

Decision Pathway – Report Template



PURPOSE: Key decision

MEETING: Cabinet

DATE: 4th June '19

TITLE	Keeping Bristol Safe Partnership Proposal	
Ward(s)	All	
Author: Jacqui Jensen	Job title: Executive Director Adults Children Education and Public Health	
Cabinet leads: Cllr Godwin; Cllr Holland; Cllr Craig;	Executive Director lead: Jacqui Jensen	
Proposal origin: BCC Staff		
Decision maker: Cabinet Member		
Decision forum: Cabinet		
Timescales: ACE ELT 28 th November, Cabinet Member Briefing 3 rd December, CLB 18 th December, SPB 14 th March '19, Cabinet 4 th June 2019		
Purpose of Report:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To seek approval to constitute a combined Executive Safeguarding and Community Safety Board consolidating the statutory functions of four existing boards: Safer Bristol Board, Bristol Safeguarding Adults Board (BSAB), Bristol Safeguarding Children Board (BSCB) and the Children and Families Partnership Board (CFPB), to be known as the Keeping Bristol Safe Partnership To meet the statutory requirements of Working Together 2018 in transition from LSCB arrangements to multi-agency safeguarding arrangements through these new arrangements Statutory guidance sets out that the lead representative for the Local Authority safeguarding partner is the chief executive. In the absence of that role in this Authority, Cabinet is asked to designate the Executive Director, People as the lead representative. 		
Evidence Base:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The publication of Children and Social Work Act 2017 and Working Together 2018 brought in required changes to the Local Safeguarding Children Board. This legislation ends the local authority's duty to have a LSCB and requires three statutory partners (Local Authority, Police Constabulary and Bristol Clinical Commissioning Group) to ensure effective multi-agency safeguarding arrangements which enable effective partnership working and assurance of the effectiveness of the safeguarding system. There are limited requirements in how these arrangements should be established. The landscape of Safeguarding is changing; the focus is moving from interfamilial abuse for children and adults at risk to include very complex contextual safeguarding concerns which present high risk. The traditional board models do not facilitate innovative solutions to high risk complex situations. There is increasing overlap between the Boards and the current approach to safeguarding, community safety and early health and prevention does not enable whole-system approaches and thinking. Transitional safeguarding is a priority for Bristol. As our children become young adults we rarely find ways of developing a more seem-less service which better meets the needs of vulnerable young adults including those who do not meet the Care Act 2014 criteria but remain at significant risk in our community. There are considerable and growing overlaps in the issues of concern to the respective groups, additionally 		

there are gaps and shortfalls as a result of the silos that the groups inadvertently create.

- There is an increasing growth in connectivity between the boards e.g sexual exploitation, hate crime, modern slavery, serious violence and gang crime, criminal exploitation and mate crime which affect children, adults, families and communities. These issues make the differential agendas for the existing board structure less relevant with issues or concerns falling between the various remits these include:
- Youth offending team funding / PCSO funding and Safer Bristol
- Impact of Domestic abuse on children, adults and adults at risk / Safer Bristol, LSAB and LSCB
- Strategic commissioning / vision setting across all boards;
- Extra-familial and complex safeguarding (the risk in the environment rather than the traditional risk in the home) is testing all service areas and consequently all boards / groups and requires a collective, coordinated focus.
- Increasing pattern of co-commissioned statutory views i.e. joint Safeguarding Adults and Domestic Homicide Review

5. The other safeguarding partners proposed regional safeguarding arrangements. This was examined considered carefully but ultimately rejected. Bristol's Elected Members May 2018 have concerns that a regional shared arrangement will not best support vulnerable children given Bristol's specific characteristics. This arrangement would also require Bristol City Council to delegate their decision-making on these fundamental City issues to a regional executive
6. The Bristol proposal is instead for a local 'place' based option complemented by regional project-work offers a solution which facilitates cross working based on local risks and fits well with the One City approach typified by the One City Plan.
7. Bristol City Council have engaged with partners through the regional Consortium Working Group to try to resolve the cultural challenges of the current arrangements and address concerns about regional duplication:
 - The lack of executive engagement and attendance on statutory boards.
 - The lack of capacity for officers in all partner agencies to sit on the myriad of statutory and partnership boards and groups due solely to the numbers of groups and capacity.
 - Ensure that the safeguarding function with respect to children is explicitly a shared accountability across Health, Police and Local Authority partners.
 - Shortfall and gaps between the remits of the current boards
8. The proposed model of a Single Executive Board has the potential to effectively and efficiently resolve the issues outlined whilst maintaining a Bristol 'place' focus. Through this work the consortium have come to agree with Bristol City Council's analysis and proposal for place-based local governance arrangements which enable integration of adult, children and community safety approaches. We therefore present this proposal with cross-partnership sign up and support.
9. Finances and the cost of the Business Unit
 - Currently the Business Unit supports two boards and manages the activity related to the statutory functions of the boards. There is no support for the CFPB or the Safer Bristol Board. The lack of support for the Safer Bristol Board is most evident when we consider the impact, financial and otherwise of DHRs.
 - The threshold decision making regarding adult and children's serious case reviews have proved to be effective with the introduction of the joint business unit supporting robust and defensible decision-making which has improved timeliness and reduced drift. However this is not the case in relation to Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) which are not support through the Business Unit. At the start of 2019 there were 13 DHRs being commissioned or undertaken. This is a substantial cost to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the department and has limited evidence of systems change and impact without the resource to support effective implementation and change.
 - Partners funding for the Business Unit may reduce and we will shrink the board staffing accordingly, however it is anticipated there will be no savings to be gained under the new model, instead the team's remit with provide wider reach and impact across the system using the resources already in place.

- The current model relies on two funded Independent Chairs. In the new model there will be a reduction in cost of one Independent chair which will mitigate any reduction in partner funds.
- There will be increased efficiency and quality as the Executive Board gears up to support the statutory functions related to all four boards and the partnership work of the CFPB.
- The transformation project has been supported through funding a project consultant from the LSCB funding envelope in order to ensure that we meet the statutory requirements of Working Together 18 through the implementation of the new board arrangements

Risks

- The new model must ensure it supports scrutiny of provision and service delivery across all four statutory functions. This includes the need to maintain oversight of safeguarding and safety issues impacting minority groups and issues which do not cross the four functions such as the care and support needs of older adults - An Independent Chair has been recruited to support the Executive Board and provide robust oversight that all functions are being discharged
- Reduction in funding by other statutory partners – The new equitable arrangement expectation of the Children’s arrangements increases the expectation on contributions by the constabulary and Clinical commissioning group
- Disengagement of smaller community groups – Sector engagement events have developed clear lines of representation and engagement with the new approach. An annual consultation event will be held open to all partners across the city. The new Task and Finish model will enable wider engagement with opportunities with less of a resource burden.

Next Steps

- Public consultation online survey and drop-in event running throughout May 2019 to inform the sub structure and strategic priorities of the Board
- Cabinet approval 4th June 2019
- New arrangements to be published by the 29th June 2019 (statutory timescale)
- Learning from Shadow arrangements to inform full implementation July 2019
- A regional advisory group to be established to develop regional children safeguarding efficiencies – this will report to the local area Executive Boards
- Policy framework and linked policies within the Council will require refresh by 29th September 2019

Cabinet Member / Officer Recommendations: That Cabinet

1. Agree to constitute an Executive Safeguarding Board, namely, *Keeping Bristol Safe Partnership* consolidating the statutory functions of the four existing boards Safer Bristol Board (CSP), Bristol Safeguarding Adults Board (BSAB), Bristol Safeguarding Children’s Board (BSCB) and the Children and Families Partnership Board (CFPB).
2. Designate the role of Executive Director, People as the lead representative for the Local Authority for the purposes of the new local safeguarding partner arrangements.
3. Note that a further report will be brought through the decision pathway to agree the final constitution and governance arrangements for the new Board.

Corporate Strategy alignment:

The proposal fits with Theme 1 of the Corporate Strategy Empowering and Caring in terms of our goal to work with partners and give children the best start in life.

City Benefits: Consolidates the safeguarding imperatives and removes shortfalls created by the various existing silo

arrangements and provides structured support to the crime and disorder functions.

Consultation Details: Wide consultation has taken place since 2017 with:

- The previous Independent safeguarding board chairs
- At the existing statutory Boards
- With the relevant Cabinet Members
- With the Safeguarding Youth Shadow Board
- Through the regional consortium partnership working group including
- An engagement session with Board members from all of the relevant boards was held in February 19
- 6 week online public consultation
- 3 public consultation drop-in events across the city
- With representatives of the young people participation groups
- 4 sector events for Voluntary Sector organisations; Education; Health and Independent Care Providers

This consultation has covered three main areas:

1. The new strategic arrangements
2. Structures for public and organisational engagement with the arrangements
3. The strategic priorities for the new arrangements from September 2019.

The consultation has informed the EQIA and will inform the final business plan.

Revenue Cost	£14,500 for Project Consultant	Source of Revenue Funding	Bristol Safeguarding Boards Pooled Budget
Capital Cost	n/a	Source of Capital Funding	
One off cost <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ongoing cost <input type="checkbox"/>	Saving Proposal <input type="checkbox"/>	Income generation proposal <input type="checkbox"/>

Required information to be completed by Financial/Legal/ICT/ HR partners:

1. Finance Advice: The 2019/20 detailed budget in the four cost-centres associated with Safeguarding in Adults and Children has funding of £0.336m, through a combination of base budget and contributions from partners. The Joint Business Unit accounts for £0.208m of that total. If partner contributions reduce, the activity supported will reduce accordingly. For instance, the proposal to reduce the number of independent chairs by one could save between £10k-£15k, but this would assist in ensuring that safeguarding responsibilities were otherwise delivered.

Finance Business Partner: David Tully, 8th March 2019

2. Legal Advice:

1. Multi-Agency safeguarding arrangements for Children

The Children and Social Work Act 2017 creates a new shared and equal duty for the Council, Police and CCG ("safeguarding partners") to make arrangements to work together to identify and respond to the needs of children in their area (Multi Agency Safeguarding arrangements).This replaces the requirement for the Council to establish a Local Children’s Safeguarding Board. The transition from Local Safeguarding Boards to Safeguarding partner arrangements must be complete by 29th September 2019 by which time the new arrangements must be published.

The safeguarding partners should agree on ways to coordinate their safeguarding services, act as a strategic leadership group and implement local and national learning. Serious case reviews have been replaced by Child Safeguarding practice reviews for which the Safeguarding partners are responsible jointly with the national panel. The Partners must set out how they will work together and with any relevant agencies. Arrangements are not prescribed and are to be agreed locally.

The geographical footprint for the new arrangements is the Local Authority area, and there can only be one partnership in each area. The Safeguarding partners should agree the level of funding from each partner on a “fair and equitable” basis.

There must be arrangements for independent scrutiny of arrangements and an annual report must be published by the partners.

2. Combining arrangements with other Boards/partnerships

There is no legal reason why the Boards/Partnerships set out in the report should not be combined in to one executive safeguarding Board, but only on the basis that the Local Authority – and other Statutory agencies - are satisfied through a robust assurance process that the statutory duties, aims and plans for the respective Children’s, Adults and Crime reduction functions would be promoted and properly discharged.

Care Act Statutory guidance enables a Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) to be set up as a joint Board that covers children’s safeguarding. Local SABs decide how they operate but they must ensure that their arrangements will be able to deliver the duties and functions under Schedule 2 of the Care Act.

Community Safety Partnerships set up by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 must exercise their functions having regard to the police and crime objectives set out in the police and crime plan for the local police area. Legislation and guidance does not prohibit combination with other boards within a geographic area. Combination of authorities across more than one geographic area is permissible if it is in the interests of: reducing crime and disorder; reducing re-offending or combating the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances. It is advised that the same criteria are applied to this proposal.

Legal services are involved in advising on the development of new governance arrangements.

Legal Team Leader: Nancy Rollason Head of Legal Service, 01/05/19

3. Implications on IT: There are no immediately identifiable IT implications in this report. However, joint working often brings IT implications in terms of compatibility, integrations and data sharing arrangements. Shared data will almost certainly provide better outcomes, but some analysis may be required to determine the appropriate support measures or solutions.

IT Team Leader: Ian Gale 5/3/19

4. HR Advice: As the report currently states there may be a reduction in staffing of the Business Support Units, as well as the reduction of an Independent Chair – this will have HR implications for the individuals concerned. As a result I would expect a full Management of Change process to take place as appropriate once the decision has been agreed upon and we know for definite what the structure will look like and what impact it may have. All Bristol City Councils relevant policies and procedures will be followed and should anyone be displaced we would seek to redeploy them to retain the skills and experience within the organisation

HR Partner: Lorna Laing 12/3/19

5. Reputational narrative: Whilst this proposed merger will unlikely attract much public attention it does have the potential to impact on the work of professionals and those accessing agency delivered services. Early work is underway to bring together the communications leads of the key agencies to plan out an approach to communicating the merger in the first instance and agree future communications arrangements. It’s recommended that a detailed communications plan is drafted in collaboration with agency partners to ensure that all relevant groups are communicated with and that one single agreed narrative is in place for all partners to use when addressing agency specific audiences.

PR officer: John Smith, Senior Public Relations Officer 12th March 2019

EDM Sign-off	ACE EDM	01/05/19
Cabinet Member sign-off	Helen Godwin; Helen Holland;	01/05/19
CLB Sign-off		[date]
For Key Decisions - Mayor’s Office sign-off	Mayors Office	10/5/19

Appendix A – Further essential background / detail on the proposal	YES
---	-----

Appendix B – Details of consultation carried out - internal and external	NO
Appendix C – Summary of any engagement with scrutiny	NO
Appendix D – Risk assessment	NO
Appendix E – Equalities screening / impact assessment of proposal	YES
Appendix F – Eco-impact screening/ impact assessment of proposal	NO
Appendix G – Financial Advice	NO
Appendix H – Legal Advice	NO
Appendix I – Combined Background papers	Please list each paper
Appendix J – Exempt Information	NO
Appendix K – HR advice	NO
Appendix L – ICT	NO