

**Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People Partnership
Held on 9th July 2007 at 2pm at the
Ecotech Centre, Swaffham**

Present:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| David Lennard Jones (Chair) | - | Norfolk Childrens Services |
| Carol Comer | - | Connexions |
| Susan Saxby | - | Partnership Officer, Children's Services |
| Sandra Summerfield | - | Norfolk Children's Services |
| Sue Jorgensen-Moore | - | Norfolk Childrens Services |
| Peter Morris | - | West Norfolk Voluntary & Community Action (VCA) |
| Lynda Niles | - | Norfolk & Waveney Mental Health Partnership |
| Julia Bivon | - | Norfolk Childrens Services |
| Sian Kendrick – Jones | - | Norfolk PCT |
| Mark Osborn | - | Teenage Pregnancy Support Unit |
| Heather Nunn | - | Parent Governor |
| Chris Gillett | - | Norfolk Governors Network |
| Geraldine Walsh | - | West Norfolk Children & Families Voluntary Sector Forum |
| Terry Cuss | - | Norfolk Constabulary |
| Robin Konieczny | - | Norfolk Childrens Services |

Supported by:

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Martin Slater | - | Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk |
| Laura Beveridge | - | Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk |
| Sarah Dennis | - | Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk |

Apologies for absence were received from:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Debbie Gates | - | Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk |
| Derek Wilkins | - | Norfolk Youth Offending Team |
| Debby McCarthy | - | Alderman Jackson School |
| Pat George | - | St Michaels Primary School |
| Diane Thurston | - | Norfolk PCT |
| Charles Hare – Winton | - | Norfolk Childrens Services |

		Action
1	Apologies Apologies were as noted above.	

<p>2</p>	<p>Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 21st May 2007 and Matters Arising</p> <p><u>Children and Young People Plan</u> Susan Saxby had made enquiries concerning the Joint Area Review (JAR) and whether colleges would be covered by this and she confirmed that colleges would be covered as part of the JAR. Susan would also be leading on the work of the sub group for the Western Area Children and Young Peoples Plan.</p> <p><u>Local Safeguarding Children Group</u> Diane Thurston had recently changed roles and so a new representative would need to be found for this group.</p> <p><u>Supporting Families</u> Recommendation 1 under item 8 required clarification.</p> <p>The minutes were agreed.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p>Chairs Correspondence</p> <p>A response had been received from Mark Weston, Commissioning Manager for the West regarding the Partnerships' request that the PCT honour their commitment to fund the Discovery Centre. No funding would be available in 2007/08 but there may be funding available in 2008/09. It was suggested that a meeting between the three funding partners might be helpful.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>A meeting to be held between the Borough Council, County Council and the PCT to discuss the future funding of the Discovery Centre.</p>	<p>DLJ/SD</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Budget and Resources</p> <p>Martin Slater reported that the budget position had not changed since the meeting on 21st May 2007. £80,000 had been allocated to the Children and Young People Partnership. £15,000 had been allocated to the network analysis, £4,000 to the Awards scheme to support young people. £2,000 of this was being held by the West Norfolk Voluntary and Community Action. £11,000 had been allocated to the Discovery Centre in light of the PCT's lack of resources.</p> <p>Martin explained that there had been a notional allocation of £10,000 to each of the four Children and Young People priorities. This left an unallocated balance of £12,000, which represented £10,000 of the initial budget plus £2,000 from the young people awards budget.</p> <p>Although there was no requirement to spend the budget by 31st March 2008, the Chair noted the importance of spending the funding on the</p>	

	<p>priorities that had been agreed.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>The budget to be circulated to members of the Children and Young People Partnership</p>	MS/SD
5	<p>Partnership Priority 1 – Youth Forum</p> <p>Peter Morris and Robin Konieczny had been working on this proposal. Robin tabled a report which outlined the proposed development plan, costs associated with the set up of the Forum and the results of the mapping exercise. A scoring tool had also been used.</p> <p>Sue Jorgensen - Moore suggested it would be preferable to offer healthy food for young people attending the Forum meetings rather than the proposed option. In response to a question from Martin Slater regarding the outcomes of the initial meetings, Robin Konieczny explained that the group would be asked to look at priorities and targets. Sue Jorgensen - Moore noted there were only 15 people on the Forum which was not a great number. Robin explained that it would provide an initial network and get them involved. Peter Morris explained it would be important for the young people to take ownership. Robin explained that the young persons Citizen Panel at County level had 6000 members of those aged 18 plus years.</p> <p>There was discussion around the development plan for the Youth Forum and it was highlighted that a budget of £1,200 was required for the initial set up meetings. The first Forum meeting was scheduled for October 2007.</p> <p>Robin Konieczny explained that the Forum in the West was one of five area Forums he would be setting up and he explained that some areas received contributions from both county and district councils. Martin Slater highlighted the need to ensure the project would be sustainable as there were several groups that needed to consult with young people. The total budget for the project would be £40,000 and the Chair questioned how this funding would be met. Susan Saxby suggested a bid be made to the County Strategic Partnership second homes funding. Terry Cuss suggested there may be funding available through the CDRPs.</p> <p>There was some discussion around the concept of giving the young people a financial reward for attending a meeting and whether this was appropriate. It was suggested that the young people could discuss this at the first Forum meeting. Robin Konieczny explained that Connexions rewarded young people for attending meetings although different organisations varied in their approach. Peter Morris suggested the reward was fair for the expectation that young people would give up their free time. The Chair highlighted the importance of ensuring that organisations were available when the young people were.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Peter and Robin for their report.</p>	

	<p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) The Children and Young People Partnership support the set up costs of the Youth Forum up to a maximum of £1,200</p> <p>2) A celebration event be considered in place of the financial reward to members of the Youth Forum.</p>	RK/PM
6	<p>Partnership Priority 2 – Exclusions from School</p> <p>Julia Bivon introduced this item and had tabled two papers. One outlined the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors leading to exclusion • Available resources to tackle exclusion • Progress and developments so far • Perspective of exclusions from both the child’s viewpoint and the agency involved. <p>Terry Cuss questioned whether there would be a correlation between unauthorised absence from school and anti social behaviour. Julia Bivon highlighted the need for statistics to be available so that such relationships could be determined. Julia had tabled a list of all exclusions from school under their various categories and categorised by area. Sandra Summerfield suggested it may prove useful to obtain a list of schools that these excluded children had attended. Common factors leading to exclusions could then be identified and preventative methods put in place.</p> <p>Robin Konieczny explained that in Finland the schools perspective was that it was their responsibility if a child was excluded and not the fault of the child.</p> <p>Sue Jorgensen - Moore questioned whether there was a correlation between exclusion figures and the NEET figures (Not in Education, Employment or Training). Carol Comer suggested that there appeared to be a direct relationship between these two figures.</p> <p>Martin Slater explained that exclusions from school were not represented on DAWN, the data observatory. Information for certain areas of the Borough were well represented.</p> <p>Heather Nunn explained that the levels of exclusions in the West were high and noted at one time there had been a distinct lack of assistance from Childrens Services in providing educational psychologists to assist young people. The Chair responded to this and explained that there had been some difficult recruitment issues in the West which were also national issues but despite repeated advertisements there had been no response from Educational Psychologists. There had also been issues about attracting suitably experienced teachers to support behaviour. In the past</p>	

there was evidence that the West had been less well resourced, but this was now rectified although recruitment was still a critical issue.

There was some discussion around the models of best practice and the use of case studies. It was suggested that the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) process may help identify a number of factors for the child.

The Chair explained that in the region of 40% of the exclusions in Norfolk were in the West where there were only 20% of the schools. Martin Slater explained that exclusions could be seen as a measure and not an outcome. He questioned whether there was a particular stage at which problems and issues became apparent. Martin questioned whether there were stages to go through before a child became excluded.

Chris Gillett explained that most schools had a 'behavioural policy' whereby if a child stepped outside this, they would be excluded. He explained that some children would not view this as a punishment. Sue Jorgensen - Moore thought that schools would do their utmost to keep a child in school and permanent exclusion would be a last resort.

Heather Nunn explained that governors would often be in a situation where a head teacher had opted to exclude a child, but once the child appeared before the panel of governors the reality of the situation would become apparent to the child and a governor panel may wish to choose not to exclude them. This often proved problematic as if the panel wished to give the child another chance, it would mean overturning the head teacher's decision which then sent a message that the head teacher had made a mistake.

Martin Slater highlighted the need for schools to receive more support especially for the issues that could not be resolved 'in house'. Sandra Summerfield supported this view and explained in one recent case, no party involved had considering involving social care.

Sue Jorgensen - Moore noted that some schools were under pressure to raise results and this may lead to a zero tolerance policy to ensure raised results.

Lynda Niles questioned whether the exclusions were prevalent in particular secondary schools. Terry Cuss explained that even some primary schools had high rates of unauthorised absences. This may correlate to the secondary schools they would eventually attend.

The Chair suggested a mapping exercise could be undertaken to match names of excluded children to CDRP and DAWN data.

Mark Osborn explained that sex and relationship education was poor across the county and there were lots of issues surrounding self esteem and bullying for example. He would be looking to increase the support given to schools for these issues. He anticipated a good practice model would be in place by October 2007.

	<p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) CAMHS to investigate the numbers of their service users that were fixed term exclusions and permanent exclusions to determine if there is a correlation</p> <p>2) Connexions to investigate how many of those young people that were in the NEET bracket were excluded, and which school they attended.</p>	<p>LN</p> <p>CC</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Partnership Priority 3 – Supporting Families</p> <p>Sandra Summerfield explained that a meeting needed to be arranged to discuss the family support strategy. In response to a question from Lynda Niles regarding progress to date with the strengthening families programme, Sandra reported that it was not progressing well. She reported that there were more people due to undertake the facilitator training in July. Lynda Niles noted that the training fee of £50 may prove to be a barrier to some.</p> <p>The Chair explained that strengthening families was a key thread in the work of the Children and Young People Partnership. Input of the schools would be required. It was noted that some schools employed family liaison officers and Geraldine Walsh explained that Park High had an officer whose role was very similar to this.</p> <p>Sandra Summerfield tabled a report outlining an initiative to improve outcomes for young people and in particular a target group of 11 to 15 year olds in North Lynn. An approach on several different levels was suggested which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A community based approach to address issues relating to local amenities • Establish a presence of dedicated professionals to build relationships with young people • Family work approach with parents receptive to intervention and address parenting and family issues • Individual work with young people <p>Sandra Summerfield expressed the need for agencies to come forward with resources to help with this programme. Terry Cuss explained that this age group were a priority for Norfolk Constabulary and he would be happy to commit resources.</p> <p>In response to a question from Susan Saxby regarding the CAF process, Sandra Summerfield confirmed that none of this group of young people had undergone the CAF process. Lynda Niles questioned whether the group of young people would have used the CAMHS service. She highlighted the work of Multisystematic Family Therapy, although this was expensive to run but showed good results.</p>	

	<p>Sandra Summerfield explained the cost of employing one worker to take on this project would be approximately £30,000 per annum. Martin Slater suggested that Sandra contact Vicky Etheridge, Neighbourhood Manager to consider joint working. Sandra had spoken to Graham Woodhouse, the Anti Social Behaviour Coordinator.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) Norfolk Constabulary, Connexions and CAMHS to go back to their organisations and research whether the identified group of young people have accessed their services</p> <p>2) Names and addresses of the group of young people to be identified to assist with the research.</p> <p>Terry Cuss left the meeting at 4.17pm.</p>	<p>TC/CC/ LN</p> <p>SSumm</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Teenage Pregnancy Strategy</p> <p>Mark Osborn introduced this item and explained he was the Teenage Pregnancy Coordinator for Norfolk. The main target for the county was to reduce the teenage pregnancy rate by 50% by the year 2010 from the baseline taken in 1998.</p> <p>Most areas had shown a decrease in the teenage pregnancy rate but in 2005 Norfolk had shown an increase of 7 ½ % from the baseline data. The first quarter in 2006 had also shown an increase. A 15% reduction was required in 2008, a 25% reduction in 2009 and a 33% reduction in 2010 to achieve the required target. Mark explained a different approach would be required. The best performing authority had achieved a 30% reduction overall.</p> <p>Mark Osborn explained that he hoped the Children and Young People Partnership could act as the strategic driving force behind the teenage pregnancy action plan. The key focus of the action plan would be to raise self esteem and aspirations.</p> <p>Sian Kendrick-Jones explained she chaired the Teenage Pregnancy Implementation Group (TPIG) in the western area. They had met on the morning of the 9th July and were considering the use of a self assessment toolkit. She supported the view of the Children and Young People Partnership providing the strategic steer, as the TPIG did not have the resources to do so. In response to a question from the Chair regarding representation on the group, Sian explained that Charles Hare-Winton attended the Children and Young People Partnership as well as the TPIG. In response to a question from Lynda Niles regarding key actions required, Mark Osborn explained that there was a structured plan based around the self assessment toolkit.</p> <p>The Chair explained that the Children and Young People Partnership's priorities did not include teenage pregnancy although it would be important</p>	

	<p>not to exclude issues such as this, which were important to address.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) The membership list of the TPIG to be circulated to the Children and Young People Partnership in order that any gaps in membership could be identified</p> <p>2) Sian Kendrick-Jones to be added to the membership for the Children and Young People Partnership as a representative from the TPIG</p> <p>3) The TPIG action plan and self assessment toolkit to be brought to the Children and Young People Partnership meeting on 12th November 2007.</p> <p>Sian Kendrick Jones presented a paper that outlined a proposal to fund a summer bus to provide sexual health advice to young people across West Norfolk. The cost consisted of six days for a school health advisor and youth worker. This initiative had worked well for the last two summers.</p> <p>In response to a question from Sandra Summerfield regarding the cost for the posts, Sian Kendrick-Jones explained the costs attached to this project were due to the fact it would take place outside of term time. Martin Slater suggested that the project could be linked to other initiatives. He questioned whether there was a genuine need for the advice in this form. Sian explained that the project was aimed at young people who would not access other services in this way. The overall view of the group appeared to be that this project was worthwhile although highlighted the importance of finding a sustainable source of funding. The group were not willing to commit the limited partnership funding to this project but thought that the services who provided the project should attempt to find a way to share the costs.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>The Chair would request that Charles Hare-Winton would discuss with Sian Kendrick- Jones the funding of this proposal and how the contributing services could meet the costs which were relatively small.</p>	<p>SKJ/SD</p> <p>SD</p> <p>SKJ/MO/SD</p> <p>DLJ/SKJ</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Local Safeguarding Childrens Group Update (LSCG)</p> <p>Sandra Summerfield explained that the launch of the LSCG had taken place the previous week and was attended by 60 people.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>A further update regarding the LSCG to be put on the agenda for 17th September 2007.</p>	<p>SSumm/SD</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Network Analysis</p>	

	<p>Laura Beveridge introduced this item and explained that the Virtual Network Analysis (VNA) website had been launched and she had received a few responses to date. She encouraged the group to promote the network analysis if possible. If anyone had any queries they could contact Laura, Martin Slater or the Chair.</p> <p>Geraldine Walsh noted there was some confusion within the voluntary sector and noted there were some people missing from the list, for example representatives from Health. Laura Beveridge explained that correspondence explaining the process had been sent to people several times and people had been encouraged to populate the list although there had been very little response. Martin Slater explained that the initial list of names had been sent to County Council who had highlighted some gaps and so the list had been sent round again, although response had still been quite poor. There had been some confusion from other parties regarding data protection. The process only worked if people added names to the list. Martin explained that the network analysis process would also be undertaken on the Fairstead Estate as part of the work of the Safer Stronger initiative, and would be repeated in four years time at the end of the Safer Stronger programme. Martin explained the whole process had been very challenging and encouraged members of the group to raise any queries they had with Jeremy Hawkins, as he would be attending a future meeting of the Children and Young People Partnership.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>Children Services Area Working</p> <p>At the last meeting, Sandra Summerfield had circulated a draft proposal regarding a new structure for Childrens Services. Since this meeting, two staff conferences had been held and there may be some amendments to the structure arising from these.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>A paper outlining the new structure and proposals for Childrens Services be brought to the meeting on 17th September 2007.</p>	<p>SSumm/ SD</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p><u>County Strategic Partnership</u> Martin Slater explained that the County Strategic Partnership were in the process of refreshing their community strategy for Norfolk. They had produced a number of documents to provide a focus for the new strategy. Skills were one of these papers.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>The paper to be circulated to the Children and Young People Partnership.</p> <p><u>Papers Tabled at Meetings</u> Martin Slater explained that several papers were being circulated at</p>	<p>MS/SD</p>

	<p>meetings and not in advance which made it difficult for partners to comment on proposals. He also requested these be made available electronically in order that they could be posted on to the Partnership website, where appropriate.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) Where possible, papers to be circulated in advance of the meetings</p> <p>2) All papers to be made available electronically for circulation to other partners and inclusion on the Partnership website.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>ALL</p>
12	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>The next meeting would be on Monday 17th September 2007 at 2.00pm and would be held in the Committee Suite at the Borough Council Offices, Kings Court, Chapel Street, Kings Lynn.</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at 5.00pm.</p>	