Notes of Meeting

Attendees
Bernadette Malone, Chair, Perth & Kinross Council (BM)
Martin Crewe, Barnardo’s Scotland (MC)
Karen Anderson, Care Inspectorate (KA)
Jacqueline Cassidy, Children in Scotland (JC)
Maggie Fallon, Education Scotland (MF)
Kay Fowlie, NHS Tayside (KF)
Ian Kyle, Highland Council (for Bill Alexander) (IK)
Ali Macdonald, NHS Health Scotland (AM)
Grant Manders, Police Scotland (GM)
Lynn Townsend, Implementation Lead, Scottish Government GIRFEC Team (LT)
Alan Small, Scottish Government GIRFEC Team (AS)
Tegwen Wallace, Education Scotland (TW)
Phil Raines, Unit Head, Scottish Government Better Life Chances Unit (PR)
Pauline Davidson, Team Lead, Scottish Government GIRFEC Team (PD)
Lesley Mortimer, SEEMiS (LM)
Stephen McLaughlin, Improvement Service (SM)
Richard Kaura, Scottish Government GIRFEC Team (RK)

Apologies
Claire Hider, Scottish Government GIRFEC Team (CH)
Anne Donaldson, North Lanarkshire Council (AD)
Bill Alexander, Highland Council (BA)
Chris Ridley, NHS Lothian (CR)

1. Welcome and Action Points from Last Meeting
BM welcomed all to the meeting, introductions were made for the benefit of new attendees.

Updates on the action points from the last meeting were as follows:

RK to circulate National Forums contact lists to Group: outstanding
RK to amend text from CPP workplan: outstanding

2. Children and Young People (Scotland) Act – Update (LT)
LT provided the Group with an update. The key points were as follows:

The development of statutory guidance is on-going, and a draft of Part 4 is currently out to 20 close partners, with a view to doing a larger, but still limited consultation in the future. LT noted that the guidance is aimed at Local Authorities and Health Boards, rather than those who will fill the Named Person (NP) position. It is hoped that the guidance will be distributed to the NISG for mid-September.
KF stated that following high level discussions regarding midwives filling the role of the NP for the first ten days after birth, consensus seems to supposed a revised position where the Health Visitor would instead fill the role from birth. It was noted that this marks a shift in the message to date.

AM observed that there is some concern that moving this role from Midwives to the Health Visitor might diminish the perceived responsibilities of the midwife. She also noted that there will be little practical difference in the role midwives play in the early days following birth.

LT continued with an update on the Childs Plan guidance, stating that it is expected that informal consultation will begin by the end of October.

LT advised that the guidance for Part 4 of the act, concerning Gypsy/ Traveller communities, has been written and is set to be tested in Fife. A similar process on guidance for the NP service for Home Schooled children has begun and is expected to be trialled with a small number of families.

BM advised all to be ready to respond to the draft guidance.

LT offered an update on the creation of FAQs. It is envisioned that there could be both general and bespoke FAQs to target various interest groups. The target date for completion of the FAQs is the end of September.

KF offered a number of additional questions that might be added, including clarification on the role of the Lead Professional and what would happen in the circumstance where there is a job share of a NP position. There was a view that questions aimed at different audiences would be helpful so that the tone and language was appropriate.

**Action:** Group members to provide any additional questions by late September. RK to compile questions suggested by the Group for consideration

MC inquired if rebuttals to the No2NP talking points have been produced, with LT advising that lines do exist.

JC advised that it might be worth market testing the FAQ prior to general release, to ensure that it answer the appropriate questions, from an appropriate frame of reference and with the right tone. It was also suggested that a version tailored for children be produced.

BM concluded discussion on the FAQ by advising that it was important to ensure consistency between that document and the guidance produced.

**Action:** Nursery NP question to be removed from FAQ. 
**Action:** LT, KA, MF and MC to assist with answering FAQs
3. GIRFEC Events – Feedback from 12 June event and plans for next event (BM & LT)

BM spoke to the fact that there is a general desire for increased understanding of GIRFEC provisions.

AS updated on Touchpoint, indicating that it was generally well received. On the issue of NPs, he advised that some seem to believe – erroneously - that the post holder will be working in isolation, without support.

BM advised that there is a huge demand for shared resources, both from those who could use examples of best practises and those who wish to sign-post or showcase their progress.

AM informed the group that the NHS currently has a huge spreadsheet resource of its practises. Discussion then centred around how best to QA work submitted to such a resource, and how best to highlight best practises.

AS raised the two-day November 4th event to be hosted by Stirling University. The event is tailored to the academic sector, and costs money to attend.

AM suggested that it would be best to tailor events to the anticipated audience, and that perhaps smaller, regional events would be preferable to national events.

BM advised that it could be valuable to tie the next learning event(s) into the release of guidance. PD mentioned that ministers are in principle happy to attend such events, and concurred that regional events would be preferable to a national event.

All agreed that it was best that at least one of these events take place before Christmas.

**Action: BM and LT to consider agenda for above event(s).**
**Action: ALL to consider what locales would be best. Feedback to BM.**
**Action: RK to collect case studies, lessons learned etc. from Group.**

LT discussed the potential value of partners sharing their papers and plans and change management experience.

PD spoke on the contributions being made by our young champion Dionne. BM advised that there was several upcoming events at which her presence would be appreciated.

**Action: PD to send Dionne’s contact information to BM.**- complete

4. Information sharing update (AS)

AS provided an update on information sharing advising that the draft model of the minimum data set is being tested in a number of LAs, accompanied by a questionnaire designed to get feedback on the current form. This testing is expected
to go on for 2 months, and he hopes to have a response to the feedback provided by the beginning of November.

AS also advised that implementation is going well, and that he gets asked certain recurring questions, which could be alleviated with the production of the FAQ.

AS discussed the potential to develop an eToolkit for the website, which could provide support to practitioners and help ensure best practices and Act compliance.

MC mentioned concerns that some have about the NP and their authority/obligation to share information. AS responded that as with all information sharing, the measure needs to be shown to be proportionate, as outlined in the Data Protection Act. BM commented that this feeds back into the need for strong, unambiguous guidance and the sharing of best/worst practices.

**Action: RK to circulate LM’s slides**

LM introduced herself and gave an overview of the work that SEEMiS does, such as recording attendance, merits and demerits for school children in all 32 LAs. LM posited that it would make a great deal of sense for this information source to be made available to and used by Named Persons.

LM advised that there are a number of other tools that SEEMiS could develop that could prove valuable for the implementation of GIRFEC, such as storage of wellbeing records, a space for teachers/school staff to record date stamped ‘post-it’ like comments, software that could be used to automatically add stored data to a Child’s Plan and provide prompts and advise to practitioners. The system is secure so that any personal or sensitive information is protected and can only be accessed by those with permissions.

The high level advantage of the above is that it can provide a single ICT solution while still allowing for differences in approach between CPPs.

BM, MC and SM each voiced their support for using the services that SEEMiS has created to support implementation of GIRFEC.

**Action: BM to provide Local Authority contacts to LM.**

5. **Self-Assessment Questionnaire follow up exercise – Summary Report (Lynn Townsend)**

The CPP Self-Assessment Questionnaire was circulated at the beginning of the meeting. Attendees were given some time to familiarise themselves with the document.

KF and AS both stated their surprise that the NP was more developed than the broader National Practise Model and information sharing. This perhaps indicates the difficulty of reporting on systems change.
LT discussed the possibility of creating a directory of practises/surveys for training and general learning purposes. AM, KA and BM all expressed strong support for the concept. BM suggested that the directory could initially be internal, primarily for the use of practitioners but then public facing once the value of the directory had been established. She also stated, however, that it would be important to make clear that the sharing of any individual LAs plans and experience should not constitute an endorsement of any specific approach. KF suggested that it might be useful to instead highlight cases of best practise, perhaps by reviewing or marking submissions. BM agreed and suggested that there could be a great deal of value in encouraging more sharing.

6. Communications Update – (Claire Hider/Pauline Davidson)

PD provided an update on current communications issues in CH’s absence. Specifically, she raised recent and future updates to the website and the potential procurement of poster customising software.

LT and others spoke to the high potential value of such a product, but advised that careful consideration be given to what posters/leaflets were produced, and to whom they were made readily available, i.e. providing leaflets on CP only to those going through the process.

PD raised the issue of groups who are actively protesting GIRFEC, particularly the NP provision. PR interjected that there may be value to having dissenting voices at some larger events, to better represent the full spectrum of thoughts/concerns relating to the GIRFEC provisions of the CYPA. LT and PD agreed, and suggested that it could be beneficial to engage with these organisations on an individual level.

7. A.O.B and date of next meeting (Bernadette Malone)

The next NISG will take place on 24 October 2014 in Victoria Quay.

Action: Look to arrange dates for NISG events into next year.