

Minutes of a meeting of the Corporate Parenting Panel held on Wednesday, 24 November 2021 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 5.04 pm
Concluded 7.19 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT
Thirkill Duffy Dunbar	Pollard	Knox

NON VOTING CO-OPTED MEMBERS

Sue Lowndes
Daniel Ware

Bradford Education
West Yorkshire Police

Observers: Councillor Alipoor

Apologies: Councillor Dale Smith

Officers

Helen Cliffe Service Manager Safeguarding & Reviewing
David Johnston Deputy Director Social Care (DD/SC)
Emily Rhodes Participation Co-ordinator
Philip Segurola Assistant Director Safeguarding and Review, Commissioning & Provider Services (AD/SRCP)
Jonathan Cooper Virtual School Head (Head/VS)

Susan Booth Governanc e Officer, Corporate Resources
Helen Osman Clerk – School Governor Service

Councillor Thirkill in the Chair

5. SUMMARY OF AGREED ACTIONS

Action	Lead	Timescale
All actions from the meeting of 27 October 2021 onward to be recorded on Action Tracker and included in the agenda pack for future meetings.	Committee Services Officer	Ongoing
All minutes to be sent to attendees individually rather than through Modern.Gov.	Committee Services Officer	Ongoing
Chair to sign minutes of the 27 October 2021 meeting once the actions have been recorded on Action Tracker.	Cllr Thirkill	15-12-2021
Sufficiency Strategy to be brought to the Panel	P Segurola	Jan/Feb 2022
Fostering and Recruitment Strategy to be brought to the Panel	P Segurola	April 2022
IRO/FIRO establishment to be reviewed	P Segurola	April 2022
Next IRO report to be brought to the Panel	H Cliffe	May 2022
Deputy Chair to pursue the timing and approach to development of a Council-wide Participation Strategy as it related to Corporate Parenting.	Cllr Duffy	15-12-2021
Corporate Parent checklist, Ward Councillor section, bullet 7 – to be amended to clarify the distinction between Regulation 44 visits and visits to get to know homes/staff.	Cllr Duffy	15-12-2021
Corporate Parent checklist: advice to be taken from the Communications Team on its effective communication.	Cllr Duffy	15-12-2021
Corporate Parent checklist: Elected Members to determine which sections should be sent to which audiences.	Cllr Duffy Cllr Dunbar Cllr Pollard	15-12-2021
Corporate Parent checklist: to be reviewed regularly by the Panel in light of feedback.	Committee Services Officer	Ongoing
Consult Legal and Governance & Audit teams on the establishment of a Governing Body for the Virtual School consisting of this Panel; and on the need to increase the maximum number of Co-opted members permitted by the Constitution.	S Lowndes	15-12-2021
Amend the draft Terms of Reference as set out at paragraph 7.5 above.	Cllr Duffy	15-12-2021
Leaders of Themes to establish links with Bradford Council Lead members within whose remit their theme sat.	Theme leaders	31-01-2022
AD/SRCP to propose a schedule of dates for future meetings and key business to be taken at each.	P Segurola	15-12-2021
AD/SRCP to report to the next Panel meeting on work underway to promote recruitment of social workers.	D Johnston	Next Panel meeting

6. ALTERNATE MEMBERS (Standing Order 34)

The Committee Services Officer said that Cllr Pollard was attending this meeting as an alternate for Cllr Smith. Cllr Smith would be unable to attend meetings for some time: Cllr Pollard would attend as his alternate.

Cllr Thirkill announced that, due to pressures on her time, she intended to step down as Chair of the Corporate Parenting Panel after this meeting. Subject to the approval of Regulatory and Appeals Committee, Sue Duffy would become Chair of the panel.

7. **DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest.

8. **POINTS OF ORDER**

- a) Cllr Dunbar noted that there was no material in the agenda pack that reflected the actions agreed at the previous meeting.

Cllr Duffy said that she had agreed with Committee Services Officer that actions would be recorded from each meeting using the Action Tracker function on Google Sheets. The action tracker would then form part of the agenda pack for the next meeting.

- b) Cllr Dunbar had not received a copy of the minutes by post or e-mail. From discussion it emerged that some Panel members had done so.

The Committee Services Officer undertook to send minutes of meetings to attendees individually rather than through Modern.Gov.

9. **MINUTES**

Recommended – That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2021 be signed as a correct record (previously circulated)

The Chair would sign the minutes once the actions therein had been recorded on Action Tracker.

10. **INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

There had been no requests to review decisions to restrict documents. The Chair noted that there had been no request to change the order of the agenda items.

11. **IRO ANNUAL REPORT 2020/2021**

The annual report of Children's Services (**Doc "B"**) provided quantitative and qualitative evidence relating to the Independent Reviewing Service in Bradford as required by statutory guidance. The Independent Reviewing Officers' (IRO) Annual Report must be presented to the Corporate Parenting Board and Bradford Partnership.

The report provided an opportunity to highlight areas of good practice and areas for improvement, identify themes and trends and report on work undertaken to date and to outline the developmental priorities for the next twelve months.

The Service Manager for Safeguarding & Reviewing (SMSR) said that the agenda paper covered the period April 2020 to March 2021. Since then, structural changes had brought oversight of the Foster Care Reviewing Officers within the

remit of the Safeguarding & Reviewing Service. She highlighted the following points in the report:

- Funding had been provided for two additional agency Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) as part of COVID19 support: these posts would remain until further notice.
- A parent/carer feedback form had been developed to facilitate the incorporation of their views into the review process.
- The IRO process was being restructured to streamline it, allow for more effective challenge and involve line management. Oversight of IRO case files had been improved, including the closing of cases by managers. The IRO audit forms had been reviewed.
- Although the number of children entering care in Bradford continued to increase, this did not necessarily impact caseload, which also depended on the number of children leaving care.
- Caseloads were approximately 85 per full time employee (fte), compared with the recommendation in the IRO handbook of 65. Nevertheless, the service had continued to meet statutory timescales in 97% of cases: where statutory timescales had not been met, the delays had been caused by late notifications to the service.
- The service continued to embed consistency of the journey through care and to reflect the legal responsibilities of the local authority.
- The service had undertaken significant recruitment to replace IROs who had retired: while this presented challenges, it had brought considerable new energy to the service.
- Participation by young people in the review process was a key issue for the service, which was being addressed through the revitalisation of Viewpoint.
- The Service was developing its relationships with partner agencies to ensure that they were undertaking the appropriate due diligence.

The Deputy Chair reminded the Panel and officers that, in future, all papers would be taken as read and not introduced by officers. Questions were invited.

Noting that there appeared to have been no Foster Care Review Officer posts prior to 2018, **the Panel asked** how the foster care had been monitored. SMSR said that foster care had been reviewed by the supervising social worker. The Assistant Director, Safeguarding and Review, Commissioning & Provider Services (AD/SRCP), said that there was a statutory requirement that each fostering household be reviewed annually. Until recently, these reviews had been conducted by the supervising social worker. Recognising the conflict this raised between the supporting role of the social worker and the review role, and acknowledging that social workers were not trained in regulatory compliance, the service had introduced standalone Foster Care Independent Review Officers (FIROs). Early indications were that this was succeeding in making review of foster care more consistent and independent. **Replying to questions**, AD/SRCP said that he did not believe that Ofsted had specifically commented on the quality of foster care reviews: this would, however, have been a vulnerability if it had not been addressed.

Asked how foster carers had responded to the involvement of FIROs as well as their supervising social workers, SMSR said that they appeared to welcome the annual independent review. **The Panel asked**, and was informed, that the Foster

Care Independent Review process included friends and family placements

SRSM said that the service currently employed three Foster Care Independent Review Officers, with a total caseload of 167 cases. She believed it would be necessary to appoint a fourth. The Panel discussed the need for a clear understanding of the number of FIRO posts in the service structure and how this related to the predicted number of foster carers following the current recruitment. AD/SRCP said that the need for a stronger grip on this kind of data was well recognised. The development of the Sufficiency Strategy would be available in February 2022 and would inform the requirement for additional FIRPs. The Panel noted the need to set this information in the wider context of support for young people: for example, effective preventive services would reduce the need for foster care.

Asked whether officers had complete confidence in the current oversight arrangements for every child in foster care in Bradford, AD/SRCP said that he could not have said this under the previous arrangements. While it was very difficult to be 100% confident in any system, the new arrangements put the Council, as Corporate Parent, in a much stronger position: processes were now appropriate and would identify any concerns at an early stage.

Asked why the Sufficiency Strategy, which had been promised at the last meeting in draft form for December 2021, now appeared to be delayed to February 2022, AD/SRCP said that officers were fully seized of the need to commission and produce the strategy at pace: the strategy was a critical document that would provide the focus for all future work, and must be thorough. A Sufficiency Strategy did exist but was not fit for purpose: it contained insufficient analysis of need and capacity. The timeline had been delayed from December 2021 to February 2022 due to the departure of the person who had been tasked with production of the strategy. **Asked** whether his reference to “commissioning” the strategy implied that there were no officers with the skills to do the work, AD/SRCP said that the issue was one of capacity rather than skills: he would normally expect a Sufficiency Strategy to be prepared internally.

Noting the statement at section 2 of the report that “... the last twelve months has required IROs to adjust to virtual working due to the impact of Covid and ‘working from home’ requirements”, **the Panel asked** whether the Safeguarding & Reviewing Service was satisfied that the vital work of IROs could be performed adequately by means of virtual working. SMSR replied that there had been no choice due to Covid 19, but that the service was slowly moving back to face-to-face working. There had been some benefits to virtual working: for example, some young people had been comfortable with virtual meetings. **Asked** whether she considered that young people had been more engaged with virtual reviews than they had been with face to face meetings, SRSM said that it varied: some young people had engaged in consultation by telephone or WhatsApp, while others preferred face to face discussion.

A Panel member said that the question was more about whether a review could be sufficiently rigorous if it were carried out remotely. **Asked** whether all reviews were now carried out face to face, the SMSR said that they were not: the speed of returning to face to face meetings was restricted by continuing Covid constraints in operation at the venues of the meetings (eg the foster home, the school). Effective virtual meetings had been held and some face to face meetings had been facilitated as necessary.

Referring to a consultation meeting held with young people in July 2021, panel members **invited SMSR to comment** on the following points raised at that meeting:

- a) Many young people had not been clear about the role and purpose of the independent reviews and had therefore been unaware that they had been giving their views to the IRO. SMSR described the frequency and timing of reviews, which included a minimum of two per year and an average of three per year.
- b) Young people had indicated that they disliked being called out of school for IRO meetings because it drew attention to their status as Looked After Children, and for this reason did not always participate. SMSR said that efforts were made to manage review meetings according to the preferences of Young People but that, with a caseload of 85 per IRO and a limited number of hours in the working day, it was not always possible to avoid taking young people out of class for review meetings. **Replying to further questions**, SMSR said that there was some flexibility around working hours but that weekend meetings were not possible because other agencies, such as schools, would not participate at weekends.

Referring to her opening remarks, SMSR said that the two temporary posts funded as part of Covid support currently each carried a caseload of 80. As and when the Covid funding ended, those cases would have to be absorbed by permanent IROs, taking their caseloads to over 90. AD/SRCP said that, to comply with the guidance in the IRO Handbook, IROs should have a maximum caseload of 70: the additional Covid-funded posts allowed the service to remain just on the right side of this ceiling, but it would be necessary to review the position as the funding came to an end.

Asked about the current position on settled status for the District's Looked After Children, SMSR did not have the figures to hand but said that Bradford was one of the better performing local authorities in this respect.

Replying to questions, SMSR confirmed that the data in the tables in Section 3.1 of the report covered the period to 31 March in each of the years shown. Noting that the rate of children leaving care in Bradford (table 2) had increased significantly and was above the national average, **the Panel asked** whether this might reflect some degree of over-correction following the 2018 Ofsted inspection, and whether the service was confident that the thresholds were now robust and the right children in the care system. AD/SRCP said that the number of children who had been in care in 2018 was lower than would be expected, giving rise to a clear concern about whether the right children had been taken into care in the right circumstances. It was common that a disproportionate number of children were taken into care when a local authority was subject to Ofsted intervention. The turnover of children in care shown in table two suggested that the correct balance had not yet been reached. DD/SC added that, when an LA become subject to Ofsted intervention, agencies tended to become risk-averse and to conclude that children would be safer in care if there were any concern about whether they were being supported effectively at home. This was also affected by court decisions. He considered that further work was required to be certain that all children who needed to be in care were in the system, and that all who were in the system needed to be there. SMSR said that the data in table two included the impact of clearing a backlog of Discharge from Care Orders.

The Panel considered that the list of areas for further focus on social work practice issues for the next year (section 8 of the report) could usefully be more

sharply focused to indicate the actions that would be taken, the timescales and how their impact would be measured.

Asked to expand upon the statement at section 3.4 of the report that “*There has been an increase in the use of mother and baby placements. In some of these cases the IROs have observed that the placements do not necessarily address the community risks that were identified in the initial single assessment*”, SMSR said that, if a child was left in the home with her mother and, possibly, her father, perhaps as a result of a court ruling, the LA would not be putting her in a protective environment: she would be exposed to other issues. A twelve-week mother and baby placement might be followed by a move into the community. When a decision was made to embark on a mother and baby placement, plans needed to be made for the probable next stages in the care requirements of the child.

The Panel commented on section 3.6 of the report: “*We are aware that a significant number of children turned 18 during 2020/21 which accounts for the high number of children aged 17+ ceasing care. With regards to children aged 16 and 17 who were subject to Care Orders, the pathway plan was to allow the order to lapse rather than seek discharge. Often this was in response to the wishes and feelings of young people.*” **Asked** whether this meant that the pathway plan was to allow the Care Order to lapse instead of to discharge the young person from care – effectively, not a plan at all – SMSR agreed. Sometimes a young person for whom a Discharge Order could be sought because they were no longer at risk expressed a preference to maintain the Care Order so that, on reaching the age of 18, they became a care leaver.

Referring to Table 14 in section 6 of the report (reasons for initiating a Challenge and Resolution process), **the Panel asked** whether a single child might be counted in two or more rows. The SMSR confirmed that they might: a Challenge and Resolution process might relate to a single or multiple issues. **Asked** about the total number of children who had been the subject of a Challenge and Resolution process, SMSR said that this information was given at Table 13 (numbers of Stage 1, 2 and 3 challenges and the numbers escalated and resolved). In the report period, 192 challenges had been resolved, each of which might have related to one or more factors.

Resolved –

- 1. That the report be noted and the Panel look forward to seeing evidence of improvement in the next IRO report in May 2022**
- 2. That the Sufficiency Strategy be completed as a matter of urgency, and by February 2022 at the latest;**
- 3. That the Fostering and Recruitment strategy flow from the Sufficiency Strategy and be updated annually**
- 4. That the Independent Reviewing Officer and Foster Carer Reviewing Officer establishment be reviewed in the context of the Sufficiency Strategy.**

Action: Assistant Director, Safeguarding and Review, Commissioning and Provider Services

12. CORPORATE PARENTING CHECKLIST

The Report of Children's Services (**Document "C"**) provided checklist information to inform members how they could be involved as Corporate Parents and links to training and development of Members and Senior Managers.

The Deputy Chair said that the agenda paper had been based on a document provided by the DfE Commissioner and had been prepared in response to the Motion to Council on Child Protection. The document needed to be agreed by this Panel and promulgated to elected Members, officer and partners. The Panel agreed that this was an accurate statement of the background to the paper.

AD/SRCP confirmed that LAs would normally have such a document to clarify for all elected Members and Officers their role as Corporate Parents, and considered that it was a thorough statement of those responsibilities. He invited the views of the Panel on how they wished it to be promulgated and the evidence they would require of its effectiveness.

The Panel welcomed the document, which would help to engender the desired cultural shift by giving a clear indication of the range of actions that Members, officer and partners could and should take to fulfil their Corporate Parenting responsibilities.

Referring to the third bullet in the section on members of the Scrutiny Committee (*"seek qualitative as well as quantitative information to ensure that the experiences of children looked after are consistent with what the performance data shows"*), the Panel discussed the challenges presented to Scrutiny Committee members in scrutinising qualitative information in this highly confidential and sensitive area. In practice, an element of trust would be required that effective procedures were in place for officers to scrutinise cases with their first and second line managers to identify what had happened, the reasons and what should have happened. It would take time to re-establish this Trust following the misinformation that the Scrutiny Committee had received at strategic level in the past.

AD/SRCP reminded the Panel that, when they returned to conduct a full inspection, Ofsted would ask the Lead Member, and possibly other Members, how they could be sure that the LA was a good Corporate Parent. Part of the answer would be based on quantitative evidence such as academic outcomes and stability of placements. This would need to be supplemented with direct knowledge of the views of young people on their experience of being in the care system in Bradford. DD/SC added that a range of methods were in place to determine the views of children and families on placements, whether children felt safer, whether they had effective support plans etc. Regulation 44 visits to children's homes included information about the facilities to which children had access. However, the LA was not currently collecting the direct views of young people as actively as it would wish. This kind of qualitative information was challenging to collect and could change over time, because the benefits of actions were not always visible to young people immediately; but a clear understanding of the views of young people was critical. As Corporate Parent, it was essential to know whether children and young people felt they were receiving high quality care and whether they considered the LA to be a good parent.

The Panel discussed the need for measures of impact for the actions set out in

the document and an appropriate way to record that impact. Actions around being aware of facts about Looked After Children could easily be addressed by providing the information to each Ward Member. Ward Member and partners needed to be vocal in their role as Corporate Parent, including through engagement with social media: they needed to ask Young People how the care system could work better for them. DD/SC noted that the acting Director of Children's Services had established a practice of messaging young people directly: this practice needed to be extended to other officers and elected Members.

Noting that the consultation meeting held with young people in the summer of 2021 had indicated that they held carrying views on the extent to which officers acted in response to their views, **the Panel asked** whether a standardised practice would be established for responding to the views of children and young people.

AD/SRCP said that young people participated in the six-monthly child and peer reviews, but there was scope to engage with them more effectively. Participation data was reasonably positive, but the effectiveness of that participation varied. A more robust engagement process was needed for children in residential care homes and for those who used commissioned services. This was an area for improvement.

Asked whether there were plans to develop a Participation Strategy, AD/SRCP said that such a strategy could be Council-wide, with a specific section addressing the participation of children in care: this would be for Members to decide. The Panel noted the need to draw together work on a Participation Strategy with existing work on the Child-Friendly and other strategies.

Cllr Allipool withdrew from the meeting at 6.17pm

Referring to Table 12 in Section 5 of the RO report (Child Participation), the Panel noted that a relatively small proportion of children physically attended and spoke for themselves at reviews. This was consistent with the feedback from young people at the consultation meeting in July 2021 that they did not wish to be taken out of school for review meetings because they were concerned about the stigma of being identified as being in care. The panel noted that older children had wanted to chair their review meetings – this did not seem unreasonable. AD/SRCP agreed: properly supported, child-led discussions could be very powerful and represented real participation.

Cllr Allipool rejoined the meeting at 6.20pm

The Panel saw merit in establishing a Council-wide Participation Strategy, underpinned by plans at the level of each service to ensure that the overall strategy was achieved in whole and without overlap. **Asked** about the timing of the Participation Strategy, AD/SRCP said that it was not being worked on at present: this was a corporate issue. The Deputy Chair would pursue this.

The Panel discussed the need to support Members and Officers in carrying out the activities set out in the agenda paper. For example, a model would need to be developed for Ward Councillor visits to residential homes. Such a model would make clear that the purpose of the visits was to hear the views of young people and carers, rather than to make judgements. **The Panel agreed** that the second part of bullet 7 in the Ward Councillor section of the agenda paper ("arrange to visit periodically and speak to staff about their experiences and challenges") should be amended to make clear the distinction between

Regulation 44 visits and informal visits to get to know homes and staff. Members noted that Regulation 44 visits were rigorous occasions: they had to be properly prepared, ask the questions that an Ofsted Inspector would ask and address any weaknesses identified in inspections. The reports of Regulation 44 visits were sent to Ofsted

AD/SRCP said that consideration was being given to how elected Members might be involved in the monthly visits that independent officers were required to make to each home in the District. This would give Members an insight into Bradford's homes and an opportunity to learn what young people thought about them, while minimising disruption. The Panel considered that a process also needed to be established to enable Ward Councillors to get to know the foster carers in their areas, both to ensure that they understood the issues and to provide signposting to sources of support as required.

Resolved -

- 1. That the Corporate Parenting Checklist be amended as agreed**
- 2. That the checklist be submitted to the Communications Team for advice on presenting and communicating it effectively**
- 3. That the checklist be considered to be a live document, to be kept under review by the Panel in response to feedback**
- 4. That elected Members review the sections contained in the checklist to be shared with appropriate stakeholders**

Action: Strategic Director, Children's Services/ CPP Panel Members

13. CORPORATE PARENTING PANEL DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

The report of Children's Services (**Document "D"**) informed both Members and the general public regarding the vision and purpose of the Corporate Parenting Panel and included a new draft Terms of Reference document.

Noting that, aside from the brief statement in the Constitution, the Panel did not have Terms of Reference, the Deputy Chair said that those set out in the agenda paper had been adapted from the Corporate Parenting Panel of another local authority.

Noting that the Virtual School had no Governing Body, the Panel considered that, like other schools, it would benefit from proper governance and accountability arrangements. The Head of the Virtual School (Head/VS) said that the Virtual School had a Management Board but that it had not met since before the Covid outbreak and did not include representation of this Panel, as the Corporate Parent of Virtual School pupils: the Governing Bodies of other schools included parent representation. He considered that the Virtual School sat naturally under the Corporate Parenting Panel. **Replying to questions**, Head/VS said that the VS Management Board was not the same as the Management Board that oversaw the Pupil Referral Units; and that the Management Board did not hold the Virtual School to account in the way that would be expected of a Governing Body.

DD/SC supported the establishment of a Governing Body for the Virtual School consisting of this Panel. Among other benefits, it would give the Panel a clearer view of the work of the Virtual School. The Education and Learning Strategic Manager (ELSM) also supported the proposal: in most LAs, the Corporate Parenting Panel was also the Governing Body of the Virtual School.

The Panel discussed how best to engage young people in its work. It noted that the Children in Care Council while a valuable partner, was not necessarily representative of the full range of Bradford's Looked After Children. AD/SRCP said that work was needed with the Children in Care Council to make it a more open forum, perhaps organised differently for the different age groups, so that it was more inclusive. He suggested that meetings of this Panel might be hosted alternately by young people, in whatever format emerged from development of the Children in Care Council and the Panel itself, perhaps in different locations throughout the District, with more formal business coming to meetings hosted by the Panel and more consultative and exploratory business to those hosted by young people. The Panel noted that this would be consistent with the views expressed by young people at the consultation meeting in July 2021 that they would like to set agendas chair meetings. AD/SRCP said that these points would be addressed in the Participation Strategy.

Resolved –

1. That the Panel agreed that Terms of Reference would be useful as a means of clarifying its role and responsibilities for a range of audiences. It noted the need to take the advice of the Legal and Governance & Audit teams on the proper way to establish the Terms of Reference and the scope to amend the provisions of the Constitution in relation to the Corporate Parenting Panel. Specific points for discussion would be:

- **The proposal that a Governing Body be established for the Virtual School and that the Corporate Parenting Panel become that Governing Body.**
- **The need to increase the maximum number of Co-opted members, to enable strong representation by partners and sufficient members to carry forward the themes identified at the meeting on 27 October 2021.**

2. That the Panel agreed the following amendments to the draft Terms of Reference set out in the report (Document "D")

Location in the draft ToR	Amendment
----------------------------------	------------------

Section headed "Purpose", fourth bullet	Add reference to the police service - 'to encourage all partners, whether they work for health or social care services, West Yorkshire Police or the voluntary
---	--

	sector, to work in an integrated manner linking back with portfolio holders in the best interests of looked after children and care leavers’
Section headed “Purpose”	Subject to the completion of the appropriate legal and other constitutional steps, add a reference to the role of the Panel as the Governing Body of the virtual School.
Section headed “Bradford Corporate Parenting Panel will”	Add reference to the preparation of an annual report on the work of the Panel to the Partnership Board and the Council
Section headed “Bradford Corporate Parenting Panel will not”	Delete section
Section headed “Details”, paragraph 6.1	Amend to read “The Panel shall meet no less often than six eight times a year”

Action: Strategic Director, Children’s Services/ CPP Members

14. ACTION TRACKING

Panel members agreed that, where they led on themes that fell within the remits of Bradford Council Lead Members, they would establish links with the Lead Members to avoid overlap, duplication or confusion.

Theme leaders reported on progress since the Panel meeting of 27 October 2021:

- a) Cllr Pollard had noted a number of points from the School Governor section of the Corporate Parenting Checklist that he would take forward in his role as Theme Leader for Education.
- b) Cllr Dunbar was due to meet officers to discuss transport related to housing: he would report more fully at the next meeting of the Panel.
- c) Cllr Duffy and CI/WYP were due to meet and would report more fully at the next meeting of the Panel.

Asked about dates for future meetings, AD/SRCP undertook to propose a schedule of dates and key elements of business to be taken at each meeting.

The Panel agreed to take at its next meeting an update on the work underway to promote recruitment of social workers.

Referring to its discussion on 27 October 2021 of the need to address its core values, the Panel asked that officers ensure that this was integrated with the other work underway on values.

Referring to its discussion on 27 October 2021 of the need to provide feedback to young people on the actions taken in light of their comments at the consultation meeting in July 2021, the Panel noted that it had assigned members of the panel to lead on the themes they had identified: reports to future meetings of the Panel would demonstrate that the themes were being actively pursued.

Replying to a question from AD/SRCP, the Deputy Chair confirmed the Panel’s

intention that training in awareness of the Corporate Parenting role of elected Member and officers should be undertaken by Members and Officers jointly where possible and should extend across the whole of the Council: it should not be restricted to Children's Services.

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Corporate Parenting Panel.

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER