sets out the key components of the new arrangement including the geography to be covered, identifies “relevant agencies” including the role of early years, education and other education institutions as organisations essential to safeguarding children and young people.

The plan details the proposed structure which is centred around a learning hub incorporating the quality assurance function and will bring together learning from a variety of sources including audit and outcomes based performance data. It will also be one of the ways the partnership engages directly with front line staff and receives feedback from children/young people and their families.

The governance arrangement outlined in the plan will ensure accountability, transparency clear escalation routes and the means of resolving any differences.

Working beyond agency boundaries and with other strategic partnerships in a problem solving, outcome focused way should lead to achieving greater impact in tackling some of the greatest challenges within safeguarding children practice.

Timeline

Approval of pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership plan through appropriate governance channels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Shadow Council • Dorset Shadow Council • Dorset CCG • Dorset Police 	February 2019/March 2019
Independent Scrutiny of safeguarding children partnership plan	April 2019
Finalise safeguarding children partnership plan	May 2019
Publication of plan and send plan to Secretary of State for Education	No later than 29 th June 2019
Commence new safeguarding children partnership arrangements	No later than 29 th September 2019

Comments received on Discussion Paper re Proposed Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership

Reference in the responses to “the plan” refers to the Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership Plan

Contributor	Theme of Comment	Response
Safeguarding Adults Boards	The proposals are welcomed and there is an intention to undertake a similar review of safeguarding adult partnership arrangements from Spring 2019. Importance of maintaining joint work in areas such as whole family approach	The new safeguarding children partnership is committed to joint work in all relevant areas.
SARC	Grateful for inclusion of SARC to comment on proposal. Think Pan Dorset partnership is the best solution. Would like to continue to be included in relevant communications.	The importance of effective communication is recognized with resources prioritised for this which is detailed in the infrastructure section of the plan.
Head Teacher	Need to refine agenda and focus issues for relevant partners and build partnerships at a local level	The new partnership plans to engage with partners on the development of a small number of priorities and encourages multi agency working at a local level.
CEO CVS	Like proactive approach. Would like the new safeguarding partnership to engage with the CVS where people are best placed to make an impact.	The voluntary sector as a “relevant partner” is recognised as having an important community links with children and young people and the partnership welcomes the opportunity to strengthen joint work.

Contributor	Theme of comment	Response
Bournemouth Senior Management Team	<p>Positive about proposals</p> <p>Will be important to consider role of elected members as move to new safeguarding children partnership goes forward.</p>	<p>As the portfolios for new Directors of Children services and lead members/portfolio holders are developed, further consideration will be given to how they will discharge their accountabilities within the context of the new safeguarding children partnership arrangements.</p>
Manager NHS England	<p>Need to reference integrated care system of Dorset CCG</p> <p>Like the assessment criteria but struggling to see where voice of the child features.</p> <p>Understand other models were considered including joint partnership with adults' boards. Would like to see how priorities will be jointly planned with other boards.</p> <p>Good to see how experience from early adopters was used but can't see in proposal how learning from early adopters will continue going forward.</p> <p>Need to see a clear dispute resolution process.</p>	<p>Now referenced on page 3 of the plan.</p> <p>Further detail now provided on capturing the voice of the child through resourced engagement work of partner agencies and through direct involvement in the learning hub cycle. Page 8 of the plan.</p> <p>The partnership will align relevant priorities with a range of other strategic partnerships detailed on page 10 of the plan.</p> <p>The partnership continues to review the publications of early adopter sites and links have already been made with Bexley LSCB to learn further about their Learning Hub.</p> <p>This is now described in the plan at page 11.</p>

Contributor	Theme of comment	Response
Childrens Trust Poole	<p data-bbox="528 244 1323 352">Need to be clear if Independent chairing role is to be ongoing and if not build into job description of leadership role within infrastructure responsibility re facilitate partnership working.</p> <p data-bbox="528 400 1312 469">Safeguarding partnership needs to respond to issues as they arise in a timely way.</p> <p data-bbox="528 596 1341 705">Importance of maintaining links with the safeguarding in education groups and education leads. The size of the forum is already large and may not be effective if expanded further.</p> <p data-bbox="528 791 1317 860">Little said about the voice of the child will be captured. Need vision for this and funds to enable engagement work.</p> <p data-bbox="528 987 1335 1096">Need to be clear on who will receive communication from the safeguarding children partnership and the infrastructure for this.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1144 1312 1181">Armed forces are not captured within the relevant agencies.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1267 1267 1294">Need clarification on partners intention re Tri.X contract.</p>	<p data-bbox="1373 244 1989 352">Learning from early adopter sites on the role of the independent scrutineer continue to be reviewed.</p> <p data-bbox="1373 400 1977 549">Proposed task and finish groups should enable timely response to issues as they arise. The escalation policy also offers a formal mechanism to resolve such difficulties.</p> <p data-bbox="1373 596 1989 745">The role of early years and education is essential to the safety and welfare of children and further detail has been included within the plan page 7.</p> <p data-bbox="1373 791 1984 979">Further detail now provided on capturing the voice of the child through resourced engagement work of partner agencies and through direct involvement in the learning hub cycle. Page 8 of the plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1373 991 1995 1139">The importance of effective communication is recognized with resources prioritised for this which is detailed in the infrastructure section of the plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1373 1150 1989 1219">Now added to the list of relevant agencies page 7 of the plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1373 1230 1957 1339">Page 13 of the plan confirms the intention of the partnership to continue with the Tr.X contract.</p>

Contributor	Theme of comment	Response
Head Teacher School	<p>Seems well considered and organized approach.</p> <p>Would like to see communications with designated safeguarding leads continued.</p> <p>Would like confirmation of continued access to training.</p> <p>Wants clarity on who will be the main point of contact in the new partnership</p>	<p>The role of early years and education is essential to the safety and welfare of children and further detail has been included within the plan page 7.</p> <p>A full training programme will continue to be available to the current cross section of workers and is detailed in the plan at page 10. Once published, the infrastructure for the new partnership will make clear key contact points. Meanwhile, the current websites and business team contacts continue to be available.</p>
Bournemouth and Poole LSCB	<p>Colleagues feel this is a good opportunity to shape the new arrangements,</p> <p>Need to ensure the Voice of the Child is embedded in the new arrangements.</p> <p>Colleagues who had worked with Bexley found their model to be good.</p>	<p>Further detail now provided on capturing the voice of the child through resourced engagement work of partner agencies and through direct involvement in the learning hub cycle. Page 8 of the plan.</p> <p>Senior leaders have reviewed plans from early adopters across the country and incorporated relevant features in the proposals including development of a “learning hub” based on the Bexley model</p>

Contributor	Theme of comment	Response
Dorset SCB	<p>Query whether the sub-groups would remain and the difficulty of maintaining the balance of wider agency involvement, such as criminal justice, in the new partnership arrangements.</p> <p>Recognition that Bexley and Devon have published their new arrangements, as an early adopter, for us to compare ours with.</p> <p>Query on how the new arrangements will be evaluated in comparison with the present arrangement.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the new safeguarding children partnership will have less “standing” sub groups but will form outcome focused task and finish groups to address key priorities.</p> <p>Senior leaders have reviewed plans from early adopters across the country and incorporated relevant features in the proposals including development of a “learning hub” based on the Bexley model.</p> <p>Evaluation mechanisms will be built into the priority setting of the new safeguarding children partnership. The learning cycle described in the plan is based on a continuous process of learning and improvement including evaluation.</p>
Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Planning Event	<p>Needs to be a strong emphasis on improving outcomes and demonstrating the impact of partnership working for the benefit of children and young people</p> <p>Needs to be alignment on priorities with other partnership groups.</p> <p>Needs to be clear mechanism to feed in and out of the safeguarding children partnership.</p>	<p>This is emphasised in the principles of the proposed safeguarding children partnership and will underpin its work in all areas.</p> <p>The partnership will align relevant priorities with a range of other strategic partnerships detailed on page 10 of the plan.</p> <p>The importance of effective communication to feed in and feed out ideas and key developments is recognized with resources prioritised for this which is detailed in the infrastructure section of the plan.</p>

	<p>Like the Learning hub based on Bexley 4 month learning cycle</p> <p>Need to consider the direct role of Probation and the Community Rehabilitation Company</p> <p>Need to build on current strengths of LSCBs</p> <p>The vision needs to be developed and co-owned with all agencies</p> <p>Clarity needed on expectations of partners</p> <p>The partnership needs to be visible</p> <p>Practice approaches should be based on service user feedback, academic evidence and practitioner views</p> <p>Training needs to be more skills based</p> <p>Learning hub needs to seek out best practice from elsewhere</p>	<p>The “learning hub” based on the Bexley model is described in the plan at page 9</p> <p>Probation and the Community Rehabilitation Company are detailed as relevant agencies with the option to request representatives from these agencies as the partnership develops or the need arises from particular areas of partnership work.</p> <p>Learning from the strengths of the existing LSCBs has been incorporated within the plan. As new and existing leaders are confirmed within the safeguarding children partnership, an early priority will be engagement on developing the vision for safeguarding children</p> <p>An accountability framework will be developed to supplement Working Together requirements of partners.</p> <p>An engagement and communications plan will address the range of ways that the partnership will be accessible and visible.</p> <p>The “learning hub” learning cycle incorporates these elements</p> <p>A new learning and improvement framework will place a greater emphasis on skills based training</p> <p>The learning cycle starts with drawing on best practice and evidence from elsewhere</p>
--	---	---

Contributor	Theme of comment	Response
Designated Safeguarding Lead	<p>Have "partners" that produced this document been prescribed by the new laws / practices around safeguarding?</p> <p>Were schools not invited because we are not on this a list?/Do we appear in a table of lots of other partners as a result of this?</p> <p>Is the rest of the document a kind of corporate level response to the new set of requirements set out by the Government?</p> <p>It reads to me as a set of very good intentions that appear to be set out in a manner to ensure compliance with a set of requirements.</p>	<p>Partners have developed plans in line with the requirements of new safeguarding children partnerships detailed in Working Together 2018</p> <p>The national consultation on Working Together considered schools as a 4th statutory partner within the new safeguarding children partnerships but this was not considered feasible due to no single representative agency for schools and other education establishments. At a local level, schools have been identified as a relevant agency.</p> <p>It has been important to structure the plan in line with statutory requirements to evidence how the safeguarding children partnership will be able to deliver against its responsibilities.</p>
Members of CCG Board	<p>Proposal seems sensible</p> <p>Engagement with relevant partners will be key</p> <p>No immediate concerns</p> <p>I'm content there has been a full option appraisal but reference to other strategic partnerships seems vague.</p> <p>Option appraisal refers to difficulty in operationalising the model in the pros and cons- need to be confident the proposed model will be effective.</p>	<p>The key strategic partnerships are listed on page 10 of the plan and were part of the engagement process.</p> <p>The larger geography of a pan Dorset safeguarding children partnership was considered a potential challenge but should be overcome with clear priorities, effective communication arrangements and robust processes.</p>
Dorset County Council Senior Leadership Team	Broad level of support. Several senior managers have been directly involved in developing proposals.	

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment			
Title	Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangements		
Date assessment started:	15/01/19	Version No.	1
		Date of completion:	15/01/19
Revision History			
Type of strategy, policy, project or service			
Is this Equality Impact Assessment (please tick)?			
Existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Changing, update or revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New or proposed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please explain)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is this an internal or external Equality Impact Assessment (please tick)?			
Internal	<input type="checkbox"/>	External	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Both	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Officers involved in the assessment	Mary Taylor/Nick Jarman		

This report was created by	
Name	Mary Taylor
Email address	Mary.Taylor@dorsetcc.gov.uk
Directorate or Service	Children's Social Care

Step 1: Aims
What are the aims of your strategy, policy, project or service?
<p>Significant changes have recently been made to multi-agency working as part of the Children and Social Work Act 2017. The Act abolishes Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs) and creates new duties and a system of collective accountability for Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), local authorities and police to make arrangements locally to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in their area.</p> <p>Senior leaders from Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), the 3 current Local Authorities and Dorset Police have overseen and engaged in an option appraisal to consider potential models for future safeguarding children partnership arrangements to meet the new requirements of <i>Working Together 2018</i>.</p> <p>The outcome of the option appraisal was that a Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership would provide the most effective mechanism for addressing current and emerging safeguarding children challenges.</p> <p>The proposal is for a new Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangement which complies with the new legislation and guidance and improves the impact and effectiveness of multi-agency safeguarding of children in Dorset.</p>
What is the background or context to the proposal?
<p>Following Lord Laming's inquiry into the death of Victoria Climbié, the Children Act 2004 required all Local Authorities in England and Wales to set up a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) whose function would be to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people in</p>

their area, through collective accountability across agencies and organisations.

The role of the LSCB has been to coordinate work by individual agencies and ensure that each organisation acts effectively when they are doing this. The LSCB publishes multi-agency policies and procedures for child protection in their area, which should be responsive to local and national concerns and provide assurance that multi-agency working is effective.

Statutory guidance was provided setting out how Local Safeguarding Children Boards should work in accordance with the Children Act 1989 and the Children Act 2004. This guidance, called “Working Together to safeguard children”, has been regularly updated in line with changes in legislation and new thinking around child protection.

The most recent revision of the guidance was published in July 2018 following the passage of the Children and Social Work Act 2017 and taking account of the Wood report into the effectiveness of LSCBs. The report concluded that LSCBs are not as effective as they could be.

The 2017 Act creates new duties and a system of collective accountability for Police, health and Local Authorities to make arrangements locally to promote and safeguard the welfare of children in their area.

Step 2: Intelligence and Communications

What data, information, evidence and research were used in this EqlA and how has it been used to inform the decision-making process?

The option appraisal included the development of an initial long list then a detailed assessment of a short list of potential models against the following criteria:

1. Ensures excellent practice is the norm
2. Ensures learning is promoted and embedded
3. Enables the public to feel confident that children are protected from harm
4. Enables partner agencies to hold one another to account effectively
5. Enables new safeguarding issues to be identified
6. Enables information to be shared effectively
7. Opportunity to reduce business support costs
8. Maximises leadership and staff capacity

Learning and experience from “early adopter” sites elsewhere in the country, who have already moved into the new arrangements, provided valuable ideas and insight to provide the most effective arrangements.

Following assessment of the options against the appraisal criteria, a Pan Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership was identified as the preferred model to enable a single more, joined up approach in addressing vulnerability and risk for children and young people across Bournemouth, Christchurch, Dorset and Poole.

The purpose of the Safeguarding Children Partnership is to ensure that agencies and others work together to safeguard children and promote their welfare. This is undertaken through co-ordination of services and through an accountability framework by which agencies can both support each other and hold each other to account. Direct work with children and families is not currently undertaken by the board, and this will remain the case under the new partnership arrangements. Individual cases will continue to be considered where there is a need for a “Child

Safeguarding Practice Review” (previously called Serious Case Review) or as part of a multi-agency audit, however, this would be for the purpose of professional learning and responsibility for direct work with the child and family would remain with the appropriate agency.

The Safeguarding partnership will continue to be responsible for providing multi-agency policies and procedures and safeguarding training., as well as forming task and finish groups to jointly address wider safeguarding and/or practice concerns.

The full proposal for the new arrangements will be considered at the following committees:

04.02.19 – Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Cllrs Batstone and Garcia could be invited to this so that they also are included in the scrutiny)

11.03.19 – Shadow Executive Committee to seek approval

What data do you already have about your service users, or the people your proposal will have an impact on?

The Wood report, commissioned by government, undertook a national review of Local Safeguarding Children Boards and found that they were not effective in providing a robust multi-agency response to safeguarding children. As a result of this changes were made to these arrangements which were written into legislation in the 2017 Children and Social Work Act and into Working Together to Safeguard Children guidance in 2018.

The guidance references the Equality Act 2010, which puts a responsibility on public authorities to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality of opportunity. It goes on to say

“This applies to the process of identification of need and risk faced by the individual child and the process of assessment. No child or group of children must be treated any less favourably than others in being able to access effective services which meet their particular needs”

An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken by the Department of Education in May 2016 on the Children and Social Work Bill. The EqIA did not identify direct equality impacts to any of the protected characteristics and the introduction of new Safeguarding Children Partnership Arrangement would have a beneficial impact on all children engaged with child protection and safeguarding.

What engagement or consultation has taken place as part of this EqIA?

A multi-agency planning event was held on 04.12.18 where the proposed plans were discussed. Following this a discussion paper was sent out to all agencies with a request for any comments to be provided from agencies by 31.12.18. The changes in legislation and guidance have been discussed at the Safeguarding Children Boards over the course of the last 6 – 12 months and all partners have been able to hear the proposals and comment on them.

The changes are a legal requirement and therefore engagement has been centred on how we put the new arrangements in place.

The feedback was received from a range of agencies and this has been incorporated into the proposed plan. Those individuals and agencies who provided feedback received a response to say

that their comments had been incorporated into to the plan, or to point them to the part of the plan which answered their query.

Is further information needed to help inform this proposal?

No.

How will the outcome of consultation be fed back to those who you consulted with?

This was not a consultation but an engagement with agencies and organisations who are currently and will be involved in ensuring the effectiveness of safeguarding children in Dorset. Those individuals and organisations who provided feedback have received a response and the final agreed plan will be circulated.

Safeguarding children partners must have published their new arrangements before 30 June 2019, and submit to the Secretary of State for Education, we then have up to three months from the date of publication to implement the arrangements. The plan must be independently scrutinised prior to being submitted, this will be commissioned by the partners following the plans being taken through the individual partner agencies governance processes. The new arrangements must be implemented by 29th September 2019.

Step 3: Assessment

Who does the service, strategy, policy, project or change impact?

If your strategy, policy, project or service contains options you may wish to consider providing an assessment for each option. Please cut and paste the template accordingly.

For each protected characteristic please choose from the following options:

Positive Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive impact on a large proportion of protected characteristic groups • Significant positive impact on a small proportion of protect characteristics group
Negative Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disproportionate impact on a large proportion of protected characteristic groups • Significant disproportionate impact on a small proportion of protected characteristic groups.
Neutral Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change/ no assessed significant impact of protected characteristic groups
Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough data/evidence has been collected to make an informed decision.

Please note in some cases more than one impact may apply – in this case please state all relevant options and explain in the ‘Please provide details’ box.

Age	<i>Positive</i>
------------	-----------------

Before completing this EqIA please ensure you have read the EqIA Guidance Notes

What age bracket does this affect?	Primarily children from pre-birth up to 18 years, however, whole family working means that it will involve working with parents, carers and others.
Please provide details	The change to the legislation and guidance is an improvement measure and therefore the anticipated impact is positive.
Disability	<i>Positive</i>
Does this affect a specific disability group?	No, however, children who are disabled can be more vulnerable to abuse than their peers and therefore there is a focus on ensuring that children who are disabled are protected is implicit in the work of the partnership
Please provide details	The change to the legislation and guidance is an improvement measure and therefore the anticipated impact is positive.
Gender Identity	<i>Positive</i>
Please provide details	As above
Pregnancy and maternity	<i>Positive</i>
Please provide details	As above
Race and Ethnicity	<i>Positive</i>
Please provide details	As above
Religion or belief	<i>Positive</i>
Please provide details	As above
Sexual orientation	<i>Positive</i>
Please provide details	
Sex	<i>Positive</i>
Please provide details	There is no evidence that either gender is more or less likely to suffer abuse.
Marriage or civil partnership	<i>No impact</i>

Before completing this EqIA please ensure you have read the EqIA Guidance Notes

Please provide details	
Other Socially Excluded Groups	Families and children who are socially isolated or appear on the edge of society, due to school exclusion, poverty, being care leavers etc may be more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. The new arrangements will have a positive impact due to a clearer focus on how agencies work together to provide safeguarding services.
Please provide details	

Before completing this EqlA please ensure you have read the EqlA Guidance Notes

Step 4: Action Plan

Provide actions for **positive**, **negative** and **unclear** impacts.

If you have identified any **negative** or **unclear** impacts, describe what adjustments will be made to remove or reduce the impacts, or if this is not possible provide justification for continuing with the proposal

Issue	Action	Person(s) responsible	Deadline	How will it be monitored?
Arrangements to be scrutinised through each agency's governance arrangements	Paper to go to Shadow overview and scrutiny committee	Nick Jarman	04.02.19	
Paper to be presented and approval sought to progress with the proposed plan.	Paper to go to Shadow executive committee	Cllr Steve Butler	11.03.19	
Plan to be independently scrutinised	Independent person to be commissioned	Partnership leads	Approx 29.05.19	
Approval to be sought from Secretary of State for Education	Plan to be published and submitted.	Partnership leads	29.06.19	
New Partnership arrangements to be implemented		Partnership leads	29.09.19	

Step 5: Sign Off

Officer completing this EqlA	Date
------------------------------	------

Before completing this EqlA please ensure you have read the EqlA Guidance Notes

Diversity Action Group Chair	Date

Shadow Dorset Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Subject	Decision Maker	Shadow Overview and Scrutiny Meeting Date	Consultation	Background Documents	Member/Officer Contact
Pan-Dorset Safeguarding Partnership Arrangements	Shadow Executive Committee	4 February 2019, 9.30am			Mary Taylor - Senior Manager, Safeguarding and Standards. Lead Member – Cllr Pauline Batstone (Safeguarding – Community Safety)
Communications		4 February 2019, 9.30am			Fiona Napier – Communications Tom Cornwall - Strategic Communications Lead Lead Member - Cllr Gary Suttle (Communications) and Cllr Rebecca Knox (Communications)
Programme Highlight Report, including SWAP Assurance Report Key Decision – No Public Access – Open	Shadow Executive Committee	4 February 2019, 9.30am			Lead Member – Leader of Shadow Dorset Council Lead Officer – Keith Cheesman, LGR Programme Director
Forward Plans/Work Programmes Key Decision – No Public Access – Open		4 February 2019, 9.30am			Lead Officer – Lee Ellis, Scrutiny Officer
Recruitment and Retention	Shadow Executive Committee	7 March 2019, 6.30pm			
Programme Highlight Report, including SWAP Assurance Report Key Decision – No Public Access – Open	Shadow Executive Committee	7 March 2019, 6.30pm			Lead Member – Leader of Shadow Dorset Council Lead officer – Keith Cheesman, LGR Programme Director

Forward Plans/Work Programmes		7 March 2019, 6.30pm			Lead Officer - Lee Ellis, Scrutiny Officer
Key Decision – No Public Access – Open					

Shadow Dorset Council

Shadow Executive Committee - Forward Plan - February 2019

For the period 11 FEBRUARY 2019 to 31 MARCH 2019
(publication date – 11 JANUARY 2019)

Explanatory Note:

This Forward Plan contains future items to be considered by the Shadow Executive Committee. It is published 28 days before the next meeting of the Committee. The plan includes items for the meeting including key decisions. Each item shows if it is 'open' to the public or to be considered in a private part of the meeting.

Definition of Key Decisions

Key decisions are defined in the Shadow Dorset Council's Constitution as decisions of the Shadow Executive Committee which are likely to -

- (a) to result in the relevant local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the relevant local authority's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates (**Thresholds - Dorset County Council £500k and District and Borough Councils £100k**); or
- (b) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions in the area of the relevant local authority."

When determining the meaning of "significant" for these purposes the Shadow Council will have regard to any guidance issued by the Secretary of State in accordance with section 9Q of the Local Government Act 2000 Act. Officers will consult with lead members to determine significance and sensitivity.

Private/Exempt Items for Decision

Each item in the plan above marked as 'private' will refer to one of the following paragraphs.

1. Information relating to any individual.
2. Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.
3. Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).
4. Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
6. Information which reveals that the shadow council proposes:-
 - (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
 - (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.
7. Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
Constitution - Dorset Council Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open	Shadow Executive Committee Shadow Dorset Council	14 Jan 2019 24 Jan 2019	<u>Consultees:</u> Governance Task and Finish Group Monitoring Officers Group <u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings	None	Lead member - Councillor Spencer Flower <i>Lead officer - Jonathan Mair, Corporate Director - Legal & Democratic Service Monitoring Officer, Designate j.e.mair@dorsetcc.gov.uk</i>
Members Allowances Scheme 2019/2020 Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open	Shadow Dorset Council	24 Jan 2019	<u>Consultees:</u> Independent Remuneration Panel Governance Task and Finish Group Monitoring Officers Group <u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings	None	Lead member - Councillor Spencer Flower <i>Lead officer - Jonathan Mair, Corporate Director - Legal & Democratic Service Monitoring Officer, Designate j.e.mair@dorsetcc.gov.uk</i>
Programme Highlight Report Key Decision - No Public Access - Open	Shadow Executive Committee	11 Feb 2019	<u>Consultees:</u> Members Services <u>Means of Consultation:</u> Task and Finish Groups Workshops Ongoing programme activity	None	Lead member - Leader of Shadow Dorset Council <i>Lead officer - Keith Cheesman, LGR Programme Director keith.cheesman@dorsetcc.gov.uk</i>
Forward Plan Key Decision - No Public Access - Open	Shadow Executive Committee	11 Feb 2019	<u>Consultees:</u> Shadow Executive Committee Dorset councils Programme Board <u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings	None	Lead member - Leader of Shadow Dorset Council <i>Lead officer - Lee Gallagher, Democratic Services Manager - Dorset County Council l.d.gallagher@dorsetcc.gov.uk</i>

<p>2019/2020 Budget</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p> <p>Shadow Dorset Council</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p> <p>20 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u> Public and Business Sector Councillors Budget Task and Finish Group Dorset Finance Officers Group</p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings Public and Business Sector Consultation</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Tony Ferrari</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Jason Vaughan, Interim Section 151 Officer jvaughan@dorset.gov.uk</i></p>
<p>Capital Strategy</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p> <p>Shadow Dorset Council</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p> <p>20 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u> Budget Task and Finish Group</p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Tony Ferrari</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Jason Vaughan, Interim Section 151 Officer jvaughan@dorset.gov.uk</i></p>
<p>Treasury Management Strategy</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p> <p>Shadow Dorset Council</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p> <p>20 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u> Budget Task and Finish Group</p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Tony Ferrari</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Jason Vaughan, Interim Section 151 Officer jvaughan@dorset.gov.uk</i></p>
<p>Local Council Tax Support Scheme</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u> Budget Task and Finish Group</p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Tony Ferrari</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Jason Vaughan, Interim Section 151 Officer jvaughan@dorset.gov.uk</i></p>
<p>Pensions Discretion Policy Statement for Dorset Council</p> <p>Key Decision - No Public Access - Open</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u> Trade Unions</p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u> HR/Union meetings and discussion</p>	<p>Proposed pensions discretion policy statement</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Peter Wharf</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Nicola Houwayek, HR Strategic Lead nicola.houwayek@dorsetcc.gov.uk</i></p>

<p>Care Home and Extra Care Housing in Bridport</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Part exempt</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u></p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u></p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Jill Haynes</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Matt Prosser, Chief Executive Designate matt.prosser@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk</i></p>
<p>Dorset Council Local Plan</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u></p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u></p>	<p></p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor David Walsh</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Stephen Hill, Strategic Director, Dorset Councils Partnership shill@dorset.gov.uk</i></p>
<p>Emergency Response Plan</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u> Shaping Dorset Corporate Board Shaping Dorset Programme Board</p> <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u> Meetings</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Barry Quinn</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Matt Prosser, Chief Executive Designate matt.prosser@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk</i></p>
<p>School Admissions Policies for September 2020</p> <p>Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Open</p> <p>1. Admissions Arrangements for Local Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools 2. Co-ordinated scheme timetable for managing national Point of Entry applications for September 2020 3. 6th Form Admissions Policy 4. Nursery Admissions Policy 5. Armed Forces Policy 6. Guidance on Consulting on Admissions Arrangements 7. Guidance on Placement of</p>	<p>Shadow Executive Committee</p>	<p>11 Feb 2019</p>	<p><u>Consultees:</u> The policies have to be consulted on for 6 weeks up to the 21 December 2018.</p> <p><u>Consultees:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Schools • All Neighbouring Local Authorities • All County Councillors • Association of Parish and Town Councils • Ministry of Defence • All registered nursery settings <p><u>Means of Consultation:</u> Email communication to each consultee. All schools and nurseries are asked</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Lead member - Councillor Andrew Parry</p> <p><i>Lead officer - Nick Jarman, Interim Director for Children's Services nick.w.jarman@dorsetcc.gov.uk</i></p>

Page 64

children outside their Chronological Age Group			to reference consultation on their websites and through their newsletters.		
Former Council Offices, North Quay, Weymouth Key Decision - Yes Public Access - Fully exempt	Shadow Executive Committee	11 Feb 2019	<u>Consultees:</u> Public consultation on the design and scheme content. <u>Means of Consultation:</u> Via Magna Homes	None	Lead member - Councillor Jeff Cant <i>Lead officer - David Brown dbrown@dorset.gov.uk</i>

This page is intentionally left blank