



SCOTTISH

CHILDREN'S REPORTER

ADMINISTRATION

Scottish Children's Reporter Administration Minute of Information Governance Leads held on Tuesday 23rd May 2023 via Microsoft Teams

Present:

Stephen Eodanable (chair), Angela Mitchell, Sheena Banks, Hannah McCulloch, Janet Robertson, Jacqueline Johnston, Bruce Knight, Nicola Baird, Gwen McNiven, Victoria Ritchie, Jo Donald, Ellen Young, Paul Mulvanny, Donald Lamb, Jennifer McIlree, and Neill Mitchell. Kelly Campbell & Ed Morrison (both until 2.45pm). Maryanne McIntyre (for item 8)

		Timescale	Action
1.	<p>Apologies Alistair Hogg, Helen Etchells, Dawn Turner, Kerry-Ann Kean, Jacqui Stephen, Pamela Armstrong. SE welcomed Neill Mitchell representing Practice and expressed thanks to Gill Short for her contribution to the group.</p>		
2.	<p>Any other Business Three items added and dealt with at the end of the meeting:</p> <p>i) Bruce Knight/ Sheena Banks – Advocacy Workers The manager from Who Cares Scotland North got in touch with Sheena to ask if SCRA could email Hearing notifications to AWs as they rarely went to the office and were getting notifications late. Sheena was able to assist with the setting up of CJSM accounts for them. She tested them for a response and as a result email Hearing notifications and links to Virtual Hearings can now be sent securely. Is this method of information dissemination used elsewhere?</p> <p>ii) Progress with annual Cyber Security refresher training Bruce shared the spreadsheet for cyber security training uptake. Central has a lower attendance but in general attendance is high. Janet commented that whilst Central is sitting at 67%, there has been an issue with recording attendance due to non-completion of the questionnaire at the end of the training session. If someone logs back in to complete that, there is a message which states the training has been completed, so there is conflicting information. Bruce is aware of this issue and will take this into account.</p> <p>iii) Bruce Knight – New Security Policy – USB storage devices Localities are required to nominate who should be able to access 'write' permissions for memory sticks. Jlls and VRI's need staff coverage. Could teams get back to Bruce to bypass the blanket exemption (by 10th July)? Some Localities have put forward a list of people who need access to sticks. Ellen asked what the maximum number of names is from a Locality. Bruce responded that, for example, in H&I the geographical spread means more sticks are required. LSMs are happy to facilitate this in Central and it doesn't need to be a senior practitioner. Neill drew attention to the USB policy.</p>	By next meeting	All
3.	<p>Minutes of last Meeting (21st February 2023) Accepted as correct</p> <p>Matters arising <u>Updates on actions from previous minutes</u></p> <p>Over 18 reports – SE updated regarding where to access the reports. Donald can now assist with this, as this report sits in Power BI. It is possible to search back 15 days and forward as far as necessary. The records are only retained for a maximum of 18 years and 15 days from the date of birth of the child. The system can be accessed and a filter added to assess who will turn 18 over the coming few months.</p>	By 10 th July	All

		Timescale	Action
4.	<p>Use of unsecured email accounts for low-risk admin matters – Stephen was looking for an initial gauge as to appetite for exploring this potential option for emailing small pieces of information to Relevant Persons. This is not a suggestion for large volumes of communications. How do we verify a correct email address? The rationale behind this is that there is no absolute rule that a data controller can't use an unsecured email for transferring data e.g. Notification papers. It can obviously depend on the sensitivity and not just the volume of data, as to the method employed. Neill pointed out that an agreement in writing with the addressee would be standard with two forms of ID as we already do for Subject Access Requests. This would be more work up front, but as Gwen pointed out, there is a long-term benefit of being able to check the current postal address for the RP, prior to sending out more sensitive data. Paul agreed with the benefits of engaging with others and having something fixed e.g. a portal. There could be a more systematic engagement approach, more dynamic. Could there be a better higher-tech process than email, offering a better solution further down the line? A small test of change approach might be of value here, at no great cost. Bruce also mentioned Objective Connect which is already available, with use opened up with the new policy around USB sticks. It is an interim solution. Kelly offered to assist with a test of change.</p>		
5.	<p>Recording dual professional roles in CSAS & resulting Virtual Hearing links –Vicky explained that a recent breach had occurred when information was sent to an unsecured email address. The hearing participant to whom the link was sent is a doctor, but is also an independent social worker. Her role in this particular child's case is that of independent social worker, which is why she was recorded on CSAS as a social worker. She was away and her relative responded to the email just to let SCRA know she was unavailable to respond. Can we mitigate future risk? Any contact with a CJSM account gets documents containing the full name of the child. The date and time in a link should suffice. Are we oversharing the child's name? This person had a gmail account, not a CJSM account which is likely to be the case for other independent social workers. Kelly uses initials on a link if an identifier is required. Neill commented that the person may not be on the panel of report writers and we may see more reports being requested, but they are likely to have CJSM accounts, not unsecured email accounts. Paul advised remembering the purpose of secure email. You can't legislate for someone opening an email not addressed to them. Angela asked if nhs.scot is secure and Bruce confirmed that it is. Stephen asked if everyone could look out for other examples of this happening.</p>	As & when	All
6.	<p>CHS feedback postcards with QR codes (post-hearing distribution to children) – Stephen explained that CHS had originally asked if Localities could distribute these postcards, which children would take away from a hearing and would be able to scan the QR code to leave hearing feedback. Maryanne and Collette have suggested My Corporate Parents website as a landing platform. They can leave feedback for the Reporter or a Panel Member but it could link to the online complaints form. It would be easier for a child to know who is responsible for what i.e. SCRA or CHS. Stephen asked if Localities were happy to distribute these and/or do they have any concerns? We know that we don't generally receive complaints from children but CHS hopes they will leave feedback. It takes them somewhere welcoming to leave feedback. Stephen asked for views. Jacqueline thought it was a good idea as long as it was clear who is responsible for what, as children often don't understand. Stephen responded that there would be collation by CHS who would pass on SCRA feedback. It would be a 1-5 sliding scale style feedback e.g. 'how was the environment?', 'were you listened to?'. We will state what we will do with the information we gather and outline what we can deliver, although we can't always know this until the information is analysed. It will be made as clear as possible. Paul noted that from the point of view of the Hearing Delivery Group, it accords with the Promise and the outline sounds positive. Stephen confirmed that it was not SCRA administering for CHS. Kelly said they had tried many forms of feedback-gathering in the past and 'feedback on the feedback' is essential. Stephen iterated</p>		

		Timescale	Action
	that we need a 'you said, we did' approach to show that providing feedback can lead to change. Regarding CHS, the SPSO are revising their complaints process for public bodies concerned with children and young people. A test of change is being carried out before the review is released so we will wait and see what the guidance looks like.		
7.	Duplicate RoPs in Sharepoint Stephen explained that this was originally flagged by Hannah. There is often a Word and PDF version of a RoP saved in Sharepoint. There is an original Word document and if there are any difficulties in pulling that through, it is converted to a PDF so two copies sit there on the system. The PDF is beneficial as it cannot be amended. Emma is happy to update the SOM Q&A regarding this, which would now request that the Word version is deleted once a PDF is created. There are no risks that Stephen is aware of. (No IG Leads raised a risk example). Kelly assumed that it was already a requirement to remove the original Word copy and Stephen confirmed that it is best practice to retain just one version.		
8.	Approval of revised Social Media policy Maryanne joined the meeting to give an overview of the revised Social Media policy which gets updated every two years and was attached to the meeting agenda. There have been several changes in Social Media platforms in recent years, particularly LinkedIn which is a common approach route for scammers. In addition, TikTok was originally a dance streaming platform but has been used by parents to live-stream Hearings. This is clearly a serious issue. Joint guidance is being updated regarding recording of Hearings. It is noticeably harder to get information removed from e.g. Twitter, Facebook and YouTube, with a requirement for the police to intervene to remove info from Facebook. It is made more difficult with a poor recognition of Scots law. Bruce added that LinkedIn has been associated with potential HR dept fraud attempts (not SCRA) e.g. to change bank account details of employees. It is advised that staff remove details of SCRA from their profiles, or at least our colleagues in HR. Maryanne asked if anyone had experienced anything recently. Bruce confirmed that his guidance states that 'staff should consider whether it is necessary to say they work for SCRA' which concurs with Maryanne's guidance of 'careful consideration' re LinkedIn. Neill asked if we report live-streaming/sharing to the police. Maryanne explained that if we don't see it, we are unable to capture it in any way. It is hard to find and then disappears. It is then a question of whether or not there was a breach. Maryanne invited anyone to contact her if they have examples or information or require further information regarding the policy updates.	Any time	All
9.	Deletion of duplicate contact records – test of change update Stephen confirmed that Tayside & Fife Locality have offered assistance with this. There would be an agreed written process to be tested over the next six weeks with a report at the next meeting and incorporation into the SOM if relevant. Donald made it clear that there is no process to identify duplicates. Whatever we do, we will still miss some. If we identify duplicates we can add 'do not use'. Stephen noted that following a survey, the issue might become significant if the growth is sustained at the pace it had been. The search function has been improved to assist with identifying the correct connections.	Next meeting	SE
10.	MOU regulating appointment of safeguarders- potential revision Stephen explained that this item concerns the MOU with Children 1 st (the previous MOU was attached with the meeting agenda) and he is looking for feedback from LRMs and any general comments. This is particularly surrounding the breakdown in numbers of <i>how</i> papers get to Safeguarders, and whether we offer all options in the future. Donald said that Safeguarders should be getting Social Work information but are struggling to contact SW and will want us to share more with them. Scottish Govt are looking at Safeguarders, with emails and phone numbers for SW becoming difficult to contact. SCRA <i>do</i> give them everything they can have and need to have. Paul raised the Health & Safety issue for Safeguarders as they need to go to people's houses with instances of them being followed home and similar. More work has been instigated around this by Scottish Govt, but this doesn't necessarily fit around the data protection MOU. There are however		

		Timescale	Action
	<p>different data standards between authorities and there needs to be some framework. Stephen said this could be discussed with Children 1st. Safeguarders use the Edinburgh office address as a care of address. Kelly and Sheena send everything to Safeguarders via CJSM – papers, notifications, outcomes, intimations etc. Janet sends a hard copy of papers but everything else electronically. Papers being sent out multiple times is a big concern to her. Trying to demonstrate what copy came from what source would be difficult. Their response is to destroy the papers quickly. Jacqueline’s Locality send most via electronic means and with a case where there are four or five children, that would mean huge volumes of papers so it is hard to post out, but this is a rare occurrence. Stephen reminded everyone that Objective Connect can be used for large volumes of papers to an unsecured email. Just contact the IT service desk. Neill noted that the previous MOU confirms Children 1st’s responsibilities and compliance with their own data management guidance. If it doesn’t happen, it’s a matter of complaint. Data management guidance should cover disposal (this should cover the situation Vicky raised). A discussion regarding the benefits of Objective Connect then took place. Bruce explained that OC is better for zipped files as it copes well with large files, if they are read-only. The issue is that OC cannot be used to send to a CJSM address. Permission can be given for the recipient to download the files or just view online. OC is a secure portal. There is a link to click on and an account is set up with a verified email which can be an unsecured email. The recipient has to agree to receive by OC. It is a matter of agreement rather than a SCRA decision. SCRA cannot restrict who accesses email inboxes, just as we can’t restrict who recipients share their papers with.</p>		
		ASAP	LRMs
11.	<p>Examples of good Locality practice or issues arising Sheena described an unusual situation whereby a letter was sent to a relevant person who was in hospital. The letter was forwarded to a hospital staff member of the same name. The agreed way round this for future letters to prevent a breach is to double-envelope the letter and address the outer envelope to the hospital administrator. This is noted in the additional information in the CSAS record.</p>		
12.	<p>New risks No new risks</p>		
13.	<p>Date of Next Meeting - Tuesday 22nd August 2023 via Teams @ 13:30 Stephen thanked everyone for attending the meeting.</p>		