

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

Wednesday, 2 December 2009

2.00 pm

Swale 1, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone





AGENDA

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

Wednesday, 2 December 2009 at 2.00 pm
Swale 1, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone

Ask for: **Theresa Grayell**
Telephone: **01622 694277**

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the meeting.

Membership (8)

Conservative (7): Mrs A D Allen (Chairman), Mrs P T Cole, Mr G Cooke,
Mrs V J Dagger, Mr L B Ridings, Mrs P A V Stockell and
Mrs J Whittle

Liberal Democrat (1): Mr M J Vye (Vice-Chairman)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

A. BOARD BUSINESS

- A1 Substitutes
- A2 Declarations of Members' Interest relating to items on today's agenda
- A3 Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 September 2009 (Pages 1 - 6)
- A4 Chairman's Announcements

B. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- B1 The placement of Looked After Children by other local authorities in Kent (Pages 7 - 16)
- B2 Update on the development of the Children in Care Council (Pages 17 - 22)

C. UPDATES

Information Papers on these issues will be sent to Members separately

NB – Information items are not for consideration at the Meeting

- C1 Child Protection and Looked After Children Statistics

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership
(01622) 694002

Thursday, 26 November 2009

Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers may be inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN'S CHAMPIONS BOARD

MINUTES of a meeting of the Children's Champions Board held in the Swale 1, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 23 September 2009.

PRESENT: Mrs A D Allen (Chairman), Mrs P T Cole, Mr G Cooke, Mrs P A V Stockell and Mr M J Vye

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs S V Hohler

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs K Weiss (Head of Policy & Performance), Ms D Marriott (Acting Safeguarding Policy & Performance Manager), Mr M Ayre (Senior Policy Manager), Mrs J Doherty (Policy Manager) and Miss T Grayell (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

7. Membership

(Item A1)

Members noted that Mrs P A V Stockell had joined the Board to fill the vacancy previously listed.

8. Minutes of Board Meetings held on (a) 11 March and (b) 20 May 2009, and (c) 21 July 2009

(Item A4)

(1) RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 20 May and 21 July 2009 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman. The minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2009 are already signed and had been included for reference only.

(2) Arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 20 May, Members raised the following points:-

- (a) Before the June elections, the former Cabinet Member had been asked to meet the Board to talk about his role, and the Vice-Chairman asked that the new Cabinet Member for CFE do the same. Mrs Hohler agreed to this request and offered a twice-yearly 'Cabinet Member's update' item for the Board; and
- (b) The Vice-Chairman asked that discussion with the Director of CFE take place to ensure that the Board's key concerns of safeguarding and educational attainment of LACs are included on the agenda for the Head Teachers' Conference in 2010. This request was supported by officers as it would help keep these issues in the spotlight. In addition, Mrs Stockell asked if the invitation to the conference could be widened

to allow any Board Member to attend if they wish. Miss Grayell was asked to follow up both these points.

9. CPR3 Child Protection Statistical Return

(Item B1)

(1) Ms Marriott introduced the report and she and Mrs Weiss answered questions put by Members, explaining the following:-

- (a) Central Government kept nationwide data submitted by all local authorities, which all local authorities could consult to identify patterns and make comparisons;
- (b) All UK local authorities had shown an increase in the number of child protection referrals since the death of Baby Peter in 2007. In Kent the increase had been 30 – 35 %. If the whole increase could be attributed to heightened anxiety following the death of Baby Peter, professionals would expect to see a peak and then a gentle decrease, but instead the pattern had been a gradual, uniform increase;
- (c) Although many of the referrals received were from the public, most were from the Police, and Police referrals showed the biggest increase;
- (d) There was always some element of inappropriate referrals but even if these cases do not go as far as an initial assessment stage they take time and resources to process. It is important to find out why referrals had been made and what could be done to address the level of inappropriate referrals; and
- (e) Children who do not meet the official threshold for services may be missing out on support, so there was a need to see what could be done to help meet their needs. KCC's partners needed to be helped to understand thresholds.

(2) RESOLVED that the report be welcomed and information set out in it and in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks.

10. Summary of Protecting Children in Kent review - oral

(Item B2)

(1) Mr Ayre gave an oral update of the review which had been set up as a result of the death of Baby Peter in Haringey in 2007. The overall aim of the review was to see whether or not Kent's child protection practice was fitter for purpose than it was before the death of Baby Peter, and whether or not Lord Laming's second report had left Kent better placed. He emphasised that the finding of the review was that child protection practice in Kent was fundamentally safe.

(2) Phases 1 and 2 of the review had been reported to special meetings of the Board, on 12 February and 21 July respectively, and the final phase would be reported to the full County Council on 10 December 2009. This final phase of the review would include the effectiveness of inter-agency working and this would include

work mentioned in the previous item about thresholds and how various partner organisations and agencies understood and applied them.

(3) The review had shown up that even agencies which had no child protection responsibility (eg District Councils) were now conscious of the need to check their staff's knowledge of child protection issues and procedures.

(4) RESOLVED that the information given in the oral update be noted, with thanks.

11. Children's Social Services Annual Activity Report for Kent Safeguarding Children Board, 1 April 2008 - 31 March 2009

(Item B3)

(1) Ms Marriott introduced the item and, with Mrs Weiss, answered questions from Members. The following points were highlighted:-

- (a) The difficult economic climate had not caused any appreciable difference in the number of domestic violence cases, as Children's Social Services' threshold for intervention looked at parenting skills and not family income level. A high number of referrals from the Police were related to domestic violence, so some joint work will be done to help CSS and the Police understand each other's processes. There were two key issues when looking at domestic violence – prevention and how to manage a case once arisen;
- (b) Kent had a higher level of child protection referrals than many other local authorities, although the way in which they are processed in each authority made the outcomes different. Other local authorities might show fewer child protection referrals but they take more of them to Section 47 Conference. Kent takes a lower proportion of its referrals to conference but a higher percentage of those referrals end up having a Child Protection Plan. Comparing figs from authority to authority was difficult as the picture was very complex, with many variables;
- (c) Many initial referrals do not meet the threshold for CSS services but are redirected to other organisations and schemes that can help. CSS always look at available services as flexibly as possible to best meet the needs of each family. However, a family may not want the alternative service offered, or the other service may not be able to respond fast enough if the family had come seeking help at a time of crisis;
- (d) Referrals which do not proceed to service delivery are always recorded on a database, so any future referral for the same family or child can be cross-referenced to previous records;
- (e) What is most important is to choose the most suitable route for each child. A decision to take a case to conference would only be made if it was considered absolutely necessary. Conferences were avoided if possible as the process is stressful for the family. Some other local

authorities have more conferences as their processes are not so geared to avoiding them;

- (f) A small number of young people aged 17 shows up in the figures reported, and these are likely to be high-risk adolescents who have not been able to settle in the accommodation offered to them, and perhaps have mental health and/or substance misuse problems. When they reach 18 they are no longer subject to a Child Protection Plan, but those with mental health and/or substance misuse problems can be offered a good transition process into Adult Social Services;
 - (g) 45% of referrals are recoded as being due to 'family dysfunction' – an ISC category which includes a range of groups such as Children In Need. It is likely that this category includes many Police referrals;
 - (h) What would be useful for Members to see in the future is not only a breakdown of the initial referral figures but a similar breakdown of those cases which arrive at the initial assessment stage, to allow comparison and a chance to identify patterns; and
 - (i) Although the information gathered is believed to be accurate, the ICS system is still not working properly. Its documentation had to be re-designed and will need to be piloted by being tested in one district before going live. It is expected that ICS will be fully operational once again in April 2010. Members were reassured that electronic systems were always backed up by good paper records.
- (2) RESOLVED that the information given in the report and in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks.

12. Private Fostering - Annual Report

(Item B4)

Mrs S Hammond, Policy and Performance Officer, was in attendance for this item

(1) Mrs Hammond introduced the report and defined private fostering as an arrangement made privately, between a child's parent and someone who is not a relative, for the care of a child. To be classified as private fostering, an arrangement would have to be intended to last for more than 28 days, and apply to a young person up to the age of 16 (18 if disabled). No local authority is involved in making the arrangement, and no local authority money is payable in support of the arrangement, yet the local authority is required to assess the arrangement to check that it is suitable and meets the child's needs. Someone who is taking on a private fostering arrangement has to notify the local authority of the arrangements, yet many people simply do not know about this requirement and do not define what they are doing as formal fostering, and the local authority has no way of checking that they had been notified of private fostering arrangements going on. Mrs Weiss added that Victoria Climbié had been in a private fostering arrangement when she died.

(2) In discussion, and in Mrs Hammond's and Mrs Weiss's responses to Members' questions, the following points were highlighted:-

- (a) A parent specifying in their will that they wish their child to be brought up by a godparent would be entering the child into a private fostering arrangement, and their solicitor would have to set up a transfer of parental responsibility for both parties to sign;
 - (b) In the UK, it is estimated that approx 20,000 children are in private fostering arrangements. Referrals to the private fostering team are very low and come mainly from Children's Social Services (CSS), and many private fostering arrangements are discovered accidentally. In the 2008/09 financial year, the team had had 72 notifications of private fostering, and 43 children were in private fostering at the year end. As arrangements are temporary and transient, it is difficult to identify an exact number at any one time;
 - (c) private fostering is not necessarily easier to identify when a child enters school. Admissions forms for schools are not standard and do not contain the same information. Adults signing a school form can specify that they are a 'parent or guardian', but are not required to give any further detail;
 - (d) the private fostering team was working hard to increase the information it was able to get from schools, and a multi-agency partnership project in Ashford was looking into barriers to information being passed through;
 - (e) Awareness of the issue and the need to identify private fostering in a school could be included in the training for School Governors;
 - (f) Parents entering into private fostering arrangements could be encouraged to identify themselves as a way of accessing the extra support that their family might need, but it would need to be emphasised that this support could not be financial;
 - (g) the private fostering team had been awarded the maximum possible score in a recent Ofsted inspection which had included visits to/interviews with young people and carers and social workers; and
 - (h) The British Association of Adoption and Fostering (BAAF) had used its conference to raise awareness of private fostering and the key issues of safeguarding and the need to identify vulnerable children.
- (3) RESOLVED that:-
- (a) the information in the report and given in response to Members' questions be noted, with thanks; and
 - (b) the private fostering team be congratulated on achieving an excellent Ofsted assessment.

This page is intentionally left blank

BY:	Kay Weiss
TO:	Children's Champions Board
DATE:	2 December 2009
CLASSIFICATION:	Unrestricted

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

The placement of Looked After Children by other local authorities in Kent

The report focuses on children and young people placed into Kent by other local authorities (OLA LAC), and outlines actions which KCC CFE are undertaking to reduce the number and impact of OLA LAC placed in Kent.

The report does not focus on issues relating to KCC Citizen LAC placed out of authority or unaccompanied asylum seeking children and the pressures this places on Kent as a gateway authority in securing sufficient and appropriate placements for them.

BACKGROUND

1. (1) KCC has advocated for over 10 years the need to reduce the number of children/young people in care being placed into Kent, which is comparable in number to those children looked after by KCC, excluding unaccompanied asylum seeking children. In 2004, KCC developed specific multi-agency practice protocols to guide its own practice and encouraged DCSF to develop national protocols like these to guide the practice of all authorities. The practice protocols are still used by KCC when making decisions regarding the placement of its LAC out of authority. The author is not aware of any national protocols or guidance that has been developed by the DCSF or any government offices to influence practice in this area. Such guidance would be useful in ensuring a consistent approach to how the legislative changes outlined under section 2.2 should be delivered in practice as well as commissioning of suitable placements.
- (2) KCC CFE was also influential in the inclusion of a specific proposal within Care Matters to address the issue of out of authority placements. This followed a visit by Beverly Hughes in 2006 to Kent, which helped raise the profile of the welfare needs of these children/young people – as well as the impact that such high numbers of OLA LAC was placing on resources in Kent.
- (3) Alongside advocating for a reduction in the numbers of OLA LAC, KCC has ensured that it maintains its responsibilities to these children whilst they remain living in Kent. This has included specific commitments to OLA LAC in Kent's Pledge with respect to supporting their education, health and promoting sport and leisure opportunities. The needs of OLA LAC in Kent are included within the remit of Kent's Corporate Parenting Forum (made up from the Children's Champion Board and Kent's Corporate Parenting Group).
- (4) With respect to monitoring OLA LAC numbers, placing authorities have a legal duty to inform the host authority when placing LAC in their area. A specific form was developed by the ADSS in 1991 which has failed to reflect practice and

partnership working between children's social services, education and health since 2004 at least. In 2004, KCC developed an up-to-date notification form when placing KCC children out of authority (see section 3 of report). The routine practice of MIU contacting other local authorities throughout the year appears to have stopped, although it is understood from conversations with MIU that this is to be re-introduced this year. A proactive approach by KCC to establishing the accuracy of data on OLA LAC is necessary to ensure information records are as accurate as possible. LAC Education Advisors, through the Integrated LAC Support Service (ILSS) also have an important role in contributing to information on school aged OLA LAC and maintain close links with schools and MIU and the placing (responsible) authority for the child/young person. Their role will need to be included in any review of the data collection process by MIU.

2. Forthcoming legislative changes

- (1) Care Matters (white paper) 2007 raised the profile of the need to reduce long distance placements (originally highlighted by Utting and others in the 80's and 90's following reviews of residential children's homes). This is reflected in the Children and Young Person's Act 2008 (Part 2, section 9), which seeks to reduce the number of children and young people in care placed out of authority by placing a duty on the local authority to secure sufficient accommodation. This legislative change is expected to become law sometime in 2009/10, although the exact timescales are not yet known.
- (2) Once in place, the legislation should ensure that:
 - a) Each local authority will arrange for sufficient accommodation within their area to meet the needs of their children
 - b) Demonstrate for those children who continue to be placed out of authority that it is consistent with promoting their welfare that they are provided with accommodation outside of the local authority area
- (3) The new legislation should result in a reduction of the number of children being placed in Kent, although a decrease is likely to be slow. It is unlikely, for example, that OLA LAC already in settled placements in Kent will be moved back to their responsible authority's area. The Children's Director, Roger Morgan, has criticised authorities who have moved children from settled long distance placements to placements within their own authority. It is important therefore, that any action taken by KCC to support the implementation of the new legislation is mindful of the need to promote the welfare of this group of children and young people in care.

KEY DETAILS

3. Looked after children placed in Kent by other local authorities

- (1) As at 2/11/09 KCC records show that there were 1425 children/young people looked after by another authority placed in Kent. This is an increase of 98 OLA LAC since March 2009 and an increase of 201 since March 2007. A detailed breakdown of OLA LAC by placing authority is presented at Appendix 1.
- (2) Based upon a detailed analysis of March 2009 data, which showed 1325 OLA LAC, 554 (42%) of these children/young people are placed in East Kent (Thanet, Swale and Canterbury), with Thanet being the district with the highest number of

placements (235 [18%]). The average for the three EK districts is 185, with Canterbury having the lowest number at 132.

- (3) Mid Kent (Dover, Ashford, Shepway and Maidstone) have 293 children/young people placed in its districts (22%), with an average number per district of 73 children/young people.
- (4) With the West Kent districts (Dartford, Gravesham, Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling and Tunbridge Wells) KCC data shows a total of 250 (19%) children/young people being placed in the area. The average number per WK district is 50 with a range from 11 (Tunbridge Wells) to 76 (Sevenoaks and Dartford each).
- (5) There are also 230 children/young people (17%) whose details on KCC's information system do not show the district where they are placed. This is most likely because this information has not been provided to KCC by the placing authority. It would be assumed based on the demographics of the other children/young people in the OLA LAC group that the majority of these children/young people will be living in the EK area.
- (6) With respect to age breakdown, the majority of these children/young people are aged between 11 years and 17 years inclusive (889 [67%]) – with 14 and 15 years being the highest (180 and 181 respectively). Based on data from an earlier report (January 2008) it would be expected that the majority of these children/young people are male (62%). This is a slightly higher proportion when compared to KCC LAC (55% male) and national average (55%).
- (7) The most recent OLA data available (2 November 2009) shows that there are 94 authorities who have one or more of their looked after children placed in Kent, with a range of 1 to 5 child/young person (44 authorities) to 10 or more children/young people (39 authorities). The highest placing authorities are:

Authority	Number of Children/ Young People	% of Total LAC	Number in East Kent Area	Increase/ Decrease
Greenwich	108	20	51	Increase of 47 since April 2005 , 27 since March 2009
Medway	71	21	43	Increase of 53 since April 2005
Bexley	62	29	10	Increase of 18 since April 2005, 1 since March 2009
Newham	72	11	37	Increase of 20 since April 2005, 11 since March 2009
Lewisham	72	13	26	Increase of 24 since April 2005, 18 since March 2009
Southwark	47	7	10	Increase of 7 since April 2005, 4 since March 2009
Lambeth	46	7	22	Decrease of 6 since April 2005, 5 since

Authority	Number of Children/ Young People	% of Total LAC	Number in East Kent Area	Increase/ Decrease
				March 2009
Waltham Forest	43	12	16	Increase of 6 since April 2005, 5 since March 2009
Essex	39	3	11	Decrease of 15 since April 2005, an increase of 3 since March 2009
Islington	34	11	15	Decrease of 8 since April 2005, decrease of 2 since March 2009
Tower Hamlets	29	9	12	Decrease of 22 since April 2005, decrease of 6 since March 2009
Hertfordshire	42	5	15	Increase of 28 since April 2005, 8 since March 2009
Hillingdon	33	7	20	Decrease of 12 since April 2005, no change since March 2009
Hounslow	33	10	19	Decrease of 1 since April 2005, up 1 since March 2009
Bromley	28	12	6	Decrease of 8 since April 2005, a decrease of 3 since March 2009
Surrey	37	4	10	No change since April 2005, an increase of 6 since March 2009

- (9) The number of children/young people placed in the EK area has dropped overall between April 2005 and November 2009 by 181 (from 790 to 609) but has increased by 55 since March 2009. This pattern is also reflected in the numbers of OLA LAC placed in the Thanet district (from 333 to 255 – an increase of 20 since March 2009).

Author's contact details

Paul Brightwell
Policy and Performance Manager – Looked After Children/Leaving Care

Tel: 01622 694308

Email: Paul.Brightwell@kent.gov.uk

20 November 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

Children in Kent placed by Other Local Authorities

Data as at 02/11/2009

Source Impulse

Placing Authority	Placed in District												Total	
	Ashford	Canterbury	Dartford	Dover	Gravesham	Maidstone	Sevenoaks	Shepway	Swale	Thanet	Tonbridge & Malling	Tunbridge Wells		Unknown
Barking and Dagenham	1	2		12		1		1	3	4			1	25
Barnet		2				2		5	4	8	1	2		24
Bedfordshire				2					4					6
Bexley	2	1	26	1	8	1	10		1	8	1		3	62
Birmingham	5	2	3		1			1	1	2			2	17
Bournemouth									1				1	2
Bracknell Forest		1		1					1					3
Brent	3							1		5			1	10
Bridgend		1											1	2
Brighton and Hove	1	1						1	3			1	2	9
Bromley	1	2	1	1	2	1	4	3		4	1	2	6	28
Buckinghamshire										2			1	3
Cambridgeshire	2	2				1		5	3	5			1	19
Camden								1	1	2			1	5
City of Nottingham		1											1	2
City of Peterborough	4			1		2			3					10
Coventry		1		1									1	3
Croydon	3	4	1	1	1		4		1	8	2	1	3	29
Derbyshire													1	1
Devon													1	1
Doncaster								1						1
Dorset		1												1
Dudley		2								3			1	6
Ealing	2	2		1	2			1	3	5			1	17
East Sussex	3	1				2	2	2	2	2		2	9	25
Enfield		4	2		2	2		1	1	3			1	16
Essex	5	4	5	4	3	1		7	4	3		1	2	39
Gloucestershire								2						2
Greenwich	3	10	25	3	9	4	15	1	19	7	2		10	108
Guernsey										1				1
Hackney	3	1	1	5			3	2	2	6			3	26
Hammersmith and Fulham		3	1	2	1				2	2				11
Hampshire		1						3	2	1	1		4	12
Haringey		2	5		4			5	6	7				29
Harrow	2							3		3		1	3	12
Havering	5	4		1	2	3			5	9	1		4	34
Herefordshire	2													2
Hertfordshire	2	4		1	3	2		7	7	4		1	11	42
Hillingdon	3	4	2	3	1			2	7	9			2	33
Hounslow	3	3		2	1	6		2	4	12				33
Isle of Wight				1										1
Islington	2	6	1	5	1		3	1		9			6	34
Kensington and Chelsea		4		1	1			1	3	4			1	15
Kingston-upon-Thames				3		1		1	2	1			1	9
Lambeth	3	7	4	1	6		6		6	9	2		2	46
Lancashire					2						1			3
Leicester City													1	1

Children in Kent placed by Other Local Authorities

Data as at 02/11/2009

Source Impulse

Placing Authority	Placed in District													Total
	Ashford	Canterbury	Dartford	Dover	Gravesham	Maidstone	Sevenoaks	Shepway	Swale	Thanet	Tonbridge & Malling	Tunbridge Wells	Unknown	
Lewisham	1	4	4	1	5	7	23		12	10			5	72
Luton	1							3	1	1				6
Manchester									4					4
Medway	1	8			1	7			30	5	2		17	71
Merton	1	1		1		1			5	3				12
Middlesbrough									2					2
Milton Keynes													1	1
Neath Port Talbot								1		1				2
Newham	4	9	5	2	10	2	7	3	5	23			2	72
Newport County Council	1													1
Norfolk	1			1			1	1	2	2			1	9
North Somerset						1								1
Northamptonshire				1				3	4	4			2	14
Nottinghamshire		1							1					2
Oxfordshire					1		1	2	2				2	8
Reading		2					1			1			1	5
Redbridge	1	1	1	1	1	1			3	5				14
Richmond-upon-Thames	1									6				7
Sandwell									2	1				3
Shropshire						1								1
Slough	1			1					1	1				4
Solihull	1							1	1					3
Southampton									1					1
Southend on Sea		5		1	1	1			1	3				12
Southwark	2	1	10	1	3	3	4	3	3	6	2	1	8	47
Stoke	1													1
Suffolk	2							1	2	6		1	2	14
Surrey	4	3	1	1	1	3	9	5	5	2	1		2	37
Sutton		2		2	1			2		4			3	14
Swansea	1			1										2
Swindon		1		1										2
Telford and Wrekin		1		1						1				3
Thurrock	1		3		1				1	3	1			10
Tower Hamlets		1	3		5	6			5	6	3			29
Wakefield								1						1
Walsall	1	2						2	1	1				7
Waltham Forest	3	2	4	3	10		2	1	9	5	2		2	43
Wandsworth	1	4		1	1					2				9
Warwickshire									1	2			1	4
West Berkshire	1					1			1				2	5
West Sussex	1	5	1				5		2	1			5	20
Westminster	4	1	1						5	2	1	1	2	17
Windsor and Maidenhead					2									2
Wokingham	1								1					2
Worcestershire		1											1	2
Unknown LEA							1	1	2				3	7
Grand Total	97	138	110	73	93	146	101	90	216	255	24	14	151	1425

Children In Kent Placed by Other Local Authorities

Data as at 02/11/2009

Source:Impulse

Age	Placed in District												Total	
	Ashford	Canterbury	Dartford	Dover	Gravesham	Maidstone	Sevenoaks	Shepway	Swale	Thanet	Tonbridge & Malling	Tunbridge Wells		Unknown
0	1	1	5	1	3		2		4	1	2			19
1		1	4	1	2	1	6		5		3		3	26
2	4		10		3	3	5	3	2			1	6	37
3	5	2	6		1	5	6	1	2		3		2	33
4	1	2	2	1	3	3	4		4	2	1		3	26
5	2	2	3	1	2	2	6		3			1	6	28
6	1	2	1		3	2	3		5		1		7	25
7		3		1	5	3		1	7	1			4	25
8	4	1	10		2	2	2	2	6	7			2	38
9	5	3	5	1			4	5	8	8	2	1	11	53
10	9	6	7	4	5	4	6	6	7	9			4	67
11	10	14	2	4	4	2	5	9	10	15		1	9	85
12	13	16	8	8	3	1	5	13	14	18	2	2	11	114
13	12	13	4	10	4	5	7	7	20	34	1		10	127
14	12	21	9	9	6	6	12	13	23	39	2	3	16	171
15	9	18	9	15	11	10	10	12	28	48	2	2	18	192
16	7	20	14	8	16	7	11	10	32	34	2	2	16	179
17	2	13	11	9	20	6	7	8	36	39	3	1	23	178
18						1								1
Total	97	138	110	73	93	63	101	90	216	255	24	14	151	1425

This page is intentionally left blank

BY:	Kay Weiss
TO:	Children's Champions Board
DATE:	2 December 2009
CLASSIFICATION:	Unrestricted

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

This report provides the Children's Champions Board with an update on the development of the Children in Care Council

BACKGROUND

1. (1) Care Matters has introduced a number of proposals to improve the delivery of Corporate Parenting. One of these is the expectation that every local authority will put in place (from April 2009) a Children in Care Council (CICC), with direct links to the Director of Children's Services and Lead Member (Care Matters, White Paper, page 22). The Children in Care Council is also highlighted as one of the key components for delivering effective corporate parenting in the National Children's Bureau model of effective corporate parenting.
- (2) Not all Looked After Children (LAC) will see the CICC as being the preferred way to express their views. The development of the CICC must therefore work alongside other mechanisms already available for children and young people to express their views, such as Student Voice, Viewpoint and Upfront (Kent's LAC Advocacy Service).
- (3) The design and delivery of the CICC should ideally meet the following requirements:
 - a) Inclusiveness (to all LAC in Kent)
 - b) An opportunity for meaningful participation of children/young people
 - c) Effectiveness – the ability to influence practice and services and for children/young people to feel confident that their voices are being heard
- (4) Achieving these goals presents Kent with greater challenges than most other authorities, whose LAC populations are smaller and less diverse. Therefore, a fully formed 'Children in Care Council' in Kent will take more time to develop. Initially Council meetings may involve a relatively small number of children and young people and increase in scope as the framework fits into place and evolves.

Proposed framework

2. (1) It is proposed that the CICC is built around a framework, beginning with the development of a central council and enabling at a later stage the development of district/area councils and sector councils (representing the needs of particular

LAC groups such as Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children, LAC with a disability, KCC LAC placed out of Kent and OLA LAC) over a 2 to 3 year timescale.

- (2) The children/young people attending council meetings will be aged 11 years plus. It will be the responsibility of the CICC members to ensure that the views of younger children are represented and considered in council meetings on all issues where this is relevant. The CICC will also be expected to look at how they consult with and keep younger children informed of what is discussed at CICC meetings.
- (3) Members of the CICC will initially be identified through Upfront and 16plus, with the aim that each district/local partnership should have a young person representative on the central council, including asylum and disability. In the longer term, each area/sector council will select a representative to sit on their behalf on the central council.
- (4) It is proposed that the CICC should be encouraged to develop strong links with Kent's Youth Council, including enabling a place on the Youth Council to be reserved for a CICC representative.
- (5) An initial CICC event was held on 15th April at Swattenden, which was attended by 25 children and young people. This included disabled children/young people and unaccompanied asylum seeking children/young people. A presentation has already been provided to CCB on the outcomes of the days event at 20 May 2009 meeting by Lisa Warne (Upfront) and Jo Bingham (16plus).

Recent developments

CICC meetings/events:

- A CICC event was held on 4 August at Port Lympne Zoo, which focussed on discussing with the provisional CICC taking forward the launch of the LAC DVD 'Care to Listen' (later launched at Maidstone Cinema on 2 November 2009). A discussion around the healthy care standards also took place.
- Another CICC meeting took place at County Council Chambers, Sessions House on Saturday 5 September 2009. The meeting was attended by 9 LAC/Care leavers and also included two young people representatives from Kent's Youth Council – who gave a presentation on how the Youth Council was run. The key issues discussed at the meeting were:
 - Finalising plans for the launch of the DVD 'Care to Listen'
 - Agreeing the job description for the first of two CICC apprenticeship posts
 - Discussing elections
 - Revisiting issues raised at the previous meeting
 - Details regarding the October trip to the Houses of Parliament
- A further CICC event took place on 27 October 2009, which involved a tour round the Houses of Parliament and an opportunity to meet with one of Kent's MPs (Julian Brazier). There was an opportunity for the CICC members to meet and ask Julian Brazier MP questions after the tour – which focussed around the need for more social workers and better placement choice in foster care.

- Arrangements are being made for the next CICC meeting, which is expected to take place in December 2009/January 2010. The meeting will finalise arrangements for CICC member elections, which are planned to take place in March/April 2010.

CICC Apprenticeships:

- Alongside CICC meetings/events – work has also been focussed on implementing the first of two CICC apprenticeship posts. This apprenticeship post focuses on providing administration support for the running of the CICC. A KCC Care Leaver has been recruited to the post and began working on 9 November 2009.
- A copy of the Job description for the apprenticeship post is presented at appendix 1.
- The apprenticeship post is being supported via KCC's Key Training Services.
- The second apprenticeship post will be recruited to after the CICC member elections – in April/May 2010. This post will focus on Human Resources functions of the CICC and the post holder will be expected to take on a leadership role for the CICC, including acting as a consultant on children/young people's involvement and attending professional meetings – including Kent's Corporate Parenting Group (KCPG). A copy of the job description for this apprenticeship post will be made available to the children's champion board once this has been developed and approved by the CICC and KCPG.

Author's contact details

Paul Brightwell
Policy and Performance Manager – Looked After Children/Leaving Care

Tel: 01622 694308

Email: paul.brightwell@kent.gov.uk

20 November 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

Kent County Council

Job Description: *Administration Assistant - Level 1*

Directorate:	Children, Families and Education Directorate
Unit/Section:	Catch 22 or Upfront will manage the post on behalf of CFE
Grade:	KS03
Responsible to:	Line Manager (Upfront or Catch 22)

Purpose of the Job:

The main purpose of the job is to do all the things that need to be done to ensure that children in care council meetings take place and that the decisions and actions that are made by the children in care council are recorded and filed so that they are available to the children in care council, and others that need to know about these decisions, at future meetings.

Main duties and responsibilities:

- Making accurate notes of the Children in Care Council meetings (what was discussed and agreed should be done about it).
- Sending out copies of the notes from the Children in Care Council meetings to members of the council and other people who need to see them.
- Writing and typing letters, reports and presentations from the Children in Care Council and arranging for these to be sent to the relevant people.
- Making sure that all correspondence (letters, memos, reports etc) to and from the Children in Care Council is properly filed so that it is kept safe and secure and can be found when needed by Council members and other people that need to have access to them.
- Being the main point of contact for people wanting to get in touch with the Children in Care Council. This will include answering routine enquiries, helping to put children, young people and staff in touch with the right person involved with the Children in Care Council, welcoming visitors who have come to see the Children in Care Council.
- Arrange appointments for the Children in Care Council to meet with people they want to see and also with people who want to meet with the Children in Care Council.
- Attend the Children in Care Council meetings (these are normally held on Saturdays)
- Arrange Children in Care Council meetings, which will include booking venues where the Children in Care Council meet, sorting out help with transport for Council members, and arranging for refreshments and lunch to be available for Council meetings.
- Helping to maintain the financial records of the Children in Care Council so that they know how much money is being spent and on what.
- Producing a regular newsletter with Children in Care Council members and staff supporting the Council, to tell young people and staff involved with them about what the Children in Care Council is doing on behalf of all children and young people and leaving care in Kent.
- Occasionally, there may be other duties that the post holder is required to do to support the smooth running of the Children in Care Council, which have not been described in the duties listed above.

Footnote: This job description is provided to assist the job holder to know what his/her main duties are. It may be amended from time to time without change to the level of responsibility appropriate to the grade of post.

Kent County Council

Person Specification: *Administration Assistant - Level 1*

The following outlines the criteria for this post. Applicants who have a disability and who meet the criteria will be shortlisted.

Applicants should describe in their application how they meet these criteria.



	CRITERIA
QUALIFICATIONS	Educated to GCSE level or equivalent
EXPERIENCE	Must have experience of being looked after by Kent County Council since their 16 th birthday
SKILLS AND ABILITIES	Good keyboard skills Computer and technology literate Able to work to deadlines Good interpersonal and organisational skills Good numeracy skills Confident telephone manner Works well under pressure Ability to maintain confidentiality Professional, friendly and polite approach to others Commitment to personal and professional learning and development
KNOWLEDGE	Of the care system