



Rutland County Council

Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP.
Telephone 01572 722577 Email governance@rutland.gov.uk DX28340
Oakham

Meeting: **CABINET**

Date and Time: **Tuesday, 17 July 2018 at 10.00 am**

Venue: **COUNCIL CHAMBER, CATMOSE**

Governance Officer to contact: **Natasha Taylor 01572 720991**
email: governance@rutland.gov.uk

Recording of Council Meetings: Any member of the public may film, audio-record, take photographs and use social media to report the proceedings of any meeting that is open to the public. A protocol on this facility is available at <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-council/have-your-say/>

A G E N D A

- 1) APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2) ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN AND/OR HEAD OF THE PAID SERVICE**
- 3) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with the Regulations, Members are required to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have and the nature of those interests in respect of items on this Agenda and/or indicate if Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applies to them.

4) RECORD OF DECISIONS

To confirm the Record of Decisions made at the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19 June 2018.

5) ITEMS RAISED BY SCRUTINY

To receive items raised by members of scrutiny which have been submitted to the Leader (copied to Chief Executive and Governance Officer) by 4.30 pm on Friday 13 July 2018.

REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR FOR RESOURCES

6) ANNUAL REPORT ON TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND ACTUAL PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2017/18

(KEY DECISION)

Report No. 101/2018
(Pages 5 - 22)

7) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

(KEY DECISION)

Report No. 103/2018
(Pages 23 - 28)

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND LOCAL SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD

8) LEICESTERSHIRE & RUTLAND LOCAL SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD (LRSAB) BUSINESS PLAN 2018/19

Report No. 123/2018
(Pages 29 - 42)

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD

9) LEICESTERSHIRE & RUTLAND LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD (LRLSCB) BUSINESS PLAN 2018/19

Report No. 124/2018
(Pages 43 - 58)

10) ANY ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To receive items of urgent business which have previously been notified to the person presiding.

---oOo---

MEMBERS OF THE CABINET: Mr O Hemsley Chairman

Mr N Begy
Mr G Brown
Mr R Foster
Mr A Walters
Mr D Wilby

SCRUTINY COMMISSION:

Note: Scrutiny Members may attend Cabinet meetings but may only speak at the prior invitation of the person presiding at the meeting.

**ALL CHIEF OFFICERS
PUBLIC NOTICEBOARD AT CATMOSE
GOVERNANCE TEAM**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report No: 101/2018
PUBLIC REPORT**

CABINET

17 July 2018

ANNUAL REPORT ON TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND ACTUAL PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2017/18

Report of the Director for Resources

Strategic Aim:	Sound Financial Planning	
Key Decision: Yes	Forward Plan Reference: FP/240518	
Exempt Information	No	
Cabinet Member(s) Responsible:	Councillor Gordon Brown, Portfolio Holder for Regulatory Services, Waste Management, Property Services, Culture & Leisure, Finance.	
Contact Officer(s):	Saverio Della Rocca, Assistant Director - Finance	Tel: 01572 758159 sdrocca@rutland.gov.uk
	Andrew Merry- Finance Manager - Technical	Tel: 01572 758152 amerry@rutland.gov.uk
Ward Councillors	N/A	

DECISION RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet:

1. Notes the actual 2017/18 prudential indicators within the report.
2. Notes that the treasury management stewardship for 2017/18 was in compliance with the treasury management strategy.

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 Report 41/2017 set the Treasury Management Strategy for 2017/18 linked to the Council's Budget, Medium Term Financial Plan and Capital Plans. It is inextricably linked to delivering the Council's aims and objectives.
- 1.2 This report sets out how the Council has performed against the Strategy.

2 BACKGROUND AND MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 The Council's annual treasury report in Appendix A includes information on the performance of the treasury management service. The key points to note in year are:
- The Council has only invested with approved institutions and within approved limits (Appendix A, paragraph 2.2.3 refers) ;
 - The Councils made a return on investment of 0.66% compared to the LIBOR rate of 0.49% (Appendix A, paragraph 2.3.1 refers) ;
 - The Council did not undertake any external borrowing in year and therefore did not breach the operational boundary for borrowing (£23m) (Appendix A, paragraph 3.4.3 refers); and
 - No external debt was repaid early as there was not a financial business case to do so (Appendix A, paragraph 3.4.3 refers).

3 CONSULTATION

- 3.1 No formal consultation is required.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 This report is for noting, there are no alternative options.

5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

6 LEGAL AND GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The report meets the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management, the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities and the Council's Financial Procedure Rules. The Council is required to comply with both Codes through Regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003.
- 6.2 The Council's treasury management activities for 2017/18 were regulated by a variety of professional codes, statutes and guidance (which have been updated for 2018/19):

- The Local Government Act 2003 (the Act), which provides the powers to borrow and invest as well as providing controls and limits on this activity;
- The Act permits the Secretary of State to set limits either on the Council or nationally on all local authorities restricting the amount of borrowing which may be undertaken (although no restrictions were made in 2012/13);
- Statutory Instrument (SI) 3146 2003, as amended, develops the controls and powers within the Act;
- The SI requires the Council to undertake any borrowing activity with regard to the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities;
- The SI also requires the Council to operate the overall treasury function with regard to the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Services;
- Under the Act MHCLG has issued Investment Guidance to structure and regulate the Council's investment activities; and
- Under Section 238(2) of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 the Secretary of State has taken powers to issue guidance on accounting practices. Guidance on Minimum Revenue Provision was issued under this section on 8 November 2007.

6.3 The Council's Treasury Management Strategy explains how it complies with this legal framework.

7 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has not been completed because there are no service, policy or organisational changes being proposed.

8 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no community safety implications.

9 HEALTH AND WELLBEING IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no health and wellbeing implications.

10 CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 The report summarises treasury management performance in the year and meets the requirements set out in section 6.

11 BACKGROUND PAPERS

11.1 Statement of Accounts 2017/18

12 APPENDICES

12.1 Appendix A - Treasury Management Annual Report

12.2 Appendix B - Link Commentary on 2017/18

12.3 Appendix C - Glossary

A Large Print or Braille Version of this Report is available upon request – Contact 01572 722577.

Appendix A.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18

1 OVERVIEW OF STRATEGY

1.1 What is Treasury Management?

1.1.1 Treasury management is the term used to describe the way a Council manages the cash it needs to meet both its day-to-day running costs and borrowing for capital expenditure. The treasury management function for a Council will make the arrangements to borrow and invest money either over the short or the longer term in order to ensure that it has money available when it needs it.

1.1.2 CIPFA defines treasury management as "...the management of the organisation's investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks".

1.2 What framework or rules do we need to follow?

1.2.1 In making arrangements for treasury management, a Council is required to follow CIPFA's Treasury Management Code. The Code aims to help ensure that Councils manage the significant risks associated with the function while also ensuring the Council receives value for money.

1.2.2 The Council approved a Strategy in February 2017 (report 41/2017) which covered;

- borrowing strategy, including capital plans (including prudential indicators);
- a minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy (how residual capital expenditure is charged to revenue over time); and
- the treasury management strategy (strategy guidelines for choosing and placing investments, the principles to be used to determine the maximum periods for which funds can be committed, what specified and non specified investments will be considered how the investments and borrowings are to be organised) including treasury indicators.

1.2.3 Councils need to prove that they are complying with the Prudential Code and this is done through a series of prudential indicators that are set locally and approved at the same time as the Council sets its budget for the following year.

2 TREASURY PERFORMANCE

2.1 How much did we have to invest during 2017/18?

2.1.1 The Council receives lots of income from council tax, business rates and central government. The majority of council tax and business rates payments are received between April and January, with expenditure being fairly static throughout the year.

2.1.2 At any point of time in the year, the Council had between £26m - £36m available to invest. The table below shows the level of investments held during the year, the average level of investments during the year was £32.373m.

2016/17 Actual £000	2017/18 Quarter 1 as at 30-Jun-17 £000	2017/18 Quarter 2 as at 30-Sep-17 £000	2017/18 Quarter 3 as at 31-Dec-17 £000	2017/18 Quarter 4 as at 31-Mar-18 £000
26,709	29,875	31,014	33,538	30,001

2.2 Did we achieve our investment objectives? Did we invest in line within approved rules?

2.2.1 Like us as individuals, the Council will invest surplus money in various ways to get a return on balances thus generating extra income. As per our overall objectives, we ensure that these surplus balances are managed in a way to maximise the income potential whilst having regard to security risk.

2.2.2 The Council's investment strategy primary objectives, in order of importance are:

- safeguarding the re-payment of the principal and interest of its investments on time – losing any funds like in the case of Icelandic banks would be very significant in this financial climate;
- adequate liquidity – the Council does not want to run short of money so it cannot pay its bills or does not have money available to make investments in capital expenditure;
- Maximising the investment return – this is clearly important but the Council does not want to maximise returns at the expense of the first two objectives.

2.2.3 All of the Council's investments during the financial year were made with approved institutions within the agreed limits contained within the Treasury Management Strategy 2017/18 (41/2017). These limits are:

- £5m for a maximum of 3 years for institutions within the upper limit of the credit ratings;
- £5m for a maximum of 364 days for institutions within the middle limit of credit ratings; other local authorities and Money Market Funds;
- £1m for a maximum of 6 months those institutions without a credit rating, normally certain Building Societies whose operation does not require a credit rating.

2.2.4 Following the principles set out in paragraph 2.2.2, the Council made investment returns as shown below.

	Original Estimate 2017/18	Revised Estimate 2017/18 Q2	Actuals 2017/18
	£000	£000	£000
Investment Income	164	204	214
Other Interest Received *	16	16	18
Total	180	220	232

* The Council also receives interest from sources other than investments. A Housing Association has been recharged £12k for the principal and interest of loans that the Council has made to it, the final payment will be in 2051/52. In 2017/18 £6k was received from the sale of buses.

2.3 How did the Council investments perform?

2.3.1 The Code of Practice on Treasury Management requires the Council to set performance indicators to assess the adequacy of the treasury function over the year. An example of a performance indicator often used for the investment treasury function is internal returns above the 6 month LIBOR rate (the average interbank interest rate at which a selection of banks on the London money market are prepared to lend to one another). The Council monitored performance against the LIBOR rate during 2017/18 and the results are shown below.

	2016/17	2017/18 (Q2)	2017/18 (Q4)
RCC Returns (%)	0.75	0.66	0.66
LIBOR (%)	0.49	0.48	0.49

- 2.3.2 The increase in the Bank Rate on 2 November 2017 from 0.25% to 0.50% did not benefit on investment returns achieved in 2017/18, as the majority of the investments for 2017/18 were made before this increase and the balances held in Q4 were lower than during the rest of the year. The effect of the increase in interest rates will be more noticeable in 2018/19, when the interest received will increase. This can be evidenced by an investment of £2m placed on 29th March 2018 for 1 year at 1.205%, previously the interest rate was between 0.80% and 0.95%.

3 PRUDENTIAL (BORROWING AND DEBT) INDICATORS

3.1 Why do we borrow?

- 3.1.1 Council's borrow to fund capital expenditure or refinance/reschedule existing borrowings e.g. replace one loan with one at a lower rate.
- 3.1.2 Effectively, the Council works out its capital expenditure plans and then calculates how much it needs to borrow having considered whether it should fund capital expenditure using other options.

3.2 What was our Capital Expenditure and how did we fund it?

- 3.2.1 The Council's capital expenditure during 2017/18 was £4.199m. The outturn report (83/2018) contains detailed analysis of the capital programme and financing.
- 3.2.2 The £4.199m was financed as per the table below. The financing need represents an increase in borrowing requirements.

	2016/17 Actual*	2017/18 Revised Estimate**	2017/18 Actual***
	£000	£000	£000
Capital Expenditure	5,338	10,080	4,199
Financed by:			
Capital Receipts/s106	274	438	341
Capital Grants & Contributions	3,950	9,040	3,858
Revenue	186	0	0
Net financing need for the year	928	602	0

* Audited Statement of Accounts 2016/17

** Revised Estimate per Mid-Year Treasury Report (189/2017)

*** Note 20 - Statement of Accounts 2017/18 (unaudited) and outturn report (83/2018).

3.3 What was the Council's borrowing need (the Capital Financing Requirement)?

3.3.1 Any unsupported borrowing in a given year is added to the Council's Capital Financing Requirement. There is no unsupported borrowing for 2017/18.

3.3.2 The Council's Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) is simply the total capital expenditure which has not yet been paid for from either revenue or capital resources. It is essentially a measure of the Council's underlying borrowing need. The CFR is reduced every year as the Council incurs a 'borrowing charge' in the Revenue Account which reduces it (this is called Minimum Revenue Provision).

3.3.3 The Council's CFR for the year is shown below, and represents a key prudential indicator.

	2016/17 Actual*	2017/18 Revised Estimate**	2017/18 Actual***
	£000	£000	£000
CFR – 1 April	22,724	22,756	22,756
Movement in Year - CFR	32	(270)	(897)
CFR – 31 March	22,756	22,486	21,859
Movement in CFR Represented by			
Net financing need for the year (from table at para 3.2.2)	928	602	0
MRP	(896)	(872)	(897)
Voluntary Revenue Provision (VRP)	-	-	-
Movement in CFR	32	(270)	(897)

* Audited Statement of Accounts 2016/17

** Revised Estimate per Mid-Year Treasury Report (189/2017)

*** Note 20 - Statement of Accounts 2017/18 (unaudited) and outturn report (83/2018)

3.4 What is the current level of debt and how might it change?

- 3.4.1 The Council currently has loans outstanding of £22.436m of which £21.386m are long term loans with the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB). The remainder comprises a Salix Loan of £420k repayable in 2020 and a Local Enterprise Partnership loan (LEP) of £630k, which matures in 2023. The Salix and LEP loans are shown in the accounts at concessionary rates which increases year on year until the final year where the full value is recognised. Details of the outstanding loans can be found in the table in paragraph 3.4.3.
- 3.4.2 All PWLB loans have been borrowed on a maturity basis. Interest payments will be made every six months on equal instalments throughout the term of the loan, with the principal being repaid on the maturity date.
- 3.4.3 The overall debt position is monitored continuously and advice provided by Link Asset Services to identify opportunities for the repayment or restructuring of debt. No such opportunities were identified as cost effective in the year. Repayment of debt is subject to either a premium or dividend equating to the difference in interest payable for the remainder of the term of the loan and that which could be earned by the lender on a new loan for the same period. The debt position at the 31 March 2018 compared to the previous year is shown in the following table:

	31 March 2017		31 March 2018	
	Principal	Average rate	Principal	Average rate
Long Term Debt Public Works Loan Board (all fixed rate debt)	£21.386m	4.83%	£21.386m	4.83%
Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)	£0.560m*	0.00%	£0.572m*	0.00%
Salix Loan	£0.399m*	0.00%	£0.361m*	0.00%
Total long term debt (all fixed rate debt)	£22.345m		£22.319m	
Operational Boundary	£23.000m		£23.000m	
Capital Financing Requirement	£22.756m		£21.858m	
Over/(under) borrowing	(£0.411m)		(£0.461m)	
Total investments	(£26.709m)	0.75%	(£30.001m)	0.66%
Net borrowing position	(£4.364m)		(£7.682m)	
* The Council has not increased its LEP loan but the actual loan (£630k over 10 years) is shown in the accounts at a concessionary rate which increases year on year until the final year where the full value is recognised. The Salix (£420k over 5 Years) is also shown in the accounts at a concessionary rate until the final year where the full value is recognised, this loan is repaid in instalments and not on maturity.				

3.5 What borrowing limits did we set and how did we comply?

3.5.1 The Council cannot simply borrow indefinitely. There are a number of prudential indicators to ensure the Council operates its activities within well-defined limits. The indicators focus on two key aspects:

- Setting limits to control borrowing; and
- Assessing the affordability of the capital investment plans.

3.5.2 In addition, we also set limits on interest rate exposure.

3.5.3 **Controlling borrowing prudential indicators**

3.5.4 The Council needs to ensure that its gross debt does not, except in the short term, exceed the total of the CFR in the preceding year plus the estimates of any additional CFR for 2017/18 and the following two financial years. This indicator is important as it effectively measures whether your actual external debt exceeds your need to borrow. If it does, then it could suggest that Councils have been borrowing when they do not need to do so or for inappropriate purposes. It could also mean that the Council has made a reduction to its CFR by undertaking VRP. This is the case for the Council, with additional VRP's being made in 2013/14 for £1.414m and 2015/16 £0.597m.

3.5.5 The table below shows that the Council has complied with this indicator for 2017/18.

	2017/18 Actual £000	2018/19 Estimate £000	2019/20 Estimate £000	2020/21 Estimate £000
Gross Debt	22,436	27,310	27,226	27,142
Capital Financing Requirement (CFR)	21,858	33,011	32,382	31,753
Under / (Over) borrowing	(578)	5,701	5,156	4,611

3.5.6 In 2017/18, the Council was in an “overborrowed” position, which can be explained as follows:

- The position did not materialise from borrowing for revenue purposes, which this indicator is a key test of. Since 2008 when the Council borrowed £4m PWLB for the by-pass, the Council has taken only two loans i) an interest free loan from the Local Enterprise Partnership to contribute to the purchase and renovation of Oakham Enterprise Park (£630k); and ii) a Salix loan at 0% for Street Lighting upgrades (£420k). This borrowing is for capital purposes and not to fund revenue.

- The Council has also made voluntary contributions to reduce its CFR as a means of reducing the capital financing charge on the revenue account. In 2013/14 the application of unused Capital Receipts was used to reduce the CFR by £1.4m and in 2015/16 to repay the advance borrowing in relation to Adult Soccer a reduction of £597k. If the Council had not done this, the CFR would be £2m higher and the revenue account would receive a higher capital financing charge.
- 3.5.7 Ideally, to reduce interest costs, the Council would have preferred to use capital receipts etc to repay external debt. However, there has not been a viable business case to do so. The Council would have to pay a premium to repay early, which would cost the Council in the long term more than repaying in line with the current loan on maturity.
- 3.5.8 A further key prudential indicator represents a control on the maximum level of borrowing. The Council approved the Authorised Limit of £28m. This represents a limit beyond which external borrowing is prohibited, and this limit needs to be set or revised by the full Council. It reflects the level of external borrowing which, while not desired, could be afforded in the short term, but is not sustainable in the longer term
- 3.5.9 The table in paragraph 3.4.3 shows that Council did not breach this limit for 2017/18.
- 3.5.10 An additional indicator is the Operational Boundary – this is the maximum amount of money a Council expects to borrow during the year. This is lower than the Authorised Limit and acts as a useful warning sign if it is breached during the year, which could mean that underlying spending may be higher or income lower than budgeted. The Council approved an Operational Boundary of £23m within the 2017/18 Treasury Strategy. The table in paragraph 3.4.3 shows that Council did not breach this limit for 2017/18.
- 3.5.11 **Affordability Prudential Indicators**
- 3.5.12 The previous section covered the overall capital and control of borrowing prudential indicators, but within this framework prudential indicators are required to assess the affordability of the capital investment plans. These provide an indication of the impact of the capital investment plans on the Council's overall finances.
- 3.5.13 One of the key affordability indicators is the ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream. This indicator helps a Council identify if borrowing costs become too high as a proportion of its budget. This is important as borrowing costs always have to be paid and are very hard to cut if resources fall.

	Budgeted £000	Actual £000	
Capital Financing Costs	1,930	1,930	
Interest Receivable	(0,180)	(0,232)	
	1,750	1,698	A
Revenue Stream			
Government Grants	6,053	5,916	
Retained Business Rates	4,956	5,355	
Council Tax	23,242	23,242	
	34,251	34,513	B
Ratio (A divided by B as a percentage)	5.11%	4.92%	

3.5.14 The table above shows that the Council complied with this indicator. The net financing costs (A) were lower than budgeted, due to the additional interest earned on investments and the Revenue Stream (B) being higher due to additional income from retained business rates.

Appendix B. Link Asset Services Commentary on The Economy and Interest Rates

1. The outcome of the EU referendum in June 2016 resulted in a gloomy outlook and economic forecasts from the Bank of England based around an expectation of a major slowdown in UK GDP growth, particularly during the second half of 2016, which was expected to push back the first increase in Bank Rate for at least three years. Consequently, the Bank responded in August 2016 by cutting Bank Rate by 0.25% to 0.25% and making available over £100bn of cheap financing to the banking sector up to February 2018. Both measures were intended to stimulate growth in the economy. This gloom was overdone as the UK economy turned in a G7 leading growth rate of 1.8% in 2016, (actually joint equal with Germany), and followed it up with another 1.8% in 2017, (although this was a comparatively weak result compared to the US and EZ).

During the calendar year of 2017, there was a major shift in expectations in financial markets in terms of how soon Bank Rate would start on a rising trend. After the UK economy surprised on the upside with strong growth in the second half of 2016, growth in 2017 was disappointingly weak in the first half of the year; quarter 1 came in at +0.3% (+1.7% y/y) and quarter 2 was +0.3% (+1.5% y/y), which meant that growth in the first half of 2017 was the slowest for the first half of any year since 2012.

During the autumn market expectations rose significantly that the MPC would be heading in the direction of imminently raising Bank Rate. The MPC meeting of 14 September provided a shock to the markets with a sharp increase in tone in the minutes where the MPC considerably hardened their wording in terms of needing to raise Bank Rate very soon. The 2 November MPC quarterly Inflation Report meeting duly delivered on this warning by withdrawing the 0.25% emergency rate cut which had been implemented in August 2016. Market debate then moved on as to whether this would be a one and done move for maybe a year or more by the MPC, or the first of a series of increases in Bank Rate over the next 2-3 years. The MPC minutes from that meeting were viewed as being dovish, i.e. there was now little pressure to raise rates by much over that time period. In particular, the GDP growth forecasts were pessimistically weak while there was little evidence of building pressure on wage increases despite remarkably low unemployment. The MPC forecast that CPI would peak at about 3.1% and chose to look through that breaching of its 2% target as this was a one off result of the devaluation of sterling caused by the result of the EU referendum. The inflation forecast showed that the MPC expected inflation to come down to near the 2% target over the two to three year time horizon. So this all seemed to add up to cooling expectations of much further action to raise Bank Rate over the next two years.

The major UK landmark event of the year was the inconclusive result of the general election on 8 June. However, this had relatively little impact on financial markets. However, sterling did suffer a sharp devaluation against most other currencies, although it has recovered about half of that fall since then. Brexit negotiations have been a focus of much attention and concern during the year but so far, there has been little significant hold up to making progress.

2. **EU.** Economic growth in the EU, (the UK's biggest trading partner), was lack lustre for several years after the financial crisis despite the ECB eventually cutting its main rate to -0.4% and embarking on a massive programme of quantitative easing to stimulate growth. However, growth eventually picked up in 2016 and subsequently gathered further momentum to produce an overall GDP figure for 2017 of 2.3%. Nevertheless, despite providing this massive monetary stimulus, the ECB is still struggling to get inflation up to its 2% target and in March, inflation was still only 1.4%. It is, therefore, unlikely to start an upswing in rates until possibly towards the end of 2019.
3. **USA.** Growth in the American economy was volatile in 2015 and 2016. 2017 followed that path again with quarter 1 at 1.2%, quarter 2 3.1%, quarter 3 3.2% and quarter 4 2.9%. The annual rate of GDP growth for 2017 was 2.3%, up from 1.6% in 2016. Unemployment in the US also fell to the lowest level for 17 years, reaching 4.1% in October to February, while wage inflation pressures, and inflationary pressures in general, have been building. The Fed has been the first major western central bank to start on an upswing in rates with six increases since the first one in December 2015 to lift the central rate to 1.50 – 1.75% in March 2018. There could be a further two or three increases in 2018 as the Fed faces a challenging situation with GDP growth trending upwards at a time when the recent Trump fiscal stimulus is likely to increase growth further, consequently increasing inflationary pressures in an economy which is already operating at near full capacity. In October 2017, the Fed also became the first major western central bank to make a start on unwinding quantitative easing by phasing in a gradual reduction in reinvesting maturing debt.
4. **China.** Economic growth has been weakening over successive years, despite repeated rounds of central bank stimulus and medium term risks are increasing. Major progress still needs to be made to eliminate excess industrial capacity and the stock of unsold property, and to address the level of non-performing loans in the banking and credit systems.
5. **Japan.** GDP growth has been improving to reach an annual figure of 2.1% in quarter 4 of 2017. However, it is still struggling to get inflation up to its target rate of 2% despite huge monetary and fiscal stimulus, although inflation has risen in 2018 to reach 1.5% in February. It is also making little progress on fundamental reform of the economy.

Appendix C. Treasury Management Glossary of Terms

Authorised Limit (Also known as the Affordable Limit):

A statutory limit that sets the maximum level of external borrowing on a gross basis (i.e. not net of investments) for the Council. It is measured on a daily basis against all external borrowing items on the Balance Sheet (i.e. long and short term borrowing, overdrawn bank balances and long term liabilities).

Balances and Reserves:

Accumulated sums that are maintained either earmarked for specific future costs or commitments or generally held to meet unforeseen or emergency expenditure.

Bank Rate:

The official interest rate set by the Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee and what is generally termed at the "base rate". This rate is also referred to as the 'repo rate'.

Basis Point:

A unit of measure used in finance to describe the percentage change in the value or rate of a financial instrument. One basis point is equivalent to 0.01% (1/100th of a percent). In most cases, it refers to changes in interest rates and bond yields. For example, if interest rates rise by 25 basis points, it means that rates have risen by 0.25% percentage points. If rates were at 2.50%, and rose by 0.25%, or 25 basis points, the new interest rate would be 2.75%.

Bond:

A certificate of debt issued by a company, government, or other institution. The bond holder receives interest at a rate stated at the time of issue of the bond. The price of a bond may vary during its life.

Capital Expenditure:

Expenditure on the acquisition, creation or enhancement of capital assets.

Capital Financing Requirement (CFR):

The Council's underlying need to borrow for capital purposes representing the cumulative capital expenditure of the local authority that has not been financed.

Capital Receipts:

Money obtained on the sale of a capital asset.

Credit Rating:

Formal opinion by a registered rating agency of a counterparty's future ability to meet its financial liabilities; these are opinions only and not guarantees.

Counterparty List:

List of approved financial institutions with which the Council can place investments with.

Debt Management Office (DMO):

The DMO is an Executive Agency of Her Majesty's Treasury and provides direct access for local authorities into a government deposit facility known as the DMADF. All deposits are guaranteed by HM Government and therefore have the

equivalent of a sovereign triple-A credit rating.
Gilts: <p>Gilts are bonds issued by the UK Government. They take their name from 'gilt-edged'. Being issued by the UK government, they are deemed to be very secure as the investor expects to receive the full face value of the bond to be repaid on maturity.</p>
LIBID: <p>The London Interbank Bid Rate (LIBID) is the rate bid by banks on Eurocurrency deposits (i.e. the rate at which a bank is willing to borrow from other banks).</p>
LIBOR: <p>The London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) is the rate of interest that banks charge to lend money to each other. The British Bankers' Association (BBA) work with a small group of large banks to set the LIBOR rate each day. The wholesale markets allow banks who need money to be more fluid in the marketplace to borrow from those with surplus amounts. The banks with surplus amounts of money are keen to lend so that they can generate interest which it would not otherwise receive.</p>
Maturity: <p>The date when an investment or borrowing is repaid.</p>
Money Market Funds (MMF): <p>Pooled funds which invest in a range of short term assets providing high credit quality and high liquidity.</p>
Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP): <p>An annual provision that the Council is statutorily required to set aside and charge to the Revenue Account for the repayment of debt associated with expenditure incurred on capital assets.</p>
Voluntary Revenue Provision (VRP): <p>An additional contribution over and above the MRP that the Council can choose to make to reduce the CFR which in turn will reduce the MRP for future years.</p>
Non Specified Investment: <p>Investments which fall outside the CLG Guidance for Specified investments (below).</p>
Operational Boundary: <p>This linked directly to the Council's estimates of the CFR and estimates of other day to day cash flow requirements. This indicator is based on the same estimates as the Authorised Limit reflecting the most likely prudent but not worst case scenario but without the additional headroom included within the Authorised Limit.</p>
Prudential Code: <p>Developed by CIPFA and introduced on 01/4/2004 as a professional code of practice to support local authority capital investment planning within a clear, affordable, prudent and sustainable framework and in accordance with good professional practice.</p>

Prudential Indicators:

Prudential indicators are a set of financial indicators and limits that are calculated in order to demonstrate that Councils' capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable.

They are outlined in the CIPFA Prudential Code of Practice. They are indicators that must be used to cover the categories of affordability, prudence, capital spending, external debt/borrowing and treasury management. They take the form of limits, ratios or targets which are approved by Council before 1 April each year and are monitored throughout the year on an on-going basis. A Council may also choose to use additional voluntary indicators.

Public Works Loans Board (PWLB):

The PWLB is a statutory body operating within the United Kingdom Debt Management Office, an Executive Agency of HM Treasury. The PWLB's function is to lend money from the National Loans Fund to local authorities and other prescribed bodies, and to collect the repayments.

Revenue Expenditure:

Expenditure to meet the continuing cost of delivery of services including salaries and wages, the purchase of materials and capital financing charges.

(Short) Term Deposits:

Deposits of cash with terms attached relating to maturity and rate of return (Interest).

Specified Investments:

Term used in the CLG Guidance and Welsh Assembly Guidance for Local Authority Investments. Investments that offer high security and high liquidity, in sterling and for no more than one year. UK government, local authorities and bodies that have a high credit rating.

Supported Borrowing:

Borrowing for which the costs are supported by the government or third party.

Temporary Borrowing:

Borrowing to cover peaks and troughs of cash flow, not to fund capital spending.

Unsupported Borrowing:

Borrowing which is self-financed by the local authority. This is also sometimes referred to as Prudential Borrowing.

Yield:

The measure of the return on an investment.

CABINET

17 July 2018

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

Report of the Director for Resources

Strategic Aim:	Building our infrastructure	
Key Decision: Yes	Forward Plan Reference: FP/040618	
Exempt Information	No	
Cabinet Member(s) Responsible:	Councillor Gordon Brown, Portfolio Holder for Regulatory Services, Waste Management, Property Services, Culture & Leisure, Finance including Revenues & Benefits and Internal Audit	
Contact Officer(s):	James Frieland, Economic Development & Tourism Manager	Tel: 01572 758159 sdrocca@rutland.gov.uk
	Saverio Della Rocca, Assistant Finance Director	Tel: 01572 490910 jfrieland@rutland.gov.uk
Ward Councillors	N/A	

DECISION RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet:

1. Authorises the Director for Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with Portfolio for Resources, to provide funds (not exceeding £200,000 in total) to community organisations on a short term loan basis to enable successful grant funded projects to be completed.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To seek Members' approval for use of Council finances to support community organisations that have successfully applied for LEADER grant funding but require assistance in bridging the period between confirmation of grant award and completion of the works being funded.

2. BACKGROUND AND MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 LEADER funding is available to local businesses, communities, foresters, farmers and land managers and is a European scheme administered in the UK by the Rural Payments Agency (RPA).
- 2.2 A total of £138m was made available for the LEADER programme between 2015 and 2020. Applications are made to the Local Action Group (LAG) for funding for projects

that create jobs or support business growth in rural areas. The LAG for Rutland & Peterborough is comprised of private sector and community representatives and from the public sector.

- 2.3 As Rutland is classified as 100% rural, any business, not-for-profit or community organisation within its borders is eligible to apply for a grant from £2,500 to £50,000 although higher amounts up to £75,000 can be considered in exceptional circumstances where projects can demonstrate a higher rate of outputs and fit with the Local Development Strategy. Each LAG decides which projects they will support in their local area and projects must support one or more of the 6 leader priorities which are to:
- 2.3.1 Support micro and small businesses and farm diversification
 - 2.3.2 Boost rural tourism
 - 2.3.3 Increase farm productivity
 - 2.3.4 Increase forestry productivity
 - 2.3.5 Provide rural services
 - 2.3.6 Provide cultural and heritage activities
- 2.4 To be successful, grant applications must also meet one or more of national priorities. These are creation of new, higher skilled or higher paid jobs, demonstrating a clear future plan for business growth and/or increased productivity and benefitting the wider economy in the rural area.
- 2.5 If a bid is successful, the applicant will receive a formal offer letter from the RPA. However, the grant is normally only paid out once works are complete or in up to three staged payments for larger projects but in any case, the applicant needs to pay for the works before the grant award can be drawn down.
- 2.6 As grant funding is paid on completion of works, several organisations are struggling to finance the works themselves and as such, the LAG has asked the Council if it will support organisations through provision of finance to bridge the gap between the grant award being confirmed by the RPA and the grant being drawn down.
- 2.7 Although the LAG processes applications from organisations across Rutland and Peterborough, this funding support would only be sought for Rutland applicants. If the Council does not provide this support then local organisations may not be able to access funding.

3. LEADER funding in Rural Peterborough & Rutland

- 3.1 Over £1m was made available to the Rural Peterborough & Rutland programme which aims to create 44 FTE jobs and support 100 rural businesses, 6 community investments and 12 tourism actions.
- 3.2 To date, £217,542 has been awarded to local businesses and organisations but take up has been fairly slow, due in part to LEADER's reputation as having a detailed application process as is fairly common with schemes involving European funding.
- 3.3 Over the last 18 months and following the appointment of a new Chairman to the LAG, there has been an increase in promotional activity and closer liaison with local businesses and other organisations to highlight the benefits of LEADER funding.

Significant promotion via social media channels, workshops and seminars has resulted in an increased number of applications, especially from community groups.

- 3.4 However, faced with difficulties around bridging the gap between the formal grant offer and completion of the works for their respective projects, several applicants have subsequently withdrawn their applications prematurely. There is clearly a positive economic impact to be gained from completed projects so some LAG members are now working alongside applicants in some cases to guide them through the application process and provide feedback on projects prior to formal submission.
- 3.5 Recent successful awards to businesses in Rutland include Parker Farms based in Ridlington who received £49,570 for a new direct seed drill that will improve farm efficiency. Simmons Optometrists in Oakham received £44,754 to facilitate business expansion.
- 3.6 The application process is two stage. The first is an expression of interest (EOI) to provide a general overview of the project and which of the LEADER funding priorities it will satisfy. Grants are typically capped at 40% of the total project value for commercial entities but this can be increased to 100% for community and not-for-profit organisations. Applicants are required to arrange alternative funding sources to make up the balance. If the EOI is approved, applicants are then invited to proceed to stage two and submit a full application.
- 3.7 The full application is then considered by the LAG at a scheduled meeting. If supported, the application is sent through to the RPA asking it to support the application and make the grant offer. Assuming the RPA are in agreement, they will then write to the applicant to make a formal offer of the grant. At this stage, the Council may be asked by a community organisation such as a village hall committee to provide financial assistance by arranging a short-term loan to enable the project works to proceed. The loan would then be paid back to the Council once works had been completed and the grant award drawn down.
- 3.8 The Government has guaranteed funding for RDPE Leader Programme grants if these are signed before the UK's departure from the EU even if the grant agreements continue after the UK has have left the EU. This is subject to projects being good value for money and being in line with domestic strategic priorities. DEFRA has confirmed that projects approved through the LEADER process meet these conditions. Projects need to be finished and paid for by 31st March 2019 in order to secure funding.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Several workshops have been help with community organisations and feedback from these taken on board. The LAG has also met directly with some local community groups considering an application to discuss potential concerns.

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 5.1 The Council has no obligation to provide financial assistance to successful grant applicants but if it does not offer support the majority of community organisations are unlikely to proceed with their applications which would have a detrimental impact on local community and economic objectives.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 In the context of LEADER funding, the total maximum amount of loan funding required is likely to be in the region of £200,000. The opportunity cost of giving a loan is c1% per annum - £2,000 - this represents the typical amount the Council would earn on interest in say a 1 year deposit. The Council would therefore seek to charge an "admin fee" of 2% of the value of the loan (1% opportunity cost and 1% for cover administration costs).
- 6.2 Based on the information provided by Leader, loans would be relatively short term in nature. Most projects tend to run for 1 - 2 years. The Council would therefore see funds repaid over a short time period. When schemes have been approved and are in progress, organisations will complete a grant form (showing amounts spent to date) and subject to satisfying all necessary criteria will receive grant funding accordingly. This grant funding would then be paid over to the Council.
- 6.3 There are inevitably risks associated with giving out loans. The main one relates organisations being unable to reclaim funding. Organisations have to apply for funding and projects have to meet various criteria, one of which relates to eligibility of expenditure. If organisations misuse funding or do not complete projects then there is a risk that the loan would not be recovered. The application assessment and approval process is rigorous so this risk is assessed as low.
- 6.4 The admin fee charged by the Council could not be claimed back via the Leader programme so organisations would have to demonstrate that they could raise funding/have resources to cover this charge. The Council would assess this prior to giving formal support to a project.

7. LEGAL AND GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The Council has the power to give loans to organisations. The Section 151 Officer can arrange these loans if Cabinet approval is given. Any loan would be subject to a loan agreement.
- 7.2 A council has a general power to borrow and to make loans under the General Power of Competence in Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 and the well-being power under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 where it is considered to be in the interests of the economic, social or environmental well-being of the area.

8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been completed. No adverse or other significant issues were found. A copy of the EqIA can be obtained from the report author.

9. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None identified

10. HEALTH AND WELLBEING IMPLICATIONS

10.1 None identified

11. ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Human Resource implications

11.2 The funding will be administered by existing staff and additional workload is expected to be minimal.

12. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 LEADER funding is time limited with final applications required before 31st March 2019 so it is important that as many grant funding applications as possible are completed before that date. It is also important that the Council supports the voluntary & community sector and providing this funding to bridge the gap between grant award and final payment will achieve both objectives.

12.2 With each application being assessed on a case by case basis and given the anticipated short loan duration, the risk of default on repayments is considered to be low and the administration charge to be levied will ensure a cost neutral initiative.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

13.1 There are no additional background papers to the report.

14. APPENDICES

14.1 There are no appendices.

A Large Print or Braille Version of this Report is available upon request – Contact 01572 722577.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET

17 July 2018

LEICESTERSHIRE & RUTLAND LOCAL SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD (LRSAB) BUSINESS PLAN 2018/19

Report of the Chair of the LRSAB

Strategic Aim:	Safeguarding	
Key Decision: No	Forward Plan Reference: FP170118	
Exempt Information	No	
Cabinet Member(s) Responsible:	Mr Alan Walters, Portfolio Holder for Safeguarding – Adults, Public Health, Health Commissioning, Community Safety and Road Safety	
Contact Officer(s):	Robert Lake, Chair of the LRSAB	(Via the Safeguarding Board Office) 0116 305 7130 sbbo@leics.gov.uk
	Dr Tim O'Neill, Director for People	Tel: 01572 758307 toneill@rutland.gov.uk

DECISION RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet:

1. Considers the LRSAB Business Plan for 2018/19 and make any comments for amendment to be considered by the Board.

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to set out the draft proposed Business Plan priorities for the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board (LRSAB) for 2018/19 for noting and comment by Cabinet.

2 BACKGROUND AND MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 The LRSAB is a statutory body under the Care Act 2014. One of the SABs three core duties is to develop and publish a strategic plan setting out how they will meet their objectives and how their member and partner agencies will contribute.
- 2.2 The Annual Report of the LRSAB was considered by Rutland Cabinet in October 2017 and emerging priorities for the new Business Plans for 2018/19 were discussed at that meeting. The views expressed at that stage were fed into the formative process for the Plan and are reflected in the current priorities.
- 2.3 The future improvement priorities identified in the Annual Report 2016/17 have been built into the Business Plan for 2018/19. In addition to issues arising from the Annual Report the new Business Plan's priorities have been identified against a range of national and local drivers including:
- national safeguarding policy initiatives and drivers;
 - recommendations from regulatory inspections across partner agencies;
 - the outcomes of serious case reviews, serious incident learning processes, domestic homicide reviews and other review processes both national and local;
 - evaluation of the business plans for 2017/18 including analysis of impact afforded by the quality assurance and performance management framework;
 - best practice reports issued at both national and local levels;
 - the views expressed by both service users and front-line staff through the Boards' engagement and participation arrangements;
- 2.4 The new Business Plan has been informed by discussions that have taken place in several forums since the autumn of 2017. These include:
- meetings of the Scrutiny Panels in both Leicestershire and Rutland at which both the Annual Report 2016/17 and future priorities for action have been debated;
 - meetings of the Leicestershire and Rutland Health and Well-Being Boards at which both the Annual Report 2016/17 and future priorities for action have been debated;
 - discussions within individual agencies.

- 2.5 The Strategic priorities for the LRSAB were formulated through the annual Development Session held on 14 November 2017 and subsequent development and Board meetings

3 BUSINESS PLAN PRIORITIES

- 3.1 Unlike previous years for 2018/19 the LRSAB business plan is not supplemented by a plan incorporating shared priorities with the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board (LRLSCB), as no areas of joint priority have been identified this year.

3.2 The specific priorities that have arisen for the LRSAB are:

Development Priority	Summary
1. Prevention of Safeguarding Need	Prevention of safeguarding need through building resilience and self-awareness in adults with care and support needs.
2. Mental Capacity	Improving the understanding of capacity to consent and application of the Mental Capacity act across agencies.
3. Safeguarding Adult Thresholds	Promote better and more consistent understanding and use of adult safeguarding thresholds.
4. Engagement	Ensure the work of the Safeguarding Adults Board is informed by the views of adults with care and support needs

3.3 Key outcomes for improvement and the actions that will need to be taken over the next year to achieve these improved outcomes are included in the business development plan appended.

3.4 The Quality Assurance and Performance Management Framework for the Board will be revised to ensure that it reflects the new Business Plan and enable ongoing monitoring of performance of core business that is not covered in the business plan.

4 CONSULTATION

4.1 All members of the Board and its Executive have had opportunities to contribute to and comment on the Business Plan. Key issues have been identified from the workforce, and the Board is developing its engagement and participation approach as part of this plan.

5 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

5.1 Although the Business Plan was signed off by the SAB at the meeting of 23rd March 2018, feedback from Cabinet will support the ongoing development of the action plans for these priorities.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no specific financial implications of the Safeguarding Boards' business plans.

6.2 Rutland County Council contributes £8,240 to the costs of the LRSAB (of a total budget of £100,878 in 2018/19).

6.3 In addition Rutland County Council are providing the lead officer for one of the Business Plan Priorities of the Board.

7 LEGAL AND GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The LRSAB is a statutory body. Local authorities have a duty to ensure that the Board is enabled to operate effectively.

- 7.2 It is a requirement of the Care Act 2014 to submit the Annual Reports to the Leader of the Council, and it has been deemed good practice to consult on the Business Plans since these form the core of the annual reporting process. In addition, the Cabinet has always been included in this reporting.

8 DATA PROTECTION IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 A Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIA) has not been completed for the following reasons. The LSCB and SAB have Information Sharing Agreements and operate in line with the Data Protection Act 1998 and GDPR from 25th May 2018. All information is shared for safeguarding processes and appropriate controls are in place to ensure data security.

9 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 9.1 The LRSAB seeks to ensure that a fair, effective and equitable service is discharged by the partnership to safeguard children and young people. At the heart of the Boards work is a focus on any individual or group that may be at greater risk of safeguarding vulnerability and the performance framework tests whether specific groups are at higher levels of risk. The Business Plan 2018/19 includes a priority on Engagement which will consider how the partnership will seek to engage with all parts of the community in the coming year.

10 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 There is a connection between the work of the LRSAB and that of the Safer Rutland Partnership. The Boards work with community safety partnerships to scrutinise and challenge performance in community safety issues that affect the safeguarding and well-being of individuals and groups e.g. Domestic Abuse and Prevent. The work on the Prevention theme links directly with Joint Action Groups.
- 10.2 The LSCB and SAB also support the community safety partnership in carrying out Domestic Homicide Reviews and acting on their recommendations.

11 HEALTH AND WELLBEING IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 Safeguarding is everyone's responsibility. Health and care needs can be linked to safeguarding risk for adults and children and health and care practitioners can have opportunities to identify and respond to safeguarding risk not available to workers in other agencies.
- 11.2 The Boards priorities, particularly, but not exclusively Mental Capacity and Prevention have direct links with improving health and wellbeing.
- 11.3 The Boards Business Plan has been considered by the Rutland Health and Wellbeing Board.

12 CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet comments on the Business Plan 2018/19 for the LRSAB, particularly in relation to the business of the County Council in 2018/19.

- 12.2 This report enables the Cabinet to comment on the Business Plan priorities and to consider whether they identify matters that it wishes to address in relation to the effectiveness of safeguarding within the work of the Authority.

13 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 13.1 There are no additional background papers to the report.

14 APPENDICES

- 14.1 Appendix A: LR Safeguarding Adults Board Business Development Plan 2018 – 2019.

A Large Print or Braille Version of this Report is available upon request – Contact 01572 722577.

This page is intentionally left blank

Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board Business Development Plan 2018-19

Priority: SAB1 Prevention of Safeguarding Need

Priority Statement: Prevention of Safeguarding need through building resilience and self-awareness in adults with care and support needs.

Rationale:

Prevention is key in reducing harm and fear of harm, improving safety and quality of life

Early intervention can reduce pressure on higher level, higher cost services.

Scoping work has found practitioners across agencies are keen to support prevention and tools are often in place, but not used as effectively as they could to prevent safeguarding need.

Services that support prevention of safeguarding harm could be better understood and engaged in safeguarding adults.

Effective transition from children's services, such as Looked After Children, Children on Child Protection Plans, and those affected by CSE, may support prevention of adult safeguarding need.

What do we want to be different?

Build resilience in adults with care and support needs

Build self-awareness regarding health and wellbeing and safeguarding risk

The Board is assured that work with young people who have been assessed as requiring additional support to reduce risk and vulnerability (including LAC, CIN, CP, CSE) assists prevention of adult safeguarding need.

Partnership Lead: John Morley - RCC

Board Officer: Sanj Pattani

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
Develop Specific options identified by prevention group in 2017/18 (awareness, work with JAGs...)	<p>Identify all tools available to support building resilience, self-awareness and preventing adult safeguarding need (including JAGs, VARMs and Transition Boards)</p> <p>Work to develop prevention of adult safeguarding need within these tools.</p> <p>Raise awareness regarding adult safeguarding and abuse.</p>	September 2018	Prevention Task and Finish group (T & F)	<p>Utilise the scoping report in order to trial with forums such as JAGs</p> <p>Consider links into the Audit Sub-Group for review of tools such as VARM.</p> <p>Consider awareness raising options for both the community and professionals such as information sharing events, sharing resources and promotion.</p>

Housing providers are appropriately involved in the work of the SAB	<p>Link with housing provider forums.</p> <p>Use ADASS MSP guidance for housing providers as a starting point for conversation of Board involvement.</p> <p>Ensure safeguarding is considered in personal prevention plans.</p>		Prevention Task and Finish group	<p>Housing Providers are aware of the forums/tools that support Safeguarding prevention – assurance to be provided via provider representation at the Prevention T & F and identify actions to be taken forward.</p> <p>Review agency awareness of the “Prevention Duty” – scoping via identified agencies within the Prevention Sub-group.</p>
Be assured that the needs of young people requiring additional support into adulthood, including LAC, CIN, CP, CSE are reviewed and supported in a timely preventative way through that transition.	<p>Meaningful Joint working should be promoted at an earlier stage before 18th birthday.</p> <p>Raise awareness regarding adult safeguarding/abuse and services/pathways available to support children and families which may reduce risk and suggest modifications to enable the objective.</p>	October 2018	Prevention Task and Finish group	<p>Link to learning from sub-groups such as trilogy of risk T & F, LSCB sub-groups.</p> <p>Joint learning and development between Adults/Children’s services.</p> <p>Ensure that young people at risk are recognised in forums such as JAGs.</p>
Education and Training with children’s services	<p>Joint training should be identified and promoted which looks at learning from research, regulatory standards and relevant legislation on prevention.</p> <p>Identify learning from SCR/SAR to promote an integrated approach to safeguarding adult’s prevention across all agencies.</p> <p>Consider promotion at provider level with an aim of preventing abuse and neglect occurring in Care Homes and within domiciliary care provisions.</p>	October 2018	Prevention Task and Finish group	<p>Scope best practice/training currently available with a prevention focus (via the Prevention T & F) to identify any potential gaps and feedback areas for improvement into relevant agencies L and D groups/teams.</p> <p>Joint workshops/peer learning from SCR/SARs.</p> <p>Build links with Provider forums and QA Services.</p>

Priority: SAB2 Mental Capacity

Priority Statement: Improve the understanding of capacity to consent and the application of the Mental Capacity Act across agencies.

Rationale:

- Practitioner feedback suggests there is a lack of confidence across agencies in understanding and assessing capacity to consent.
- Safeguarding Adults Reviews (SARs) and other reviews have identified the use of the term 'lack of capacity' as a generic statement, without reference to specific decisions, which is inaccurate and unhelpful.
- Consistency in the application of the Mental Capacity Act could be improved across agencies.

What do we want to be different?

- The Mental Capacity Act is applied with relevance and consistency within partner agencies
- Across agencies there is increased understanding of and confidence in the undertaking of Mental Capacity Assessments in relation to 'consent' and decision making
- The workforce has improved understanding of the resources available to support the service user participating in informed 'decision' making.
- The Board is assured of effective application of the Mental Capacity Act across agencies

Partnership Lead: Rachel Garton - CCG

Board Officer: Helen Pearson

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
1. The workforce across agencies has greater understanding of the principles and responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act and its relevance to Safeguarding Adults.	<p>Through a variety of methods/media we will reinforce the principles and responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act (See also Objective 2)</p> <p>Stage 1 Set up Task and Finish Group to agree the scope/objectives and allocate tasks</p> <p>Stage 2 Deliver on agreed objectives (see also Objective 2)</p> <p>Stage 3 Assess Progress and impact (see Objective 3)</p>	<p>End of May 2018</p> <p>March 2019</p> <p>Feb/March 2018</p>	<p>The Task and Finish Group will provide oversight. Tasks may be delegated to existing groups.</p> <p>Links will be made with the City SAB to agree LLR work streams</p>	<p>Survey staff understanding across agencies.</p> <p>Baseline and retest/sample number of alerts / enquiries that state 'No Capacity but lack an assessment.</p> <p>Link to data re Making Safeguarding Personal and the use of the Vulnerable Adults Risk Management tool (VARM)</p>

2.The workforce across agencies has increased confidence in undertaking capacity assessments and supported decision making	<p>Develop partnership guidance to demystify mental capacity and support effective assessments. This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider development of a toolkit - Communication (including first steps / principles / questions to support assessment) - Multi-Agency Procedures and Practice guidance (e.g. basic steps as above) – included in Adult and Children Safeguarding Procedures - Guidance and awareness regarding use of advocates /interpreters and other communication aids - Learning and Development (Multi-agency workshops with information to cascade within organisations) 	March 2019	As Above	Survey staff confidence across agencies.
<p>All partners have embedded an approach to the Mental Capacity Act that enables staff to confidently and consistently carry out mental capacity assessments and offer appropriate support.</p>	<p>Stage 3</p> <p>Gain assurance that agencies are effectively embedding approaches to assessing mental capacity within their procedures, practice and learning and development.</p>	March 2019	As Above	<p>Test through case file audits</p> <p>Request specific assurance report from agencies on their work to embed approaches to mental capacity.</p>

Priority: SAB3 Adult Safeguarding Thresholds

Priority Statement: Promote a better and more consistent understanding and use of adult safeguarding thresholds.

Rationale:

- The Threshold guidance was initially a tool for supporting the Local Authority decision making but is now to be used by all referrers however the wider use still needs embedding. This guidance is available via the Multi-Agency Procedures
- Whilst there is a good balance of referral and application of thresholds there were still concerns regarding consistency of use of thresholds across different settings
- Guidance on Section 42 enquiries in health settings has been introduced in 2017/18.
- Work has taken place with providers in other settings regarding their role in Section 42 enquiries.
- The role of independent/private sector in Section 42 enquiries regarding application of thresholds sometimes conflicts with advice given by CQC.

What do we want to be different?

Growing and consistent application of thresholds across all organisations

Assurance that S42 enquiries in health settings are being carried out in line with guidance

Assurance that all service providers are carrying out their role in Section 42 enquiries appropriately.

Partnership Lead: Laura Sanderson - LCC

Board Officer: Chris Tew

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
40 Develop approaches to support consistent use of thresholds.	Updated procedures produced. Agreed by multi agency partners and published for all staff in agencies across LLR	July 2018	Laura Sanderson and the LLR SAB procedures sub Group	Continue to monitor alerts and enquiries overall and from different sources. Look for reduction in alerts/increase in proportion of alerts that become enquiries. Case file audit of referrals. Document audit of agency referral/incident forms. Agency assurance reports

	By liaison with East Midlands Safeguarding Adults Network (EMSAN) ensure consistency across the Region	July 2018	Laura Sanderson as a member of EMSAN	on approaches Board to provide challenge where appropriate. Monitoring as above.
	Consider single referral form or common language across agency forms to support consistent application of thresholds. LCC work with care providers and partner agencies	September 2018	Laura Sanderson and the SAB Procedures Group	
	Work with CQC to get a better understanding of the roles of commissioners/regulators in safeguarding threshold reporting to ensure the expectations of CQC on providers does not conflict with the requirements of the L.A's across LLR	September 2018	Laura Sanderson and Local Authority partners from Leicester City & Rutland	
Develop understanding and confidence in the use of safeguarding thresholds	<p>Ensure the new procedures and other changes are communicated across LLR partner agencies by utilising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding Matters publication and equivalent in City • Single agency communication methods • Highlight in training and awareness events Across LLR 	September 2018	<p>Senior agency staff in agencies</p> <p>SAB training group</p> <p>SBBO to ensure in Safeguarding Matters</p>	
Ensure the work completed has been adopted by agencies and is improving performance	By monitoring performance through SEG data throughout the year	During the year 2018 -19	SEG	
	Sample review of alerts to ensure that they meet safeguarding thresholds and common themes.	During the business year 2018 -19 or early in 2019 - 20 dependent on capacity in Audit plan	SAB Audit Group	

Priority: SAB4 Engagement

Priority Statement: Ensuring the work of the Safeguarding Adults Board is informed by adults with care and support needs

Rationale:

Listening and responding to the wishes of adults with care and support needs should be at the heart of all the Board does. Whilst work on making safeguarding personal is increasing the response to the wishes of adults with care and support needs within individual safeguarding situations this is not visible at the Board level and there is room for more engagement in the overall work of the Board.

What do we want to be different?

The voice and wishes of adults with care and support needs is clearly influencing the work of the SAB.

Partnership Lead: No lead officer to be appointed

Board Officer: Gary Watts

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
42 The views of adults with care and support needs are visible at the board	Work with advocacy agencies and existing engagement and participation groups in partner agencies to set up the Board approach for engagement and participation in the priorities and work of the Board.	October 2018	Board Office	The Board's priorities for 2019 onwards are clearly influenced by the views of adults
	Present an individual adult safeguarding case study at each Board meeting, including key messages from the individual to the Board.	January 2019	Statutory partners' Board members	Case studies presented at each SAB from January 2019. Actions arising from presentations.
The board has assurance regarding the ongoing effective implementation of making safeguarding personal	Each agency to present to the Board regarding MSP including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of MSP • The impact of MSP in their practice on adults with care and support needs • Working in line with the ADASS guidance for their agency 	January 2019	Statutory partners' Board members	Improvements in embedding approach seen in data and partners reports.
	Detailed review of Making Safeguarding Personal data.	January 2019	SEG	Actions arising from presentation

CABINET

17 July 2018

LEICESTERSHIRE & RUTLAND LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD (LRLSCB) BUSINESS PLAN 2018/19

Report of the Chair of the LRLSCB

Strategic Aim:	Safeguarding	
Key Decision: No	Forward Plan Reference: FP170118	
Exempt Information	No	
Cabinet Member(s) Responsible:	Mr Richard Foster, Portfolio Holder for Safeguarding Children & Young People, armed Forces Champion	
Contact Officer(s):	Simon Westwood, Chair of the LRLSCB	(Via the Safeguarding Board Office) 0116 305 7130 sbbo@leics.gov.uk
	Dr Tim O'Neill, Director for People	Tel: 01572 758307 toneill@rutland.gov.uk

DECISION RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet:

1. Considers the LRLSCB Business Plan for 2018/19 and make any comments for amendment to be considered by the Board.

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to set out the draft proposed Business Plan priorities for the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board (LRLSCB) for 2018/19 for noting and comment by Cabinet.

2 BACKGROUND AND MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 The LRLSCB is a statutory body established by Section 13 of the Children Act 2004 and currently operates under statutory guidance issued in Working Together 2015. It is a requirement that the Board issue an annual business plan setting out its priorities for action.
- 2.2 Under the Children and Social Work Act 2017 LSCBs are due to cease and local multi-agency safeguarding arrangements will be established. The detail of the requirements for these new arrangements will be published in Working Together 2018 guidance due in spring 2018. Until multi-agency safeguarding arrangements are in place LSCBs will continue to function under current statutory guidance.
- 2.3 The Annual Report of the LRLSCB was considered by Rutland Cabinet in October 2017 and emerging priorities for the new Business Plans for 2018/19 were discussed at that meeting. The views expressed at that stage were fed into the formative process for the Plan and are reflected in the current priorities.
- 2.4 The future improvement priorities identified in the Annual Report 2016/17 have been built into the Business Plan for 2018/19. In addition to issues arising from the Annual Report the new Business Plan's priorities have been identified against a range of national and local drivers including:
- national safeguarding policy initiatives and drivers;
 - recommendations from regulatory inspections across partner agencies;
 - the outcomes of serious case reviews, serious incident learning processes, domestic homicide reviews and other review processes both national and local;
 - evaluation of the business plans for 2017/18 including analysis of impact afforded by the quality assurance and performance management framework;
 - best practice reports issued at both national and local levels;
 - the views expressed by both service users and front-line staff through the Boards' engagement and participation arrangements;
 - recommendations contained in the Ofsted review of the LRLSCB published on 13 February 2017 and the recommendations in the Ofsted inspections of Leicestershire and Rutland Councils published on the same date.
- 2.5 The new Business Plan has been informed by discussions that have taken place in several forums since the autumn of 2017. These include:
- meetings of the Scrutiny Panels in both Leicestershire and Rutland at which both the Annual Report 2016/17 and future priorities for action have been debated;
 - meetings of the Leicestershire and Rutland Health and Well-Being Boards at which both the Annual Report 2016/17 and future priorities for action have been debated;
 - discussions within individual agencies.

- 2.6 The Strategic priorities for the two Boards were formulated through the annual Development Session of the two Safeguarding Boards held on 14 November 2017 and subsequent development and Board meetings

3 BUSINESS PLAN PRIORITIES

- 3.1 Unlike previous years for 2018/19 the LRLSCB business plan is not supplemented by a plan incorporating shared priorities with the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board (LRSAB), as no areas of joint priority have been identified this year.

- 3.2 The specific priorities that have arisen for the LRLSCB are:

Development Priority	Summary
1. Partnership Transition	Influence the development of new multi-agency safeguarding arrangements.
2. Multiple Risk Factors	The impact of multiple risk factors on children is recognised, understood and responded to across agencies.
3. Safeguarding Children- Access to services	Ensure the pathways for access to services for safeguarding children are robust and effective
4. Child Exploitation - (Child Sexual Exploitation, Trafficking, Missing and Gangs)	Children at risk of exploitation are effectively safeguarded.
5. Safeguarding Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities	Improve the approach to safeguarding children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

- 3.3 The Board's office has consulted with young people in Leicestershire and Rutland regarding the priorities of the Board. Young people have identified hearing and responding to the voice of young people to be considered as a priority in the Business Plan. As a result the LRLSCB has identified that this will be incorporated across the priorities rather than as its own stand-alone priority. The LRLSCB has also instigated ongoing input from children and young people through a specific advisory group that will lead parts of Board meetings and contribute to the development of priorities and work of the LSCB.
- 3.4 Key outcomes for improvement and the actions that will need to be taken over the next year to achieve these improved outcomes are included in the business development plan appended.
- 3.5 The Quality Assurance and Performance Management Framework for the Board will be revised to ensure that it reflects the new Business Plan and enable ongoing monitoring of performance of core business that is not covered in the business plan.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 All members of the Board and its Executive have had opportunities to contribute to and comment on the Business Plan. Young people have been consulted on the priorities.

5 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 5.1 Although the Business Plan was signed off by the LSCB at the meeting of 23rd March 2018, feedback from Cabinet will support the ongoing development of the action plans for these priorities.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no specific financial implications of the Safeguarding Boards' business plans.
- 6.2 Rutland County Council contributes £52,250 to the costs of the LRLSCB (of a total budget of £240,263 in 2018/19).
- 6.3 In addition Rutland County Council are providing the lead officer for one of the Business Plan Priorities of the Board.

7 LEGAL AND GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The LRLSCB is a statutory body. Local authorities have a duty to ensure that the Board is enabled to operate effectively.
- 7.2 It is a requirement of Working Together 2015 (Government guidance on inter-agency working on children's safeguarding) to submit the Annual Reports to the Leader of the Council, and it has been deemed good practice to consult on the Business Plans since these form the core of the annual reporting process. In addition, the Cabinet has always been included in this reporting.

8 DATA PROTECTION IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 A Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIA) has not been completed for the following reasons. The LSCB and SAB have Information Sharing Agreements and operate in line with the Data Protection Act 1998 and GDPR from 25th May 2018. All information is shared for safeguarding processes and appropriate controls are in place to ensure data security.

9 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 9.1 The LRLSCB seeks to ensure that a fair, effective and equitable service is discharged by the partnership to safeguard children and young people. At the heart of the Boards work is a focus on any individual or group that may be at greater risk of safeguarding vulnerability and the performance framework tests whether specific groups are at higher levels of risk....

10 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 There is a connection between the work of the LRLSCB and that of the Safer Rutland Partnership. The Boards work with community safety partnerships to scrutinise and challenge performance in community safety issues that affect the safeguarding and well-being of individuals and groups e.g. Domestic Abuse, CSE and Prevent. The LSCB and SAB also support the community safety partnership in carrying out Domestic Homicide Reviews and acting on their recommendations.

11 HEALTH AND WELLBEING IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 Safeguarding is everyone's responsibility. Health and care needs can be linked to safeguarding risk for adults and children and health and care practitioners can have opportunities to identify and respond to safeguarding risk not available to workers in other agencies.
- 11.2 The Boards priorities, particularly, but not exclusively Children with Disabilities and Multiple Risk Factors have direct links with improving health and wellbeing.
- 11.3 The Boards Business Plan has been considered by the Rutland Health and Wellbeing Board.

12 CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet comments on the Business Plan 2018/19 for the LRLSCB, particularly in relation to the business of the County Council in 2018/19.
- 12.2 This report enables the Cabinet to comment on the Business Plan priorities and to consider whether they identify matters that it wishes to address in relation to the effectiveness of safeguarding within the work of the Authority.

13 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 13.1 There are no additional background papers to the report.

14 APPENDICES

- 14.1 Appendix A: LR Local Safeguarding Children Board Business Development Plan 2018 – 2019.

A Large Print or Braille Version of this Report is available upon request – Contact 01572 722577.

This page is intentionally left blank

Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board Business Development Plan 2018-19

Priority: LSCB1 Partnership transition

Priority Statement: Influencing transition to new effective multi-agency safeguarding children arrangements for Leicestershire and Rutland.

Rationale:

- The Children and Social Work Act 2017 abolishes Local Safeguarding Children Boards and requires the setup of Multi-agency safeguarding arrangements. The nature and operation of these is governed by Working Together 2018 guidance and additional regulation. Arrangements are to be agreed by the statutory partners (CCGs, Police and Local Authorities) by March 2019 and implemented by June 2019.
- The LSCB has experience it can feed into development of new arrangements and would want to be assured that the new arrangements will be effective in safeguarding children in the future.
- Schools' role in safeguarding children is essential and the new legislation and guidance provides an opportunity to clarify and strengthen this within multi-agency arrangements.
- The LSCB will need to support effective transition to the new arrangements.

What do we want to be different?

Comprehensive multi-agency arrangements, focussed on safeguarding children, are ready for implementation at the end of March 2019.

The voice of children has been heard in the development of the arrangements and is a visible part of the new arrangements including the independent scrutiny.

Partnership Lead: Simon Westwood, Independent Chair

Board Officer: James Fox

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
Transition to new multi-agency safeguarding arrangements takes place in line with the Government timetable	Work with the 'safeguarding partners' to develop a transition plan. With safeguarding partners implement the transition plan.	Jan 2019 Sept 2019	Independent Chair	Transition Plan agreed by statutory partners and in place. New arrangements implemented by September 2019.
New arrangements are focussed on safeguarding children and incorporate the voice of children	Establish a children and young people advisory group to feed into the current Board and the development of new arrangements and seek approval of statutory partners. Receive reports on development of the new arrangements.	July 2018 Quarterly	Independent Chair and Board office	Children and Young People Advisory Group established. 4 updates considered by the Board in 2018-19.
The role for schools in the new arrangements is clear and understood by schools and statutory partners	Make the case to safeguarding partners for an education advisory group to feed into development of new arrangements.	March 2019	Independent Chair	Arrangements for Schools' involvement in new arrangements are agreed and published. 1 st meeting of the advisory group held and terms of reference agreed.

Priority: LSCB2 Multiple Risk Factors

Priority Statement: The impact of multiple risk factors on children is recognised, understood and responded to across agencies.

Rationale:

- Multiple risk factors including, but not limited to, the 'trilogy of risk' of mental health, domestic abuse and substance misuse in families multiply risk to children when present together in their family lives. Poverty has been identified as a key risk factor that is often overlooked.
- Case reviews have identified that lack of engagement or disguised compliance by families in services multiplies risk of harm to children.
- Effective information sharing regarding domestic abuse can support reduced risk of harm to children.
- There is a need for agencies to improve understanding of the support resources available to respond to domestic abuse, substance misuse, mental health problems.

What do we want to be different?

Pathways for support for safeguarding children provide guidance and response to lack of engagement or disguised compliance by parents to address the additional risk of harm.

The Board is assured by the measures below that partner agency responses to domestic abuse affecting children are safeguarding them.

Partnership Lead: Head of Children's Social Care, RCC

Board Officer: Gary Watts

Key delivery mechanism:

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
Ensure that the additional risk of lack of engagement/disguised compliance on safeguarding risk is better understood and assessed by practitioners	Research evidence of the impact of lack of engagement or disguised compliance to be included in review of pathway for access to services for safeguarding children.	October 2018	Board Officer	<i>Research report published in review findings.</i>
	Review of pathways for accessing services to include discussion across agencies regarding agency response to lack of engagement and safeguarding.	Dec 2018	Lead Officer	Review to provide a report to the Board with recommendations for change and learning.
	Provide research findings and guidance online for practitioners.	March 2019	Training group	Online guidance published on the website and through Safeguarding matters.
	Develop metrics to assess agencies' response to lack of parental engagement with safeguarding services.	March 2019	Business Intelligence Teams, County and Rutland	Proposal for new metrics to be recommended to the Board.

Ensure that pathways for access to services address multiple risk factors	The review of access to services to include a review of the approach to cases where key multiple risk factors exist (trilogy of risk).	March 2019	Access to Service Task and Finish group	Pathways / Thresholds for access to services published and include reference to multiple risk factors.
Ensure that approaches to multiple risk factors are informed by learning from CDOP reviews	Review safeguarding-related findings from CDOP reviews of multiple risk factors regarding suicide and infant mortality. Share the learning from this with Board partner agencies.	September 2018	Lead Officer / Mike McHugh	(See above) Report to Board in Dec 18 to reference these findings.
52 Provide assurance to the Board that the partnership response to domestic abuse is safeguarding children	Complete a multi-agency file audit on domestic abuse cases affecting children.	July 2018	Audit Chair (Rebecca Wilshire, RCC) and Board Office	File audit and recommended action plan presented to the Board.
	Receive reports from the Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (DASV) Executive on the effectiveness of information sharing in domestic abuse cases where safeguarding children is a concern.	October 2018	Chair of DASV Exec	Assurance Reports received by the Board identifying any barriers to information sharing that need to be tackled.
	Receive a report from the DASV Executive regarding the impact of domestic abuse provision and approaches to safeguarding children.	Jan 2019		Report identifies provision available, any unmet needs and includes numbers of children identified as affected and the type of support provided.
	Work with the County Safer Communities Board to make sure leadership and governance for children affected by domestic abuse are clear.	October 2018	Independent Chair	Leadership and Governance agreed and linked to published future safeguarding arrangements.

Priority: LSCB3 Safeguarding Children – Access to services

Priority Statement: Ensure the pathways for access to services for safeguarding children are robust and effective.

Rationale:

- The partnerships have identified across LLR that the current 'Threshold' documents require revision and the LLR Procedures Group has this as part of their action plan.
- In addition the Leicestershire and Rutland LSCB has adopted this as part of the 2018 -19 Business plan.

What do we want to be different?

- The intention is to ensure that there are revised and published 'pathways for access to services' that are compatible with the new Working Together statutory guidance, are clear to staff and cover as broad a range of potential factors and risks as possible.
- The partnerships have identified across LLR that the current 'Threshold' documents require revision and the LLR Procedures Group has this in their action plan.
- The revised document will enable practitioners from different partner agencies to discuss children and families using a shared language which will lead to them receiving the right service at the right time.

Partnership Lead: Chris Nerini, LCC

Board Officer: Chris Tew

Key delivery mechanism: Pathways Task and Finish Group

Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
Updated pathways/thresholds for access to services are developed and published	Gather together examples of 'pathways/thresholds for access to services' from other areas to be able to compare with our current procedures and develop updated procedures.	July 2018	Board Office	Examples of good practice will have been identified and shared with the Task and Finish group.
	Convene a Task and Finish group comprising of suitable representatives from key agencies across LLR including Local Authority, Police, and Health (commissioning and major health provider agencies) to review local thresholds.	June 2018	Board Office	The identified Safeguarding partners will be actively engaged in the task.
	Hold sufficient meetings to develop new procedures, taking into account the views of professionals in all key agencies and the provisions of the new Working Together statutory Guidance. Ensure these procedures cover as many of the situations that may be experienced by professional staff dealing with children and families as possible.	June 2018 to October 2018	Task and Finish Group	Consistent representation from all key agencies on the Task and Finish group.
	Complete the new procedures and publish them via the LLR Procedures Subgroup.	By March 2019	LLR Procedures Group	Pathways / Thresholds for access to services published.

	Test implementation as part of case file audits when in place alongside other Safeguarding Assurance activity including the views of children and families and the workforce.	March 2019 onwards	LLR Case file audit groups SEG / PAAG	Compliance with revised procedures and thresholds. Audits indicate evidence of multi-agency working through timely assessment and access to services.
--	---	--------------------	--	--

Priority: LSCB4 Child Exploitation (Child Sexual Exploitation, Trafficking, Missing and Gangs)

Priority Statement: Children at risk of exploitation are effectively safeguarded.

Rationale:

- CSE, Trafficking and Missing continue to be high level safeguarding priorities at national and local levels. During 2016/17 changes to the governance of multi-agency CSE work has focused the LSCB's role on scrutiny and challenge. The Ofsted review of the LSCB in 2016 identified the need to improve details in the analysis of missing return interviews. A multi-agency audit regarding missing children scheduled for 2017/18 is still outstanding.
- Partnership Funding for several projects tackling CSE specifically end in 2018/19.
- Gangs may be an emerging issue in the area.
- Children missing education are particularly vulnerable group.

What do we want to be different?

The Board is assured through the planned actions that children at risk of Child Sexual Exploitation are being effectively safeguarded.

The operational approach to safeguarding missing children is informed by the outcomes of return interviews and the number of those refusing to participate are minimised.

The Board is assured by the planned actions below that partner agencies are working together to ensure children missing education are tracked, and where safeguarding concerns are assessed are referred for support.

Partnership Lead: Simon Cure, Police

Board Officer: Sanj Pattani

Key delivery mechanism:

55	Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
	Gain assurance that the approach to Child Sexual Exploitation safeguards children	<p>Carry out a case file audit regarding Child Sexual Exploitation.</p> <p>Receive reports on the impact on service provision of any changes in funding regarding CSE.</p> <p>Raise awareness through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training opportunities • SPDF CSE Project work stream 'Faith and Communities CSE Champion Service' (operating as EngageME) • CSE communications and engagement strategy and action plan including development of 	September 2018	<p>Audit Chair: Teo Bott (tbc), audit will be across LLR</p> <p>CSE Executive Chair</p> <p>CSE, Missing and Trafficked Operations Group</p>	<p>Audit outcome and action plan report to Board.</p> <p>Report received and actions to mitigate any risks identified and monitored. Report whether numbers at high and medium risk are being reduced.</p> <p>Quarterly performance reports.</p>

	educational resources			
Seek assurance thorough an audit of return interviews that the approach to children going missing safeguards children	<p>Receive reports on the analysis of return interviews and how this informs work to safeguard children going missing in future. Include in this the number and reasons of any refusal to cooperate.</p> <p>Carry out a case file audit regarding Children going Missing</p>	<p>October 2018 and March 2019</p> <p>December 2018</p>	Audit Chair (Leics Police), audit will be across LLR but provide information by LA	Audit outcome and action plan report to Board.
To ensure that Authorities placing children in Leicestershire and Rutland notify the LA of any CSE risk assessments	To distinguish in the data analysis risk assessments for children placed in Leicestershire and Rutland from other LAs and report this to the CSE Hub	December 2018	Police	To have a clear identification of the levels of CSE risk of all children placed in Leicestershire and Rutland from other Authorities
<p>Ensure Children Missing from Education are tracked and safeguarded where necessary</p> <p>59</p>	<p>Seek assurance from the LAs that children missing from education are identified quickly and that effective tracking systems are put in place to enable effective action to be taken to refer on safeguarding concerns. To ensure that children placed in care in Leicestershire and Rutland from other Authorities are identified as a separate group by Authority.</p>	October 2018	LA Children Missing education leads	All children missing education are tracked and whereabouts known. The numbers, types of safeguarding concerns are reported and outcomes of those report risks have been addressed.
Develop and share learning about local approaches to safeguarding regarding gangs	<p>Monitor emergence of referrals regarding gangs.</p> <p>Seek the views of the Board's Young Persons Advisory group on this matter.</p> <p>Develop safeguarding procedures regarding gangs.</p>	<p>November 2018</p> <p>March 2019</p>	<p>Police</p> <p>LLR LSCB</p>	<p>Monitor referrals regarding gangs. Report numbers and types of concern and strategies in place to tackle these.</p> <p>Young people's views reported to Board and priority lead.</p> <p>Joint procedures in place and disseminated.</p>

Priority: LSCB5 Safeguarding and Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities				
Priority Statement: Improve the approach to safeguarding children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.				
Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The LSCB organisational assessment and case file audit regarding Children with Disabilities in 2017/18 identified areas to further develop practice.				
What do we want to be different? Additional safeguarding risks regarding children with special educational needs and disabilities are recognised and responded to effectively.				
Partnership Lead: Carolyn Corbett, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust			Board Officer: Helen Pearson	
Key delivery mechanism: Task and Finish Group				
Objective	What are we going to do?	When is it going to be done by?	Who is responsible?	How will we measure progress and impact?
Ensure that work with children with special educational needs and disabilities considers and responds to their specific additional safeguarding risk 57 Further action may be added when the organisational assessment and case file audit is reported to the Board in July	Revive the former Task and Finish group with involvement across agencies.	June 2018	Lead and Board office	Procedures produced in line with standards.
	Review safeguarding procedures regarding children with disabilities in line with the organisational assessment findings.	March 2019	Procedures Subgroup / Task and Finish Group	Follow up audit in 2019/10 to check compliance and outcomes.
	Review findings to be considered in the access to services review.	March 2019	Pathways Task and Finish Group	Feedback from children with disabilities and families on procedures.
	Develop and use awareness raising material to promote good safeguarding of children with disabilities.	March 2019	Task and Finish Group	Increased self-reported awareness and confidence from those attending spotlight event.
	All agencies to review accessibility of complaints processes and other information relevant to disabled children and their families.	January 2019	All Board Members	Review completed and action to address any concerns reported to the Board.
	Carry out a spotlight event focussed on safeguarding children with special educational needs and disabilities in conjunction with Leicester City LSCB.	September 2018	LLR LSCB Training Group	Event held and practitioner feedback reported to the LLR Children's Joint Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank